

MEMOIRS
OF
THE LIFE,
WRITINGS,
AND
RELIGIOUS CONNEXIONS,
OF
JOHN OWEN, D.D.
(1616-1683)

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF OXFORD, AND DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH,
DURING THE COMMONWEALTH.

οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν
whose praise is throughout all the churches

BY WILLIAM ORME.
(1787-1830)

London:

PRINTED FOR T. HAMILTON,
33, PATERNOSTER ROW.
MDCCCXX.

1820

https://archive.org/stream/memoirsoflifewriooorme/memoirsoflifewriooorme_djvu.txt

*This is the standard on which other Owen biographies are based.
Formatted, lightly modernized, and annotated (in blue)
by William H. Gross www.onthewing.org Feb 2019*



Engraved by E. Scriver from an Original Picture Painted in the Year 1656.

About the Biographer – William Orme

William Orme (1787–1830) was a Scotch Congregational minister, known as a biographer of Richard Baxter and other Non-conformist figures.

He was born at Falkirk, Stirlingshire, on 3 February 1787. His parents moved to Edinburgh, where in 1792 he began his education under a schoolmaster named Waugh. On 1 July 1800 he was apprenticed for five years to a wheelwright and turner.

His father died in October 1803. About this time, Orme came under the influence of James Alexander Haldane, whose preaching at the Tabernacle in Leith Walk, Edinburgh, had attracted him. In October 1805 he was admitted by Robert Haldane as a student for the ministry at a seminary under George Cowie. The usual term of study was two years, but Orme's periods of study, interrupted by a preaching mission in Fife (1806), amounted to little more than a year in all. On 11 March 1807 he became pastor of the congregational church at Perth where he was ordained.

About 1809 he broke with Robert Haldane, in consequence of Haldane's adoption of Baptist views, and took part in the controversy that arose. He declined a call to the congregational church at Dundee. He took an active part in the development of Scotch congregationalism, especially aiding in the formation of the Congregational Union of Scotland (1813), and in the establishment of a divinity hall at Glasgow (1814).

On 7 October 1824, he became pastor of the congregational church at Camberwell Green, Surrey, and soon afterwards was elected foreign secretary of the London Missionary Society. He died in his prime on 8 May 1830, and was buried on 17 May at Bunhill Fields. His portrait, engraved by Thomson from a painting by Wildman, was published in the *Evangelical Magazine* for January 1830. He was twice married, and left a widow.

He published, in addition to separate sermons and pamphlets:

- 'Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Religious Connections of John Owen, D.D.,' etc., 1820.
- 'Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin,' etc., 1823.
- '*Bibliotheca Biblica...* List of Books on Sacred Literature, with Notices, Biographical, Critical,' etc., Edinburgh, 1824.
- 'Memoirs, including... Remains of John Urquhart,' etc., 1827, 2 vols.

Posthumous was:

- 'Life and Times of Richard Baxter,' etc., 1830, 2 vols. This was partly printed at the time of his death; it was edited by Thomas Russell. It accompanied an edition of Baxter's 'Practical Works,' begun by Orme in 1827. The second volume contains a detailed critique of Baxter's writings.

His two volumes on Richard Baxter were commended by Sir James Stephen. Andrew Thomson superseded him as a biographer of John Owen, and Joseph Ivimey for William Kiffin.

This article incorporates text from a publication now in the public domain: Gordon, Alexander (1895). "Orme, William," in Lee, Sidney. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 42. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

PREFACE.

The following work embraces the personal history, the theological writings, and the religious connexions of Dr. John Owen. In common with many others, I had long entertained the highest respect for the works of this eminent person; and in the perusal of them, had spent some of the happiest and most profitable hours of my life. The pleasure derived from his writings led me, a few years ago, merely for my own satisfaction, to make some inquiry respecting their author. Not finding such an account as satisfied me, I began to think that a careful examination of his numerous works, and of the contemporaneous productions of his age, might enable me to afford a fuller and more correct view of him, than had yet been given. Thus originated the present volume.

iv PREFACE.

It does not become me to speak of the success which has attended my investigations, as every reader will now form his own opinion. But I may be allowed to state that neither personal labour nor expense has been spared to procure information. And had I been aware, at an early period, of all the difficulties which have been experienced in prosecuting the task, it is more than probable it would never have been undertaken. At a distance from the great depositories of literature — far from the scenes of Owen's life and labours, and engaged in a service which has a right to the chief part of my time and attention, my inquiries were frequently much retarded and interrupted. I am very far, however, from regretting the labour in which I have been engaged. Whatever may be its effects on others, the personal benefit which I have derived from it myself, is an ample compensation for all the trouble it has cost me.

It is not necessary here to say anything of the sources of information to which I have been chiefly indebted, as they have been in general carefully marked. And I have the satisfaction to assure the reader, that every fact and circumstance in the personal life of Owen, which it was possible to procure and authenticate, has been fully and faithfully given.

PREFACE. v

Much attention has been paid to the works of Dr. Owen. The difficulty of even obtaining a complete collection of them, may be estimated from a remark made by the author himself, that "some of them he had not seen for nearly twenty years." As many of them were answers to the books of others, and were replied to, often by more than one opponent, a vast number of works had to be procured and examined, which are now almost entirely unknown. A minute account of all of these will not be expected within the limits of a volume. It would have been much easier, indeed, to have extended the criticism, than it was to confine it within the bounds which it occupies. But it is hoped such an account is in general given, as will gratify the curiosity and in some measure inform the judgment of the reader. Quotations are seldom made except when they contain information respecting the life of the author, or are necessary to illustrate his opinions.

vi PREFACE.

While I have been careful to state what the real sentiments of Owen were, and to rescue them from misrepresentation when necessary, I have not deemed it essential to the faithful discharge of my duty, as his Biographer, to indiscriminately adopt or defend them. Any difference which exists, however, will be found of very small importance, and to more generally respect Owen's manner of stating his sentiments, than the sentiments themselves. What the Doctor avowed, the writer of his life need not be ashamed to profess: —

Nullius addictus jurare in verba Magistri.¹

¹ "I am not obliged to swear allegiance to any master." — from Horace's Epistle to his benefactor Maecenas.

In noting the religious connexions of Owen, and the state of parties during his time, I have studied to speak the truth, and to avoid giving unnecessary offence. I am not anxious to lay claim to exemption from partiality for the body with which Owen was chiefly connected, but I trust this has never led me to defend its faults, or to misrepresent its enemies. Convinced that truth is the only thing of importance to myself or others, I have used my best endeavours to discover it, and when discovered, I have fairly told it. It is probable, however, that some mistakes may be detected in the narrative; but these, it is hoped, will not affect any point of moment.

PREFACE. vii

The Appendix contains a number of Notes and Documents which could not be conveniently inserted in the body of the work. As I was uncertain, during the printing of the first part of the volume, what room could be afforded for them, they are not referred to at the bottom of the page. But as they are placed in the regular order in which they illustrate the text, and as each article has its subject and the page of the text to which it belongs marked at the head of it, no serious inconvenience will result from the omission of references.

I have been under various and important obligations to several valuable literary friends, both in Scotland and in England, by whom the work has been rendered more complete than it would otherwise have been. To Dr. Charles Stuart of Dunearn, and Joshua Wilson, Esq. of London, I have been in particular much indebted for the use of many books and tracts which I might in vain have sought for many years. For these and other attentions, they will be pleased to accept my grateful acknowledgments.

viii PREFACE.

“And now,” to adopt the words of Isaac Walton,¹ “I am glad that I have collected these Memoirs, which lay scattered, and contracted them into a narrower compass; and if I have by the pleasant toil of doing so, either pleased or profited any man, I have attained what I designed when I first undertook it. But I seriously wish, both for the reader’s and Dr. Owen’s sake, that posterity had known his great learning and virtue by a better pen — by such a pen, as could have made his life as immortal as his learning and merits ought to be.”

PERTH,
October 15th, 1820.

¹ Preface to the Life of Bishop Sanderson.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| About the Biographer – William Orme | 3 |
| PREFACE..... | 4 |
| CHAPTER I..... | 10 |
| Introduction – Family of Owen – State of the Puritans – Owen’s Education – State of Oxford –Owen’s religious convictions – Leaves the University – Takes part with the Parliament – The Civil War – Owen’s Conversion – Publishes his Display – Progress of Arminianism – Presentation to the Living of Fordham – Marries his first Wife..... | 10 |
| CHAPTER II..... | 27 |
| Owen’s connexion with the Presbyterian body – its state at that time – Baxter’s account of its intolerance – Owen publishes his “Duty of Pastors and People” – His “Two Catechisms” –Preaches before Parliament – Publication of the Discourse, and his Essay on Church Government – His views of Uniformity and Toleration – Leaves Fordham..... | 27 |
| CHAPTER III..... | 38 |
| Owen’s settlement at Coggeshall – View of Independency – The Brownists – Causes which retarded and promoted the progress of Independency in England – Owen becomes an Independent – Publishes Eshcol – A Treatise on Redemption – His views on this subject – Controversy occasioned by it – Publishes two Discourses on the deliverance of Essex – Remarks on some sentiments contained in them..... | 38 |
| CHAPTER IV..... | 50 |
| Owen preaches before Parliament on the day after the execution of Charles I. – The Independents not guilty of putting the King to death – Testimonies on this subject – Remarks on Owen’s Sermon – Charges against it – Essay on Toleration annexed to it – Doctrine of Religious Liberty owes its origin to Independents – Writers on this subject – Brownists and Baptists – Jeremy Taylor – Owen – Vane – Milton – Locke – Cook’s account of the origin of Toleration among the Independents – A different account of it – Smith and Hume – Neal – Owen preaches again before Parliament – His first acquaintance with Cromwell – Is persuaded to accompany him to Ireland..... | 50 |
| CHAPTER V..... | 62 |
| Owen preaches before Parliament – Joins the army – Character of the array – Arrives in Ireland– Labours in Dublin – First controversy with Baxter – Character of Baxter – Preaches before Parliament on his return from Ireland – Measures of the Commonwealth to promote religion in that country – Owen appointed to accompany Cromwell into Scotland–Preaches in Berwick and Edinburgh – State of religion in Scotland – Testimony of the English Ministers–Of Binning – Rutherford – Burnet – Neal–Kirkton – Owen’s return to Coggeshall – Appointed to the Deanery of Christ Church – Account of this office – Remarks on his acceptance of it – Strictures of Wilton – Owen preaches before Parliament – Death of Ireton – Owen preaches his Funeral Sermon – Character of Ireton – Preaches again before Parliament..... | 62 |
| CHAPTER VI..... | 75 |
| Division of the Memoirs at this period – Owen made Vice-Chancellor – Attends a Meeting in London, called by Cromwell to promote union – Created D.D. – Elected M.P. for the University – Cromwell’s Instrument of Government – Debate about the Construction of the Article respecting Religious Liberty – Remarks on Neal’s account of it, and the Meeting of Ministers respecting it – Owen appointed an Ejecting Commissioner and Tryer – Conduct of the Tryers – Owen delivers Pococke – Baxter’s account of the Tryers – Owen’s measures for securing Oxford – Correspondence with Thurloe – Attends a Meeting at Whitehall about the Jews – Preaches at the Opening of a New Parliament – Again on a Fast day – Assists in defeating Cromwell’s attempt to make himself King – Deprived of the Vice-Chancellorship..... | 75 |

CHAPTER VII..... 87

State of the University during the civil wars, and when Owen was made Vice-Chancellor — Extract from his first address to it — From his fifth address — Specimen of the state of insubordination which prevailed in it — Learned men in office during his Vice-Chancellorship — Independents — Presbyterians — Episcopalians — Persons of note then educated — Writers, Philosophers, and Statesmen — Dignitaries of the Church — Dissenters — Royal Society then founded in Oxford — Clarendon’s testimony on the state of learning in it at the Restoration — Owen’s management of the several parties — Conduct to the Students — Preaching — The University presents a volume of poetic addresses to Cromwell — Owen’s address — Trick played by Kinaston at Oxford — Owen’s conduct toward two Quakers — His views of the Lord’s Prayer misrepresented — Refuses to swear by kissing the book — Wood’s account of his dress and manners -Extract from Evelyne — Owen addresses the new Chancellor, Richard Cromwell — Takes leave of the University.....87

CHAPTER VIII..... 104

Owen publishes his “Divina Justitia” — His work “On the Perseverance of the Saints” — John Goodwin — The doctrine of perseverance — Kendal — Lamb — Baxter writes on this subject — Owen requested by the Council of State to answer Biddle’s two Catechisms — Biddle — Progress of Socinianism — The “Vindiciae Evangelicae” — Never answered— “On the Mortification of Sin” — Controversy with Hammond about Grotius — Death of Gataker—Selden — Usher.....104

CHAPTER IX..... 116

The Independents propose to publish a Confession of their faith — Their sentiments on this subject — Confessions published by them on various occasions — Cromwell consents to their meeting for this purpose — They assemble at the Savoy — Agree to a declaration of their faith and Order — Its sentiments on several subjects — Extracts from the Preface written by Owen — Baxter’s displeasure with the meeting — Defence of it by Forbes — Chief objection to the Declaration — Not much known even among Independents — Death of Cromwell — State of religion during his Government — His influence on Independency — Tillotson’s account of a fast in the family of Richard Cromwell — Strictures on that account — Owen publishes his work on Communion —On Schism — Is answered by Hammond — by Firmin — by Cawdry — Owen’s Review of Cawdry — Cawdry’s rejoinder — Owen’s defence of himself and Cotton — Publishes on the Divine Origin of the Scriptures — His considerations on the Polyglot — Walton’s Reply — His controversy with the Quakers — Richard Cromwell succeeds his Father — Owen preaches before his first Parliament — Charged with pulling down Richard — Defended from this charge — Assists in restoring the long Parliament — Preaches before it for the last time — The Independents entertain fears of their liberty from Monk — Send a deputation to him to Scotland — His conduct and character —Owen ejected from the Deanery of Christ Church — Remarks on his political conduct. 116

CHAPTER X.....143

Owen retires to Stadham — Effects of the Restoration — Venner’s insurrection — The fifth monarchy men — Difference between Owen and Clarendon — The Act of Uniformity — Owen writes on the Magistrates’ power in Religion — His Primer for children — His *Theologoumena*—His Criticisms on Fiat Lux — Cane’s Reply — Owen’s Vindication — Difficulty of finding a license for it — Interview with Lord Clarendon — Invitation to New England — Sufferings of the Dissenters — Relieved for a time by the plague and fire of London — Owen writes various Tracts — Preaches more regularly in London — Publishes a Catechism on the Worship and Discipline of the Church — Answered by Camfield — Discussions between Baxter and Owen, respecting a union of Presbyterians and Independents — Failure of the attempt — Owen receives a Legacy — Publishes on Indwelling Sin — On the 130th Psalm — The first volume of his Exposition of the Hebrews — Review of the whole work..... 143

CHAPTER XI..... 165

Persecuting conduct of the Congregationalists in New England — Remonstrances of Owen and his brethren on the subject — Owen publishes on the Trinity — His controversy with Parker — His Truth and Innocence vindicated — Publications of others on the same side — Marvel and Parker — Conduct of Parliament toward the Dissenters — Vernon’s attack on Owen — Owen’s defence — Also — Owen invited to the Presidency of Harvard College — Publishes on the Sabbath—Correspondence on this subject with Eliot — Charles publishes a Declaration of Indulgence — Address from the Dissenters on this account

| | |
|--|------------|
| presented by Owen — Owen’s attention to the measures of the Court — Becomes one of the preachers of the Morning Exercise — Publishes on Evangelical Love — Death of Caryl — Union of Caryl’s and Owen’s Church under the Doctor — Notices of persons of distinction who were members of the Church — The Parliament offended with the King’s Indulgence — Notices of distinguished Noblemen whose friendship Owen enjoyed — His interviews with the King and Duke of York — Work on Communion attacked by Sherlock — Owen’s vindication — Controversy occasioned by Sherlock’s book — Owen publishes on the Holy Spirit — Review of all his writings on that subject — Attacked by Clagett — Publishes on Apostasy — Marries his second wife. | 165 |
| CHAPTER XII. | 192 |
| Owen’s assistants — Ferguson — Shields — Loeffs—Angier—Clarkson — Intercourse between Owen and Bishop Barlow respecting Bunyan — Owen publishes on Justification — On the Person of Christ — The Church of Rome no safe Guide — Death of Goodwin — Owen publishes on Union among Protestants — Controversy with Stillingfleet — Owen’s Vindication of the Non-conformists — Publications of others on the same side — Stillingfleet’s Unreasonableness of Separation — Owen’s Answer — Other Answers — Unfair conduct of Stillingfleet — Owen publishes on Evangelical Churches — His humble testimony — On Spiritual-mindedness — Account of the Protestant Religion — Meditations on the Glory of Christ — His declining health — Last sickness — Letter to Fleetwood — Death—Funeral — Clarkson’s Sermon on the occasion — Last Will — Sale of his Library — Monument and Inscription — Portraits of Owen — General view of his character as a Christian — A Minister — A Writer — Conclusion. | 192 |
| APPENDIX. | 232 |
| FAMILY OF OWEN — p. 8. | 232 |
| THE SYNOD OF DORT, p. 32. | 232 |
| WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY, — p. 72..... | 233 |
| PAMPHLETS ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, — p. 100..... | 233 |
| ADVOCATES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, — p. 106. | 234 |
| ORIGIN OF TOLERATION AMONG INDEPENDENTS, — p. 109..... | 235 |
| PREACHING OF THE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, — p. 116..... | 236 |
| THE EARLY STATE OF INDEPENDENCY IN IRELAND, p. 123..... | 237 |
| THE EARLY STATE OF INDEPENDENCY IN SCOTLAND, P 137..... | 239 |
| OWEN’S SUCCESSORS IN COGGESHALL — p. 134. | 240 |
| STATE OF OXFORD DURING THE EARLY PART OF LAST CENTURY, p. 180. | 241 |
| THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD OPEN TO ALL DURING THE COMMONWEALTH, p. 187. | 242 |
| RACOVIAN CATECHISM, — p. 214..... | 243 |
| ON THE USE OF THE TERM INDEPENDENT, p. 229. | 244 |
| PRAYERS OF CROMWELL’S CHAPLAINS, — p. 250. | 245 |
| THE ALLEGED SCHISMATIC NATURE OF INDEPENDENCY, p. 265..... | 246 |
| THE EARLY INDEPENDENTS OBSERVED THE LORD’S SUPPER WEEKLY, p. 308. | 246 |
| PERSECUTIONS IN NEW ENGLAND, — p. 336. | 247 |
| OWEN’S SUCCESSORS IN BURY STREET, — p. 397..... | 248 |
| POSTHUMOUS WRITINGS, — p. 443. | 249 |
| PREFACES TO THE WORKS OF OTHERS, — p. 443..... | 251 |
| LETTERS FROM DR. OWEN TO VARIOUS PERSONS. | 258 |
| CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE WORKS OF OWEN, | 263 |
| INDEX | 265 |

MEMOIRS,

etc.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction — Family of Owen — State of the Puritans — Owen's Education — State of Oxford — Owen's religious convictions — Leaves the University — Takes part with the Parliament — The Civil War — Owen's Conversion — Publishes his Display — Progress of Arminianism — Presentation to the Living of Fordham — Marries his first Wife.

THE seventeenth century was the age of illustrious events and illustrious men in Britain. The civil and religious struggles and changes which took place during that eventful period, the causes in which they originated, and the effects with which they were followed, are worthy of the attention of every British Christian, and are powerfully calculated to excite and improve both his religious and his patriotic feelings. While he will often have occasion to drop the tear of pity over his bleeding country, he will frequently be called to adore the wondrous operations of that glorious Being, "who rides in the whirlwind, and directs the storm;" who piloted the Ark of the Church through the mighty tempest which threatened its destruction, and finally secured its safety by a covenant of peace, we trust never to be broken.

In every rank and profession there were then many distinguished individuals whose independence of mind in the cause of their country, whose laborious researches in every department of literature, or whose important discoveries in philosophy, conferred honours on themselves and on the land of their birth, of which they can never be deprived.

2

The names of Pym and Hampden, of Sidney and Russel will live while the fabric of the British Constitution continues to be loved and respected; those of Locke and Boyle, of Wallis and Newton, can perish only with the records of science and time. A Churchman can never think of Hooker and Taylor, Chillingworth and Barrow, without emotions of the profoundest delight and veneration. And while the cause of Non-conformity — which the amiable and candid Doddridge pronounced to be "the cause of truth, honour and liberty, and of serious piety too," — continues to be dear to those whose ancestors defended and suffered for it, the page which records the names and the virtues of Baxter and Bates,¹ of Howe and Owen, however imperfect, will always secure attention and respect.

We leave to Statesmen the commemoration of those who then shone in the cabinet, or distinguished themselves in the field. We resign to Churchmen the task of recording the learning, piety, and sufferings of their brethren. The task of preserving the memory of his forefathers naturally devolves on a Dissenter. If he were to be indifferent to their reputation and their wrongs, who can be expected to assert them? And if he is zealous in their cause and anxious to vindicate their honour, the motive is creditable to his feelings, whatever may be the degree of success which attends his attempt.

It is rather surprising that, while the minutest researches have been made into the lives of many obscure individuals, no separate work has been devoted to the life of John Owen.

3

Mr. Clarkson, who preached his funeral sermon, observed, "that the account which is due to the world of this eminent man deserved a volume," which he hoped would soon make its appearance. Cotton Mather, in that singular work "Magnalia Americana Christi," published twenty years

¹ Dr. William Bates was one of the most eminent of the Puritan divines; he took part in the Savoy Conference. His collected writings were published in 1700, and fill a large folio volume. The Dissenters called him silver-tongued Bates. Calamy affirmed that if Bates had conformed to the Established Church, he might have been raised to any bishopric in the kingdom. He died in 1699, aged seventy-four.

afterwards, declared that, “the church of God was wronged in that the life of the great John Owen was not written.” About twenty years after that, prefixed to the folio edition of his Sermons and Tracts, appeared the first and the only account of him which can be depended on. But though it appears to have been drawn up by Mr. Asty, with the assistance of Sir John Hartopp, it is both inaccurate and imperfect, and it does not contain so many pages as the Doctor had written books. With the exception of this, and the scanty notices of general biography, Owen is only known by means of his writings.

No necessity exists for stating here the claims which the subject of these memoirs has to a distinct account of his life. Every theological scholar, every lover of experiential piety, every reader of our civil and ecclesiastical history, as well as every dissenter, has heard of the name, and known something of the character of Owen — a man, “admired when living, and adored when lost;” whose works yet praise him in the gates, and by which he will continue to instruct and comfort the church for ages to come.

Those who believe that “God has made of one blood all nations of men,” will never themselves be flattered by the pride of ancestry, nor attach much importance to it in others. No harm, however, can arise from noticing, when it can be done with any degree of certainty, the particular line of the Adamic race to which a respected individual owed his birth.

4

Therefore, regardless of Bishop Watson’s remark that “German and Welsh pedigrees are subjects of ridicule to most Englishmen,” we shall proceed to give a short account of the family of Owen.

John Owen derived his pedigree from Lewis Owen, Esq. of Kwyn, near Dollegelle, a gentleman of about £300 per annum, and lineally descended from a younger son of Kewelyn ap Gwrgan, Prince of Glamorgan, Lord of Cardiffe, the last family of the five regal tribes of Wales. This Welsh Prince was Vice-Chamberlain and Baron of the Exchequer in North Wales, about the middle of the reign of Henry VIII, and continued so till the eighth year of Elizabeth. Lewis Owen was High Sheriff of the county of Merioneth, and lost his life on returning from the assizes at Montgomery, by the hands of some outlaws, at a place called Dugsed. A cross was erected there to his memory, which still goes by the name of “the gate of the Baron’s cross.”

Griffith, the fifth son of this gentleman had a daughter named Susan, who was married to Humphrey Owen, of the same family in another line. This Humphrey had *fifteen* sons, the youngest of whom was Henry, the father of the subject of our history.¹

Henry Owen, being not merely a younger, but the youngest son of so numerous a family, was bred to the Church. After studying at Oxford, he taught a school for some time at Stokenchurch.² He was afterwards chosen minister of Stadham, in the county of Oxford,³ where he remained many years. In the latter part of his life he became rector of Harpsden, in the same county, where he died, on the eighteenth of September, 1649, in the sixty-third year of his age, and was buried in the chancel of the church.⁴

5

¹ Memoirs, pp. 2, 3.

² Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*

³ Mem.

⁴ Tree belonging to the family.

“My father,” said his son, “was a Non-conformist all his days, and a painful labourer in the vineyard of the Lord.”¹ “He was reckoned,” says the author of his memoirs, “a strict Puritan, for his more than ordinary zeal, in those early days of reformation.”²

For many years, the situation of the Puritans had been gradually becoming more unpleasant and intolerable. The haughty spirit of Elizabeth had made their yoke heavy, but the vanity and dogmatism of her successor rendered it almost insupportable. The great body of them had no difference with their opponents about the lawfulness of ecclesiastical establishments. They had no doubts as to the propriety of using the sword to a certain extent for the purpose of producing unity of sentiment and uniformity of practice in religion. They objected not so much to the interference of the civil powers in the affairs of the church, as to the mode and degree of that interference. “They were,” says Neal, “for one religion, one uniform mode of worship, one form of discipline for the whole nation, with which all must comply outwardly, whatever were their inward sentiments.”³ “The standard of uniformity,” says the same writer, “according to the Bishops, was the Queen’s authority and the laws of the land; according to the Puritans, it was the decrees of provincial and national synods, allowed and enforced by the civil magistrate. But neither party was for admitting that liberty of conscience and freedom of profession, which is every man’s right as far as is consistent with the peace of the civil government he lives under.”⁴

6

Their objections to the Church of England respected chiefly the nature and extent of the King’s supremacy, the unscripturalness of some of her offices, the Popish character of parts of her liturgy, and some of the modes of worship which she enjoined. Had the crown resigned its authority to church rulers, had the offices of Metropolitan, Archbishop, and some others been abrogated, had the liturgy been reformed, had the sign of the cross in Baptism, kneeling at the Supper, and bowing at the name of Jesus been done away with; had they been allowed to wear a round instead of a square cap, and a black gown in place of a white surplice, then the great mass of the early Puritans and even of the later Non-conformists would have become the warmest friends of the Church. They were not *Dissenters* from its constitution, but *Non-conformists* to some of its requisitions.

These things are not stated to insinuate that the points in dispute were of small importance, for nothing is unimportant which is enforced on the conscience as part of religion. Rather, it is to show what they really were; and to enable the reader to understand the nature and progress of those religious discussions which for a long period occupied so large a portion of the public attention. It is not so wonderful that the views of the Puritans on many subjects were imperfect; but it is surprising that they saw so much — and that, with those views, they were able to so boldly contend for what they believed to be the cause of God. It cannot be doubted that if their object had been accomplished, the Church of England would have been much improved.

7

And so far as externals are concerned, it would have been brought nearer to the model of Scripture, and thus rendered worthier of the designation her sons are so proud of: “The glory and bulwark of the Reformation.” But although they had succeeded, so long as the spiritual and temporal kingdoms remained incorporated, the root of the evil must have continued still.

High expectations were formed by the Puritans from the accession of James I. to the throne of England. But alas! They were soon most miserably disappointed. James had been educated a Presbyterian, was a professed Calvinist, and a sworn Covenanter. But after he obtained the British

¹ Rev. of the Nat. of Schism, p. 38.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³ Hist. of the Puritans, vol. 1. chap. iv. p. 186.

⁴ *Ut supra*, 157.

crown, he became a high Episcopalian, a determined Arminian, and a secret friend to Popery. His bad principles, improper alliances, and unworthy conduct, laid the foundation of much future misery to his country, which burst like a torrent upon his successor, and finally swept his family from the throne. The Hampton Court conference, held in 1603, revealed the high ideas which James entertained by kingly prerogative, and how much he was disposed to domineer over the consciences of his subjects. "No Bishop, no King" was his favourite maxim. "I will have one doctrine, one discipline, one religion in substance and in ceremony," said his Majesty, in the plenitude of his wisdom and authority; and concluded this mock discussion in which the Puritans were brow-beaten and insulted, by vowing that he would make them conform, or hurry them out of the land, or do worse.

For once, James was as good as his word, and everything was done which was likely to render his conscientious subjects miserable, or to drive them to extremes. The same measures were persevered in, and increased in severity, by the infatuated and unfortunate Charles.

8

The consequence was that many left the land of their fathers, and found a refuge or a grave in a distant wilderness; some wandered about in England, subject to many privations and hardships, doing good as they had opportunity; while others endeavoured to reconcile the rights of conscience, with submission to the powers that were — and prayed and hoped for better days.

Of this last description was Henry Owen. A full account of his family is no longer to be obtained. It appears, however, that he had at least three sons and a daughter. His eldest son, William, was a clergyman. He is described in the records of the Herald's College "of Remnam, in the county of Berks, parson of Ewelme in the county of Oxford," where he died in 1660, in the forty-eighth year of his age. His third son, Henry, appears to have chosen a military profession. He went over to Ireland with Cromwell as an ensign, and there seems to have acquired some landed property. He died before John, but his son succeeded to the Doctor's estates in England.¹

His daughter married Mr. John Hartcliffe, minister of Harding, in Oxfordshire, and afterwards of Windsor. I know little of him; but his son made some figure. He was educated for the Church, and in 1681, after a keen contest, he succeeded Mr. John Goad as master of Merchant Tailor's School. In the contest, he appears to have been assisted by his uncle, who exerted his influence among the London merchants, on behalf of his nephew.

9

His predecessor, Goad, was ejected for his Popery. Mr. Hartcliffe wrote several treatises, became D.D. in 1681, and died in 1702, Canon of Windsor.² It is said he once attempted to preach before Charles II; but not being able to utter one word of the sermon, he descended from the pulpit as great an orator as he went up, treating his Majesty with a silent meeting.³

John, the second son, was born at Stadham, in the year 1616; the very year in which Mr. Jacob formed, in England, the first Church of that denomination of which Owen was destined to be the brightest ornament, and one of the most learned and successful advocates.

Young Owen, after receiving the first rudiments of education (probably from his father), was initiated into the principles of classical learning by Edward Sylvester, master of a private academy at Oxford. This respectable tutor not only taught Greek and Latin, but made or corrected Latin discourses, and Greek and Latin verses, for members of the University. They found it necessary to exhibit what they were unable to produce, and lived to see a number of his pupils make a

¹ Dr. Owen's Will.

² Nichol's Anecdotes, I. p. 64. Birch's Life of Tillotson, p.238; Weed's Athen. Ox. II. p. 637.

³ Contrivances of the fanatical conspirators, by W. Smith.

distinguished figure in the world. Among these (besides Owen) were Dr. John Wilkins, who was more celebrated for his philosophical talents than for being Bishop of Chester; Dr. Henry Wilkinson, Margaret professor in the University during the Commonwealth, and afterwards a celebrated Non-conformist; and a man better known than either of the preceding, William Chillingworth, author of “The Religion of Protestants,” a work which confers an honour on the age that produced it.¹

10

Owen appears to have made rapid progress at school, for by the time he was only twelve years of age, he was fit for the University, and actually admitted a student of Queen’s College, Oxford. We can have no doubt that his father afforded him all the assistance in his power in the acquisition of learning, as he knew that he had no property to give him, and that he would have to fight his way through the world by his own exertions. Nothing, perhaps, is more unfavourable to genius and industry than being born to a fortune already provided. It diminishes or destroys that excitement which is absolutely necessary to counteract our natural indolence; while it too often encourages those feelings of pride and vanity which are destructive of application and success. Hence, while the heir to titles and to wealth has often passed through the world in inglorious obscurity, the younger son has frequently supported and increased the honours of his family. Most persons who have risen to eminence in any profession, have given early promise of future distinction. There are indeed exceptions to this remark. Many a fair blossom has gone up as dust, and the seed sometimes lies so long under the surface, that all hope of its resurrection is given over — when some powerful cause suddenly quickens the latent germ, and develops the energies and beauties of the future plant.

11

When Owen joined the University, and while he continued at it, few of its leading members were distinguished either for their learning or their talents. The Provost of his College was Dr. Christopher Potter, originally a Puritan. But after Laud’s influence at Court, he became a creature of that ambitious Prelate’s, and was considered a supporter of his Arminian sentiments. Wood says he was learned and religious. But he produced nothing which reveals much evidence of either, except a translation from the Italian of Father Paul’s history of the “Quarrels of Pope Paul V with the State of Venice.”² The Vice-Chancellors of the University during Owen’s residence were Accepted Frewen,³ afterwards Archbishop of York; — William Smith, Warden of Wadham College; — Brian Duppa, Bishop of Winchester, of whose qualifications Wood gives rather a curious account:

“He was a man of excellent parts, and in every way qualified for his function, especially as to the attractiveness of his person, and gracefulness of his deportment, which rendered him worthy of the service of a court, and in every way fit to stand before Princes:”⁴

— Robert Pink, Warden of New College, a zealous defender of the rights of the University, and who was much esteemed by James I for his dexterity in disputing, as he was also by Charles I for his eminent loyalty;⁵ — and Dr. Richard Baylie, President of St. John’s College and Dean of Salisbury. The Margaret Professor of Divinity, was Dr. Samuel Fell, a parasite of Laud’s, by whose means he was advanced to the Deanery of Lichfield. He was ejected from all his preferments by

¹ Wood’s *Athen. Passim*.

² *Athen. Ox. II.* pp.44, 45.

³ Accepted Frewen (1588-1664) was a priest in the Church of England and Archbishop of York from 1660 to 1664.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 177.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 57.

the Parliamentary visitors in 1647. ¹ The Hebrew Professor was John Morris, of whom we know nothing as an oriental scholar; and Henry Stringer was Professor of Greek, of whose classical attainments we know as little.

12

Barlow is almost the only name we are now disposed to associate with learning: all the others are either forgotten or unknown. It will afterwards appear how different the state of the University became, in regard to men of eminence and learning, when Owen filled its highest offices.

In Queen's College, Owen studied mathematics and philosophy under Thomas Barlow, then fellow of the college of which he afterwards was chosen Provost when Owen was Vice-chancellor. He was made a bishop in 1676, and lived till after the revolution. Barlow was a Calvinist in theology, an Aristotelian in philosophy, and an Episcopalian in church government. He was a man of eminent talents, and according to Granger, as great a master of the learned languages, and of the works of the celebrated authors who have written in them, as any man of his age. ²

Owen studied music (for recreation) under Dr. Thomas Wilson, a celebrated performer on the flute, who was for some years in constant attendance on Charles I, who used to lean on his shoulder during the time he played. He was made Professor of Music in Oxford by Owen when he was Vice-chancellor of the University. This shows that the men of that period were neither so destitute of taste nor so morose and unsocial as they have been often represented. ³

Moderate talents assisted by diligent application, will frequently do more than genius of a much higher order, whose efforts are all irregular and desultory. But when talents and laborious exertion are combined with the fervour of youth and the aids of learning, much may be expected from the result.

13

Our student pursued his various branches of improvement with incredible diligence, allowing himself for several years, not more than four hours sleep a night. It is impossible not to applaud the ardour which this application reveals. The more time a student can redeem from sleep, and other indulgences, so much the better. But it is not every constitution that is capable of such an expenditure. And many an individual in struggling beyond his strength for the prize of literary renown, has procured it at the expense of his life, or the irreparable injury of his future comfort. Owen himself is said to have declared afterwards that he would gladly part with all the learning he had acquired in younger life by sitting up late at study, if he could but recover the health he lost by it. ⁴ He who prefers mercy to sacrifice, requires nothing in ordinary circumstances beyond what the human system is fairly capable of bearing.

Owen appears to have been blessed with a sound and vigorous constitution. This, no doubt, enabled him to use greater freedoms than he otherwise dared to have done. To brace and strengthen it, he was not inattentive to those recreations which tended to counteract the pernicious effects of his sedentary occupations. He was fond of forceful and robust exertion — such as leaping, throwing the bar, ringing bells, etc. Such diversions may appear to some to be ridiculous and unbecoming; but this arises from lack of consideration. That kind and degree of exercise which are necessary for preserving the proper temperament of the human system, are not only lawful, but a part of the duty which we owe to ourselves.

¹ Ibid p. 63.

² Biog. Hist. Art. Thos. Darlow.

³ Wood's Life, p. 92.

⁴ Gibbon's Life of Watts, p. 161.

Such recreations are not to be compared with those fashionable levities, and amusements which only tend to vitiate the moral and intellectual powers, and to enervate rather than strengthen the constitution. It is much more gratifying to see the academic robes waving in the wind, than shining at the midnight dance, or adorning the front ranks of a theatre.

On the 11th of June, 1632, Owen was admitted to the degree of B. A.; and on the 27th of April, 1635, at the age of nineteen, he commenced Master of Arts, ¹ a designation which was then more declarative of learning and diligence than it has since become. When literary degrees are spurs to application, and the rewards of merit, they answer a useful purpose. But when they come to be almost indiscriminately bestowed, they lose their value, are despised by the genuine scholar, and are sought after only by those on whom they can confer no honour or distinction.

During this period of his life, his mind seems to have been scarcely, if at all, influenced by religious principle. His whole ambition was to raise himself to some eminent station in church or state, to either of which he was then indifferent. Afterwards he used to acknowledge that, being naturally of an aspiring mind, and very desirous of honour and preferment, he applied himself very closely to his studies in the hope of accomplishing these ends. Then, the honour of God and the good of his country were objects subservient to the advancement of his own glory or interest. Had he continued in this state of mind, he would probably have succeeded; but it would have been in another cause than that to which he was finally devoted.

Instead of a Puritan, he might have been found among their persecutors, and his name have descended to posterity in the roll of state oppressors, or bigoted churchmen. Many young persons who have been devoted by their parents to the church, and have improved their talents in the hope of rising in it, would have conferred a blessing on themselves, as well as on the church and the world, had they found another path to earthly glory. Some radical mistake must exist when the church of Christ becomes (or is capable of being made) the theatre of worldly ambition. The merchandise of “the souls of men,” is the most infamous traffic in which man can engage, and constitutes one of the chief of those delinquencies charged on the mystical Babylon.

Owen, however, was unconsciously preparing himself, for shining in another career. He was now under a higher, though unperceived influence, acquiring the capacity for using those weapons which he was destined to wield with mighty effect against all the adversaries of the gospel. “Many purposes are in a man’s heart, but the counsel of the Lord — that shall stand.” ^{Pro 19.21} He was probably often exulting in the prospect of wealth and honour, while God was preparing him to suffer many things for his sake, and for important usefulness in his own cause.

The limited resources of his father prevented allowing him any liberal support at the university. But this deficiency was amply made up by an uncle, the proprietor of a considerable estate in Wales. Having no children of his own, his uncle intended to make him his heir. Although this intention was not carried into effect, his nephew must have felt grateful on account of the assistance afforded during his early years.

Previously to his leaving the university, which took place in his twenty-first year, Owen appears to have become the subject of religious convictions. By what means these were produced, it is now impossible to ascertain. He had received a religious education in his father’s house, and early impressions then made, may have been revived and deepened by circumstances which afterwards occurred. The impressions were very powerful, and appear to have deeply affected his mind and

¹ Wood’s Fasti, vol. I. pp. 872—879.

even his health. The course of spiritual conflict through which he passed, undoubtedly fitted him for what he was to do at a future period; and it probably infused that tone of spiritual feeling into his soul which runs through all his writings. The words of the apostle are no less applicable to mental than to bodily sufferings; “who comforts us in all our tribulations, that we may be able to comfort those who are in any trouble, by the comfort with which we ourselves are comforted by God.” ^{2Cor 1.4} If the spiritual physician knows nothing from experience, of the malady of the patient, then he is but imperfectly qualified to administer relief.

It was while he was under these religious convictions that Owen left the university. And as they chiefly led to this event, it is necessary to notice the circumstances which occasioned it. For several years things had been gradually coming to a crisis between the court and the country. The aggressions of the former on the civil and religious liberties of the latter, had become so numerous and so flagrant, as to occasion a very general spirit of discontent. In an evil day, Charles had advanced to the primacy of England William Laud. He was a man of undoubted talents and learning, but of high monarchical principles; he was fond of pomp and ceremony. Though he was no friend to the Pope at Rome, he had little objection to himself being the Pope in England. His arbitrary conduct in the star chamber, his passion for ceremony in the church, and his love of Arminianism in the pulpit, hastened his own fate, and promoted that of his master.

17

The best of the clergy were either silenced, or obliged to leave the country. High churchmen were engrossing almost every civil and ecclesiastical office, to the disappointment of many, and the vexation of all.

The same year, 1637, that produced the celebrated resistance of Hampden to illegal taxation, drove Owen from Oxford in consequence of the ecclesiastical tyranny of Laud. Among the other situations which that ambitious churchman had monopolized was that of chancellor of Oxford. By virtue of his office, he caused a new body of statutes to be drawn up for the university; in the preface to which he clearly intimates that he considered the days of Mary ¹ better than those of Edward. In these statutes, obedience to some superstitious rites was required of the members of the university, on pain of being expelled. Though the mind of Owen was not sufficiently enlightened to see the glory of the gospel, his conscience was brought so far under the authority of Divine revelation, that he could not submit to these human exactions. On the one side lay all his worldly prospects; on the other lay the approval of Heaven. He had the faith and courage to embrace the choice of Moses: he relinquished the pleasures of the world, rather than sacrifice the honour of his God.

This change of feeling and sentiment was soon discovered by his former friends. As usually happens in such cases, they forsook the man whom neither the king nor the primate would delight to honour. The result of his refusing to submit, and of the opposition of Laud’s party, was his leaving the university.

18

He was never to return, until He who disposes equally the lot of nations and of individuals, sent Haman to a scaffold, and raised Mordecai to fill his place. During this struggle, the mind of Owen appears to have been in awful spiritual perplexity. This, combined with external circumstances and the discouraging prospects which were presented, threw him into a state of profound melancholy. For a quarter of a year he avoided almost all intercourse with men; he could scarcely be induced to speak. And when he did say anything, it was in so disordered a manner that it rendered him a wonder to many.

¹ Mary I, nicknamed “Bloody Mary,” who imprisoned reformers, and burned many at the stake. Her successor was young Edward VI, a Protestant.

“Forsaken and forsaking of all friends.
He now perceives where earthly pleasure ends;
His grief the world of all her power disarms,
Wine has no taste, and beauty has no charms:
God’s holy word, once trivial in his view,
Now by the voice of his experience true.
Seems, as it is, the fountain whence alone
Must spring that hope, he pants to make his own.”¹

Only those who have experienced the bitterness of a wounded spirit can form any idea of the awful distress he must have suffered. Compared with this anguish of soul, all the afflictions which can befall a sinner are but trifles. Letting into the mind but one drop of that wrath which shall finally fill the cup of the ungodly, is enough to poison all the comforts of life, and to spread mourning and lamentation and woe over the countenance. It is not in the least wonderful that cases of this kind sometimes occur; but considering the character of man, it is rather surprising that they do not more frequently occur. If men were disposed to seriously reflect on their present condition, and to contemplate their future prospects, nothing but the gospel could preserve them from the deepest despair. Perhaps he alludes to this severe distress, among other things, when he says,

19

“The variety of outward providences and dispensations with which I have myself been exercised, together with the inward trials with which they have been attended, have left such a constant sense and impression on my spirit, that I cannot but own a serious call to men to beware.”²

Such a conflict of feeling, and of so long a continuance, it would have been strange if he had ever forgotten. And “knowing the terrors of the Lord,” it would be stranger still, if he had ceased to beseech men to avoid them.

It is the opprobrium of Oxford, that Locke was expelled from its bowers. It is little less to its disgrace, that such a man as Owen was compelled to withdraw from them. The treatment which both those learned men experienced in this celebrated seat of loyalty and learning, probably contributed in no small degree to produce that deep-rooted dislike toward civil and ecclesiastical domination, which appears so conspicuously in their writings. That which men intended for evil, God overruled for good. The influence of Owen’s early secession from that body which holds the right of the church (or rather of the king) to decree “rites and ceremonies,” was felt by him during the course of his future life. There is a comfort connected with following the dictates of conscience in obeying the word of the Lord, which imparts a vigour and independence to the human character. It can never be felt by the time-serving votaries of church or state. And it is infinitely more valuable than all the honours of the one, or the emoluments of the other. It is common to treat the conduct of such persons as Owen — who left the church for refusing to submit to the interference of human authority — as unnecessarily punctilious,³ and as resulting from a narrow conformation of mind.

20

But let it be remembered that it was not a particular rite or ceremony which they refused to observe, so much as the *principle* which enforced obedience; and the greatness of their minds was revealed in their willingly exposing themselves to severe suffering for conscience’ sake. The strong view which Owen took of the matter, is well expressed in the following passage: —

¹ Taken from William Cowper’s poem, *Hope* (c. 1750)

² Preface to the work on temptation.

³ Punctilious: overly fastidious or meticulous (“picky”); marked by precise accordance with details (*minutiae*).

“I shall take leave to say what is upon my heart, and what, the Lord assisting, I shall willingly endeavour to make good against all the world, that this principle — that the church has power to institute any thing or ceremony belonging to the worship of God, either as to its matter or manner, beyond the orderly observance of those circumstances which necessarily attend such ordinances as Christ himself instituted — this principle lies at the bottom of all the horrible superstition and idolatry, of all the confusion, blood, persecution, and wars, that have for so long a season spread themselves over the face of the Christian world. And it is the design of a great part of the revelation, to reveal this truth. I do not doubt that the great controversy which God has had with this nation for so many years, was on this account: that contrary to that glorious light of the gospel which shone among us, the wills and fancies of men — under the name of order, decency, and the authority of the church (a *chimera* that none knew what it was, nor in what its power consisted, nor in whom it resided) — were imposed on men in the worship of God. Hence the Spirit of God was derided in prayer; hence the powerful preaching of the gospel was despised; hence the sabbath was derided; hence holiness was stigmatized and persecuted. And for what?”

21

That Jesus Christ might be deposed from the sole privilege and power of making laws in His church, that the true husband might be thrust aside, and adulterers of his spouse be embraced! — that task-masters might be appointed over his house, *which he never gave to his church*, Eph. 4.12 — that a ceremonious, pompous worship, drawn from Pagan, Jewish, and Antichristian observances, might be introduced. There is not one word or iota of any of this in the whole book of God. Those who hold communion with Christ are careful, then, of this: that they will allow nothing, practise nothing, in the worship of God, private or public, except what they have his warrant for. Unless it comes in his name, with ‘Thus saith the Lord Jesus,’ they will not hear an angel from heaven.”¹

Let those who despise the man, answer his reasons, and then boast of their superiority. The circumstance of Owen’s leaving Oxford, affords Anthony Wood (who rejoices to get a hit at Puritans and Round Heads), an opportunity to accuse him of perjury.² When Owen joined the university, he very probably took the oaths, and made the usual subscription. When he saw them to be unlawful, or felt they involved consequences of which he had not been aware, he renounced them. If this is perjury, it remains to be considered whether the guilt lies with those who impose oaths and subscriptions on boys — which they cannot understand and which, when they come to be men, repent they should ever have taken — or those who are thus innocently ensnared. Before such conduct can be charged with perjury, the lawfulness of the oath must be shown; unlawful oaths and vows require repentance, not fulfilment. All such subscriptions are unrighteous impositions. They impede the progress of truth, ensnare the minds of the subscribers, and operate as a bounty on hypocrisy.

22

They secure a monopoly of privileges to the chartered corporation; and exclude a large portion of the principle and talent of the country from the enjoyment of advantages that ought to be common.

Before Owen left college, he received orders from Bishop John Bancroft, nephew to the celebrated Archbishop of the same name, who occupied the diocese of Oxford from 1632 to 1640. After leaving it, he lived for some time as chaplain to Sir Robert Dormer, of Ascot in Oxfordshire, and as tutor to his eldest son. When Owen left him, he became chaplain to Lord Lovelace of Hurby in Berkshire.³ He continued in this situation till the civil war broke out, when — Lord Lovelace espousing the cause of the king, and Owen espousing the cause of the Parliament — a separation naturally took place. This step was attended with very important consequences for Owen. His uncle, being a determined Royalist, was so enraged at his nephew for attaching himself to the

¹ Owen on Communion, pp. 309, 310. Ed. 1721.

² Athen Ox. II. 555.

³ Athen. Ox. II. p.556.

Parliament, that he turned him out of favour at once, settled his estate on another, and died without leaving Owen a thing. A step attended with such effects, was not likely to be rashly taken. It shows that Owen must have been influenced by some very powerful considerations. Having taken his ground, he was not to be driven from it by regard to the favour of friends, or the sordid interests of this world. ¹

The civil war has often been rashly and unjustly charged upon the Puritans, or Non-conformists. Notwithstanding the force of evidence with which the accusation has been repelled, it continues to be repeated still.

23

Episcopal charges, thirtieth of January sermons,² and velvet cushions in every varied form, endeavour to fix the crime of rebellion on men who deserve to be held in everlasting remembrance for what they did, instead of being execrated. Religious dissatisfaction, it should never be forgotten, was only *one* of the many causes of that awful convulsion; and religious persons composed but *one* of the classes which produced it. The continual breaches made on the constitution by Charles I, from the period of his accession to the throne, till he was forced to leave it — by his arbitrary treatment of his Parliaments; by his persevering attempts to render himself independent of them; by his illegal modes of raising money; by the oppression and cruelty with which those who asserted their civil or religious liberty were treated; — *these* were the real causes of the war. And that these measures were prompted chiefly by the high church party which had the management of the king, and which goaded him on to the last, is evident to all who have paid the least attention to the history of the period.

This is how far the Non-conformists were from being the authors of the rebellion, as it is called. Clarendon himself acknowledges that “the major part of the long Parliament consisted of men who had no mind to break the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alteration in the government of church or state.”³ As an evidence of their attachment to the church, seventeen days after their first meeting, they made an order that none should sit in their house, except those who would receive the communion according to the church of England. ⁴

24;

The Earl of Essex, the Parliament’s general, was an Episcopalian; the admiral who seized the king’s ships, and employed them against him, was the same; Sir John Hotham, who shut the gates of Hull against him, was a churchman; the same may be affirmed of Sir Henry Vane, Senior; of Lenthal, the speaker; of the celebrated Pym, and of most of the other leading persons in Parliament and in the army. So that it is clear as noon day, that whatever fault attaches to the civil war must be imputed to the Church of England, whose members were first and deepest in the quarrel. ⁵

The object of that momentous contest on the part of the community, was a change of men and measures, and not a subversion of the constitution of either church or state. Had Charles driven off his popish and unconstitutional counsellors; had he consented to govern by regular Parliaments, and revealed sincerity in fulfilling his promises; had he granted even a limited toleration to his persecuted subjects, and changed some of his most unadvised and unpopular measures, he would have retrieved his affairs, established his throne, saved the lives of many

¹ Memoirs.

² [Charles was executed on January 30th, 1649.](#)

³ Hist. of the Reb. I. p. 184.

⁴ Tind. Con. p. 5.

⁵ Clarendon passim, Sylvester’s Life of Baxter, Part 111. p. 249.

thousands of his subjects, and more than fifty millions of money to his country — besides preventing that awful catastrophe which men of all parties must deplore.

The war increased the number of Presbyterians, and augmented their influence by the calling in of the Scots; it afforded opportunity to the Independents to propagate their sentiments, and to multiply their disciples; it also occasioned the increase of the Baptists, and some smaller sects. But that any or all of these religious parties were the causes of the war, the chief instruments in carrying it on, or justly chargeable with the excesses which took place, is unsupported by evidence, and contrary to clearly established facts. ¹

25

The situation of the people of God during this trying period must have been very perplexing. Neutrality was scarcely possible, especially to those who possessed rank, or held office in the country. Those who joined the king were counted enemies to the liberty of England; those who joined the Parliament were reckoned enemies to legitimate authority. Politics, however unfriendly to the growth of religion, was required to be studied, so that the subject might know his duty. All the Non-conformists naturally took part with the House of Commons, as they saw clearly that nothing short of their ruin was determined by the king. Most of those who wished well to true religion, though attached to the church, acted in the same manner, as it was evident that religion was more at heart with the Parliamentary party than with the king's. The friends of liberty, of course, supported the popular side of the constitution, against the encroachments of prerogative. It is exceedingly unfair to charge those who acted in this manner with rebellion. The House of Commons forms an essential part of the British Constitution, as well as the monarch. At this lamentable period, the constitution was divided against itself. War was openly maintained on both sides, between the king and the Parliament. Liberty and redress were the professed objects of the one party, power was the object of the other. If you took part with the king, you were liable to be punished by the Parliament; and if you supported the Parliament, you were in danger from the wrath of the king. So long as the constitution was thus divided, no man could be justly chargeable with crime in following either the one party or the other, as his conscience dictated. ²

26

As Owen had no connexion with party politics, other than that which arose from necessity, a view of the progress of civil discord, or a defence of the measures pursued by the Parliament, cannot be expected here. No doubt can be entertained about his sincerity. And as conscience evidently directed the part which he took, if the cause had been even more doubtful than it appears to me to have been, he should have the full benefit of this plea. The Rev. Thomas Scott, a respectable minister of the Church of England, says this:

“Many, no doubt, who obtained an undue ascendancy among the Puritans in the turbulent days of Charles the First, and even before that time, were factious, ambitious hypocrites. But I must think that the tree of liberty, sober and legitimate liberty, *civil and religious*, in the shadow of which we in the establishment, as well as others, repose in peace, and the fruit of which we gather, was planted by the Puritans, and watered, if not by their blood, at least by their tears and sorrows. *Yet, it is the modern fashion to feed delightfully on the fruit, and then revile, if not curse, those who planted and watered it.*” ³

¹ The reader will find a full view of this interesting subject in May's History of the Long Parliament; in various parts of Clarendon and Whitelocke; and particularly in a valuable anonymous pamphlet, “An Essay towards attaining a true idea of the Character and Reign of Charles I, and of the causes of the Civil War.” — 1748.

² Baxter's Holy Commonwealth, p. 453, ad finem.

³ Quoted to the Eclectic Rev. vol. VII. p. 11.

Owen's patron having joined the king's army, Owen went up to London, where he was an entire stranger, and took lodgings in Charter House yard.¹ Though the force of his convictions had subsided after the first severe conflict, they continued to disturb his peace. Nearly five years elapsed from the commencement of his trouble, to obtaining solid comfort of mind.

27

This was a long time to be harassed with fears and despondency. It was probably occasioned by receiving a direction in his inquiries, which increased the evil it that was intended to remove. The dawn of light, however, was now at hand. The glory of the gospel speedily dispersed his darkness, and produced feelings of joy and happiness corresponding with to his former depression, and of which he never again seems to have been altogether deprived.

During his residence in the Charter House, he accompanied a cousin of his to Aldermanbury church to hear Mr. Edmund Calamy, a man of great note for his eloquence as a preacher, and for his boldness as a leader of the Presbyterian party. By some unexplained circumstance, Mr. Calamy was prevented from preaching that day. Consequently, not knowing who was to preach, many left the church. Owen's cousin urged him to go and hear Mr. Jackson, the Minister of St. Michael's, Wood-street, a man of prodigious application as a scholar, and of considerable celebrity as a preacher. Owen, however, being seated, and unwilling to walk further, refused to leave the church till he saw who was to preach. At last a country minister, unknown to the congregation, stepped into the pulpit. After praying very fervently, he took for his text, Mat. 8.26. "Why are you fearful? O ye of little faith!" The very reading of the text appears to have impressed Owen, and led him to pray most earnestly that the Lord would bless the discourse to him. The prayer was heard — for in that sermon, the minister was directed to answer the very objections which Owen had commonly brought against himself. And though the same answers had often occurred to him, they had not previously afforded him any relief. But now Jehovah's time of mercy had arrived, and the truth was received, not as the word of man, but as the word of the living and true God. The sermon was a very plain one — the preacher was never known — but the effect was mighty through the blessing of God.

28

All instruments are equally efficient in the hand of the Great Spirit. It is not by might nor by power that the Lord frequently effects the greatest works, but by means apparently feeble, and even contemptible. Calamy was a more eloquent and polished preacher than the country stranger. And yet, Owen had perhaps often heard him in vain. Had he left Aldermanbury church, as proposed, he might have been disappointed elsewhere; but he remained and enjoyed the blessing. The facts now recorded may afford encouragement and reproof, both to ministers and hearers. It may not always be practicable to hear whom we admire; but if he is a man of God, an eminent blessing may accompany his labours. The country minister may never have known, till he arrived in another world, that he had been instrumental in relieving the mind of John Owen. And doubtless, many similar occurrences are never known here. How encouraging this is to the faithful labourer! It may appear strange to some, that the same truths should produce an effect at one time, and not another. But those who are at all acquainted with the progress of the gospel among men will not be surprised. The success of Christianity, in every instance, is the effect of Divine sovereign influence; and that is exerted in a manner exceedingly mysterious to us. "The wind blows where it wishes, and you hear the sound of it, but cannot tell where it comes from, and where it goes: so it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit." ^{Joh 3.8} The darkness of Owen's mind was now happily

¹ The London Charterhouse is a historic complex of buildings in Smithfield, London, dating back to the 14th century; it is within the London Borough of Islington. It takes its name from a Carthusian priory, founded in 1371 and dissolved in 1537. The site was largely rebuilt after 1545, as a large courtyard mansion. It was altered and extended after 1611, when it became an almshouse (hospital) and school, endowed by Thomas Sutton.

removed; his health, which had been impaired by depression of spirits, was restored, and he was filled with joy and peace in believing. ¹

29

“The sound of pardon pierc’d his startled ear.
He dropt at once his fetters and his fear,
A transport glows in all he looks and speaks.
And the first thankful tears bedew his cheeks.” ²

By his own account, the long and heavy depression which Owen had laboured under, had greatly subdued his natural vanity and ambition. The circumstances of his conversion must have convinced him of the utter insufficiency of mere learning to accomplish the salvation of men. His own experience must have simplified his view of the gospel, and of the mode of stating it to others; and it contributed to impart that spiritual unction to his preaching and writing, by which they are eminently distinguished. When or where he began his labours in the ministry, we cannot discover. It is very probable that he began them in London, and about the period of this remarkable change — perhaps not long before his appearance as an author, in which capacity we shall now proceed to view him.

While living in Charter House yard, he published his “Display of Arminianism, etc.” It is a work which deserves attention on its own account, from its being the first performance of our Author, and from having contributed to lay the foundation of his future reputation. The imprimatur is dated March 2nd, 1612. It is highly probable that the unhappy state of his own mind was occasioned by some misunderstanding of the subjects which the Arminian controversy embraces; and that this led him to so fully investigate them, as this tract shows he had done.

30

As it appeared soon after his mind had obtained comfort, a great part of it must have been written before, or at least so fully digested in his mind, that he could soon put it together after he got possession of the key which unlocks most of the difficulties.

The Arminian discussion involves a variety of important points, some of which are not peculiar to Christianity; they have been the fruitful sources of fierce contention, Milton represents the fallen angels themselves as disputing about some of them, with no better success than men.

“Others apart sat on a hill retir’d
In thought more elevate; and reason’d high
Of Providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fix’d fate, freewill, foreknowledge absolute;
And found no end in wand’ring mazes lost.” ³

The discussions of the ancient philosophers — about the *Origo Mali*; ⁴ the disputes of the Fathers and Schoolmen, and of the Jesuits and Jansenists about grace and predestination; and the altercations of modern philosophers respecting liberty and necessity — are all related to the Arminian controversy, and may all be traced to a common cause. It is the desire to know what God has not revealed, and the vain attempt to reconcile apparent difficulties in the government of heaven, with the constitution of man. What the dark ages could not conceal, nor popery itself subdue, the Reformation was more likely to excite than to extinguish. Accordingly, the work of Luther, “*De Servo Arbitrio*” and the reply of Erasmus, “*De Libero Arbitrio*,” show how early these

¹ Memoirs.

² Another excerpt from Cowper’s poem, *Hope*.

³ From John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (1667), book II, pars. 557-561.

⁴ *Origo Mali*: the source and origin of evil.

subjects occupied the attention of the Reformers, and with what keenness they engaged in their discussion.

31

Calvin took high ground on this controversy; and both by his talents and learning, was peculiarly fitted to explore the niceties of theological and metaphysical debate. His leading views, which he stated with great perspicuity, and defended with uncommon ability, were both more scriptural and philosophical than those to which they were opposed. But in his minor details and illustrations he has sometimes expressed himself incautiously, and has afforded too much room for Arminians to dispute, and for Antinomians to abuse his doctrines. ¹

Long before the time of Arminius, some of the principles which he brought forward, had been introduced into the Low Countries. But they had been prevented from making much progress by the vigilance of the clergy, and the opposition of the magistrates. When published by Arminius, they experienced both support and opposition. He died after the controversy had raged with considerable fierceness, but before it assumed that formidable aspect which finally involved the States in the most violent civil commotions. After his death, the debates continued to spread over Holland. The side of the Arminians was taken by Episcopius, who became their leader, by Grotius and Hoogerbeets; and opposed by Gomarus for religious reasons, and by Maurice, Prince of Orange, for political reasons. The far-famed Synod of Dort was called to heal the divisions, and to reconcile the contending parties of the church. As might have been expected, this measure completely failed, though it cost the States ten tons of gold. The Arminians complained that they were brow-beaten and condemned instead of being heard; and for refusing to submit, they were imprisoned and banished. ²

32

From Holland, the dispute was imported into Britain. Previous to the Synod of Dort, though individuals might have believed and taught differently, Calvinism was the prevailing theological system of this country. The complexion of the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES is evidently Calvinistic. They were understood in this sense by their framers, as the British and the Continental Reformers were almost all Predestinarians. This sense was affixed to them by the succeeding Fathers of the English Church, and by the body of the Puritans. It was among the ridiculous inconsistencies of James I to oppose the Arminians abroad, and to support them at home. He wrote against Arminius; protested against the appointment of Vorstius to succeed him in the divinity chair of Leyden; sent deputies to the Synod of Dort to get the party condemned; and about the same time, he used means for its advancement in England. In 1616, he sent directions to the University of Oxford respecting the disputed points. In 1622, orders were issued that none under the degree of bishop or dean should preach on any of these topics. The Arminian clergy were promoted in the church, and their writings protected. The reasons for this inconsistency in James's conduct are to be found in his love of flattery and power. The English Arminians were, in general, high church — fawning courtiers — ever ready to burn incense at the altar of the king's supremacy, and to preach to the multitude his divine right to dispose of their persons and properties as he thought proper. ³

33

What the father thus inconsistently supported, the son endeavoured to raise to celebrity. In the reign of Charles I, Arminianism combined with the doctrine of passive obedience, and respect for Popish ceremonies, became the religion of the court, and the road to royal favour. The whole High Church party, with Laud at its head, ranked under its banners, and supported its authority by

¹ See Calvin's *Institutes*, Passim.

² Brandt's *History of the Reform. in the Low Countries*, vol. II. Hale's *Letters from the Synod of Dort*.

³ Brandt, i. pp. 318-321. Heylin's *Quinquartular Hist.* p. 633. Neal's *Pur.* ii. pp. 132, 138.

royal and episcopal patronage, and high commission and star-chamber decisions. In a speech in the House of Commons, November 23rd, 1640, Sir Edward Deering said,

“Truth is suppressed, and popish pamphlets fly abroad, *cum privilegio*. Witness the audacious and libelling pamphlets against true religion by Pocklington, Heylin, Cosins, Studley, and many more; I name no bishops, I only add, etc.”¹

The progress of Arminianism in England, and the causes of that progress, are thus ingeniously noticed by Owen in the preface to this first production of his pen.

“Never were so many prodigious errors introduced into a church, with so high a hand, and with so little opposition, since Christians were known in the world. The chief cause I take to be that which Eneas Sylvius gave, why more maintained that the Pope is above the Council, than that the Council is above the Pope. Because Popes gave archbishoprics and bishoprics, etc.; but the Councils sued *in forma pauperis*. And, therefore, they could scarcely get an advocate to plead their cause. The fates of our church having of late devolved the government of it onto men tainted with this poison, Arminianism became backed with the powerful arguments of praise and preferment, and quickly beat poor naked truth into a corner.”

34

The great object of the work is to give a view of the sentiments of the Arminians on the decrees of God, Divine foreknowledge, Providence, the resistibility of Divine grace, original sin; and, in short, all the leading topics of this important and extensive controversy. Owen extracts from the writings, chiefly of the continental divines, those passages which contain the most explicit declaration of their sentiments; and states what had occurred to him, in the way of answer. Each chapter is concluded by a tabular view of those passages of Scripture which support the orthodox doctrine, and quotations from Arminian writers that seem to oppose it. It is, therefore, according to its title, *A Display of Arminianism*, not a full discussion of the controversy. How far modern Arminians would abide by the views which are given here about their sentiments, I can scarcely tell; but it cannot be doubted that Owen has given a fair account of the opinions of their ancestors. Though some of the passages which he quotes should not, perhaps, be rigidly interpreted, and should probably be explained in connexion with other parts of their writings; enough still remains to show that their doctrines were far removed from the simplicity and purity of Scripture. Perhaps the body of modern Calvinists would not adopt every expression and sentiment of Owen’s *Display* — not because they are more Arminianized than their fathers, but because they express themselves in fewer words, and are not so attached to the peculiar phraseology of scholastic disputation.

35

The style of the *Display* is simpler, and less strongly marked with the peculiarities of the Author, than some of his subsequent performances. He probably had more time to correct and polish it, than he afterwards could command. It occasionally reveals a considerable degree of sharpness and severity; he may have been led to this, not so much by the asperity of his own temper, as by the licentious freedoms of the writers he opposes, and by his strong convictions about the dangerous tendency of their opinions. It is the duty of all who know the gospel, and especially of those who preach it, to watch the progress of error, and to endeavour to obstruct it. But it is of infinite importance that this should be done with Christian temper, and by employing those weapons which Christianity sanctions.

The *Display* is dedicated to the Committee of Religion, and is appointed to be printed by the committee of the House of Commons, for the regulating of printing, and the publishing of books. In the dedication he expresses himself very strongly about the evils which he apprehended would come upon the state, through the differences in the church, and he implores the Parliament’s

¹ Deering’s *Speeches*, p. 13.

interference. "Are there any disturbances of the state?" he asks. "They are usually attended with schisms and factions in the church; and the divisions of the church are too often the subversion of the commonwealth." Owen was destined soon to acquire more correct sentiments: — to see that no political divisions or disturbances in the kingdoms of the earth, should interrupt the peace and unity of the kingdom of Christ; and that no other remedy should be employed to cure error, than the application of truth.

36

The first effect of this publication, was his presentation to the living of Fordham in Essex,¹ from the Committee for purging the church of scandalous ministers, by the hands of a special messenger. The sequestered incumbent was Richard Pully. According to Walker, he was "a person of great learning, religion, and sobriety; but was turned out to make way for" one whom he erroneously calls "an Independent of New England." ² The Committee members, it would appear, were of a different opinion. The presentation was an honourable mark of their approval, and it did credit both to themselves and to our Author. His acceptance afforded much satisfaction to the parish and also to the surrounding country. It is stated that, while here, an eminent blessing attended his labours. Many from other parishes resorted to hear him, and not a few, through the blessing of God, were led to the knowledge of the truth. The faithful minister will never pass unrewarded. In all situations, God will acknowledge that portion of his own truth which is properly brought forward; and seal with success that which has the sanction of his authority.

Soon after he had taken up his residence in Fordham, he married his first wife, whose name is said to have been Rooke. He had eleven children by this lady, all of whom died young, except one daughter, who married Roger Kynaston, a Welsh gentleman. The match proving an unhappy one, she returned to her father's house, where she died of a consumption.

37

No particulars remain about this Mrs. Owen. Even the year of her death cannot be ascertained; but she is said to have been a person of very excellent character. ³ Mr. Gilbert alludes to her in his third epitaph on the Doctor, in these lines: —

Prima Ætatis Virilis consors Maria
Rei domesticæ perite studiosa
Rebus Dei domus se totum addicendi,
Copiam illi fecit Gratissimam.

¹ That is, Owen was granted a living, a *paid church office*, at Fordham in Essex.

² *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 320.

³ *Memoirs, Dr. Owen's Will*.

CHAPTER II.

Owen's connexion with the Presbyterian body — its state at that time — Baxter's account of its intolerance — Owen publishes his "Duty of Pastors and People" — His "Two Catechisms" — Preaches before Parliament — Publication of the Discourse, and his Essay on Church Government — His views of Uniformity and Toleration — Leaves Fordham.

By accepting the living of Fordham, Owen formally connected himself with the Presbyterian body which about that time enjoyed the greatest prosperity it ever arrived at in England. It is not our object, at present, to ascertain whether Presbytery was the form of government that prevailed in the primitive church. But we believe it is generally admitted that Calvin was the first, after the reformation, to bring it into notice, and reduce it to practice. Whether this form of polity was suggested to him by the Civil Government of Geneva, or entirely by the New Testament, will be credited according to whether men are the abettors or opponents of his system. Be this as it may, the Presbyterianism of Britain originated in the school of Geneva. The English exiles, driven to that city of liberty from their native country by the oppressions of popery and prelacy, were alienated from the system in which most of them had been educated, by the conduct of its supporters as well as by its obvious contrariety to the word of God. They were thus prepared to view with a favourable eye, a code of government and worship which had more support in Scripture; which provided a greater degree of parity and power for all the ministers of the church; and which seemed to be productive of a large portion, both of spiritual and temporal good to men.

39

The adoption of this system by the reformed churches of Holland, France, Scotland, and part of Germany, promoted its influence, and increased its celebrity. The writings of Calvin, Beza, and other celebrated men of the same school, were extensively read, and their authority generally respected. The intercourse between England and those countries, which was greatly increased by the tyrannical measures of government, advanced the progress of its career in that quarter. The body of the Puritans was never exactly of the same mind on the subject of church government. Without doubt, not a few of them were rigid Presbyterians; but many of them would gladly have submitted to a modified Episcopacy, such as that which Archbishop Usher recommended. The Divine right of classical Presbytery came to be contended for, chiefly after the Scotch army was brought into England, and when a uniformity of faith and worship in the three kingdoms began to be enforced. For a considerable time, it appeared likely to gain the ascendancy, as most of those who fell off from Episcopacy (from their dissatisfaction with its forms) united themselves with it, though many of them were not disposed to admit all its pretensions. ¹

Owen, so far as he was a Presbyterian, was one of this description. Speaking of his sentiments at this period of his life, and of a Treatise then published, which we shall immediately notice, he says,

40

"I was then a young man, about the age of twenty-six or twenty-seven. The controversy between Independency and Presbytery was then young also; nor, indeed, was it clearly understood by me; especially as stated on the Congregational side. The conceptions delivered in the Treatise were not, as appears in the issue, suited to the opinion of one party or the other; but such as occurred to my own naked consideration of things, with relation to some differences that were then upheld in the place where I lived. Only, being unacquainted with the Congregational way, I professed myself to own the other party, knowing only that my principles were suited to their judgment and profession — *having looked very little further into those affairs than I was led by all opposition to Episcopacy and ceremonies.*" ²

¹ Baxter's own Life, i. p. 97, et passim.

² Review of the true nature of Schism, pp. 33, 34.

Presbytery was not established in England “by way of probation,”¹ as Neal expresses it, until 1645; and as presbyteries were not erected for some time after this, and in many places never erected, it is not probable that Owen was ever a member of a presbytery.² This circumstance, together with his sentiments as stated in the above extract, shows that his connexion with that body was more nominal than real. To give a correct view of the state of religion in it about this time is not an easy task. The partiality of its friends has perhaps led them to exaggerate its excellencies, and the dislike of its enemies has induced them to aggravate and multiply its faults. It doubtless embraced many individuals, estimable for their piety, and celebrated for their learning; and not a few who had suffered much in the cause of God.

41

In a body which contained so many faithful preachers of the truth, there must have been a large portion of genuine religion; although, from its principles, many were admitted into fellowship with it, whose profession could not have borne a close investigation.³ The testimony of Baxter, whose opportunities of judging were abundant, and whose partiality to the Presbyterians secures him from the suspicion of misrepresenting them is as follows: —

“The persons who were called Presbyterians were eminent for learning, sobriety, and piety; and the pastors, so called, were those who went through the work of the ministry, in diligent, serious preaching to the people, and edifying men’s souls, and keeping up religion in the land.”⁴

— But “I disliked the course of some of the more rigid of them, who drew too near the way of prelacy by grasping at a kind of secular power; not using it themselves, but binding the magistrates to confiscate or imprison men, merely because they were excommunicated; and so corrupting the true discipline of the church, and turning the communion of saints into the communion of the multitude, who must keep in the church against their wills for fear of being undone in the world. Whereas a man whose conscience cannot feel a just excommunication unless it is backed with confiscation or imprisonment, is no fitter to be a member of a Christian church, than a corpse is fit to be a member of a corporation.

— They corrupt the discipline of Christ by mixing it with secular force; and they reproach the keys or ministerial power, as if it were not worth a straw unless the magistrate’s sword enforces it; and worst of all, they corrupt the church by forcing in the rabble of the unfit, and unwilling, and thereby tempt many godly Christians to schisms and dangerous separations.

42

“Till magistrates keep the sword themselves, and learn to deny it to every angry clergyman who would do his own work by it, and leave them to their own weapons — the word and spiritual keys; *et valeant quantum valere possunt*⁵ — the church shall never have unity and peace. And I disliked some of the Presbyterians: that they were not tender enough to dissenting brethren; but too much *against liberty*, as others were too much *for* it; and thought to do by votes and number, that which love and reason should have done.”⁶

Certainly the worst feature of Presbytery about this time, that which excited the greatest attention, and which ultimately ruined the body, was its intolerance, or determined and persevering hostility to liberty of conscience. The most celebrated Presbyterian divines, such as Calamy and Burgess, in their discourses before Parliament, represented toleration as the hydra of schisms and heresies, and the floodgate to all manner of iniquity and danger. Therefore, the civil authorities ought to

¹ Puritans iii. chap.vi. p. 295.

² Ibid. p. 335.

³ Baillie’s Dissuasive, pp. 154-174.

⁴ Baxter’s own Life, part ii. p. 140.

⁵ *et valeant quantum valere possunt* — a Latin proverb: if power can, it will.

⁶ Baxter’s own Life, part ii. pp. 142-3.

exert their utmost energy to put it down. ¹ Their most distinguished writers advocated the rights of persecution, and endeavoured to reason, or shout down religious liberty. With this view chiefly, Edwards produced his “Gangrena,” and his “Casting down of the last and strongest hold of Satan, or a Treatise against Toleration.”!!! And — not to note the ravings of Bastwick, and Paget, and Vicars — it is painful to quote the respectable names of Principal Baillie of Glasgow, and Samuel Rutherford, Professor of Divinity in St. Andrews, as engaged in supporting so bad a cause. The former throughout his “Dissuasive,” reveals how determined a foe he was, to what he calls a “monstrous imagination.” ² The latter wrote a quarto volume of four hundred pages “against pretended liberty of conscience.”!!

43

It was the Trojan horse whose bowels were full of warlike sectaries, and weapons of destruction. Like the fabled box of Pandora, it had only to be opened to let loose upon the world all the ills which ever afflicted our race. It was the Diana, before whose shrine the motley groups of dissenters from presbytery were represented as making their most devout prostrations. Let the following specimen show that I do not caricature the persons of whom I am speaking:

“A Toleration is the grand design of the devil — his masterpiece, and chief engine he works by at this time, to uphold his tottering kingdom. It is the most compendious, ready, sure way to destroy all religion, lay all waste, and bring in all evil. It is a most transcendent, catholic and fundamental evil for this kingdom of any that can be imagined. As original sin is the most fundamental sin, having the seed and spawn of all in it; so a toleration has all errors in it, and all evils. It is against the whole stream and current of Scripture both in the Old and New Testament; both in matters of faith and manners; both general and particular commands. It overthrows all relations, political, ecclesiastical, and economical. And whereas other evils, whether of judgment or practice, are but against some one or two places of Scripture or relation, *this* is against all — this is the Abaddon, Apollyon, the destroyer of all religion, the abomination of desolation and astonishment, the liberty of perdition, and therefore the devil follows it night and day, working mightily in many by writing books for it, and in other ways; — All the devils in hell, and their instruments being at work to promote a toleration.” ³

44

Had these been the sentiments of a few private and violent individuals only, it might have been proper to pass them by as giving an unfair view of the principles or spirit of the party with which they were connected. But when similar sentiments and temper are revealed in the public and united proceedings of the body, the matter is very different. That this was the case with the Presbyterians at this time, is too evident from many facts. The Presbyterian party in the Westminster Assembly defeated the attempt, recommended by the committee of the Lords and Commons, to promote a union, if possible, with the Independents. They refused even to tolerate their churches. Baxter acknowledges that they were so little sensible of their own infirmities, that they would not agree to tolerate those who were not only tolerable, but worthy instruments and members in the churches.⁴ When they found the Commons would not support their violent and unreasonable demands to suppress all other sects, they brought forward the Scotch Parliament to demand that their advice be complied with, and to publish a declaration against toleration. ⁵ The whole body of the London ministers addressed a letter to the Assembly, in which they most solemnly declared how much they “detest and abhor the much endeavoured toleration.” ⁶ The “*Jus divinum* of church government,” published by the same body, argues for “a compulsive,

¹ Crosby’s History of the Baptists, i. pp. 176, 177.

² Pref. to part ii.

³ Edward’s Gangrena, part i. p. 58.

⁴ Neal iii. ch. vi. pp. 302-310.

⁵ Ibid. pp. 310

⁶ Crosby i, p. 188.

coactive, punitive, corrective power to the political magistrate in matters of religion.”¹ The provincial assembly of London, the ministers of Warwickshire and Lancashire, published declarations or addresses to the same purport.

45

From the latter body we select part of a paper signed by *eighty-four* of them, and which they entitle “The harmonious consent of the Lancashire ministers with their brethren at London:”

“A toleration would be putting a sword in a madman’s hand; a cup of poison into the hand of a child; a letting loose of madmen with fire-brands in their hands; appointing a city of refuge in men’s consciences for the devil to fly to; laying a stumbling block before the blind; proclaiming liberty to the wolves to come into Christ’s fold to prey upon the lambs — neither would it provide for tender consciences, but I would take away all conscience.”²

Enough on so unpleasant a subject. Whatever differences existed in this party on other things, a perfect harmony seems to have prevailed on this. They were evidently startled and alarmed at the strange appearances of the religious world. They apprehended nothing less than the utter destruction of religion from the liberty which men had begun to enjoy. Their fears magnified the danger, and their attachment to the cause of God led them to express themselves in the unwarrantable manner which we have seen. It is only matter of thankfulness that they were not permitted to grasp the sword. Otherwise something more dreadful than intemperate language would probably have followed, had they reduced their language to action.

These violent sentiments and proceedings must have alienated many from their cause, and led moderate men to doubt the foundation of a system which seemed to require such support. These, in fact, were the things which entirely ruined their interest.

46

“If the leading Presbyterians in the Assembly and city had come to a temper with the Independents, on the footing of a limited toleration, they had in all likelihood prevented the disputes between the army and Parliament which were the ruin of both; they might then have saved the constitution, and made their own terms “with the king; but they were enchanted with the beauties of *covenant uniformity*, and the Divine right of Presbytery, which, after all, the Parliament would not admit in its full extent.”³

It required, indeed, considerable enlargement of mind, to impartially examine the causes of the confusion of practice, and conflict of opinion, which were then operating on the country — and to look through the tempest which was then howling, to a period of peace which would certainly follow — to a time when the novelty of liberty would subside into the enjoyment of its sweets; and when the ebullitions of party would give way to “quietness and assurance forever.” Milton took the true view of the state of the country when he exclaimed, in all the fervour and felicity of the poet and the patriot,

“Methinks I see a noble and puissant nation rousing herself, like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks. Methinks I see her, as an eagle, muing⁴ her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam; purging and unsealing her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; while the whole tribe of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms.”⁵

¹ p. 73.

² Crosby i. p. 190,

³ Neal iii. ch. vi. pp. 309-10.

⁴ *Mue*: to moult or shed.

⁵ Areopagitica, Works, p. 393. ed. 1697.

We have no reason to think that Owen ever approved of these sentiments and this spirit in the body with which he was apparently connected for a time. It seems rather probable that its violent temper tended to shake any attachment he ever had to it.

47

The moderation of his views, even while a Presbyterian, appeared in the next production of his pen. It was published not long after his settlement in Fordham. This was, “The Duty of Pastors and People distinguished — touching the administration of things commanded in Religion, especially concerning the means to be used by the people of God, distinct from Church Officers, for the increasing of Divine knowledge in themselves and others,” etc., 4to, pp. 56, 1644-. Though it has the date of 1644, it was published in 1643.¹ It is dedicated to his “Truly noble and ever honoured friend, Sir Edward Scot of Scots Hall, in Kent, Knight of the honourable order of the Bath.” In the dedication, he tells Sir Edward that he had published it in consequence of the solicitations of some judicious men who were acquainted with its contents; and he thanks him for many favours, especially for the free “proffer of an ecclesiastical preferment, then vacant, and in his donation;” but these circumstances had prevented him from accepting. I know nothing of Sir Edward Scot, but Owen makes most honourable mention of him in this address. From one passage, it would seem he had been in Sir Edward’s family some time; and as it does credit to the worthy Knight, and shows something of the troubled state of the country, it is worth quoting.

“Twice, by God’s providence, have I been with you when your county has been in great danger to be ruined; once by the horrid insurrection of a rude, godless multitude; and again by the invasion of a potent enemy prevailing in the neighbour county. At both which times, besides the general calamity justly feared, particular threatenings were daily brought to you. Under which sad dispensations, I must crave leave to say that I never saw more resolved constancy, or more cheerful, unmoved Christian carriage in any man.”

48

His object in this treatise is to steer a middle course between those who ascribed too much power to ministers, and those who gave too much to the people. He says,

“Some would have all Christians be almost ministers, others none but ministers be God’s clergy: those would give the people the keys, these use them to lock them out of the church. The one ascribing to them primarily all ecclesiastical power for ruling the congregation, the other abridging them of the performance of spiritual duties for building their own souls. As though there were no habitable earth between the valley, I almost said, the pit of democratic confusion, and the precipitous rock of hierarchical tyranny.”²

His design, therefore, is to show how “The sacred calling may retain its ancient dignity, though the people of God not be deprived of their Christian liberty.”³

In prosecuting this discussion he declares himself to be of “the belief of that form of church government which is commonly called *Presbyterial*, in opposition to *Prelatical* on the one side, and that which is commonly called *Independent* on the other.”⁴ He was then, as appears from what we have already quoted, very ignorant of independency, but was more nearly allied to it in sentiment than he himself knew. Hence, referring afterwards to this very tract, he says,

“On review of what I asserted there, I found that my principles were more suited to what is the judgment and practice of the Congregational men, than those of the Presbyterian.

49

¹ Rev. of Schism, p. 33

² Rev. of Schism, p. 10.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. p. 42.

Only, whereas I had not received any further clear information in these ways of the worship of God, which I have since been engaged in, I professed myself of the Presbyterian judgment, in opposition to democratical confusion; and indeed, I do so still, and so do all the Congregational men in England that I am acquainted with. So that, when I compare what I wrote then, with my present judgment, I am scarcely able to find the least difference between one and the other; only a misapplication of names and things by me, gives countenance to this charge.”¹

An examination of the tract itself confirms this view of it. It is very different from the *Reformed Pastor* of Baxter, or the *Pastoral Care* of Burnet. Both these small works, which contain much important matter, are occupied with stating and enforcing the duties of ministers; while Owen’s is devoted to pointing out the rights and duties of the people. The greater part of it is employed in preliminary disquisition respecting the condition of the people of God before the coming of Christ. It is only towards the end of it, that he treats their duty now, in extraordinary and ordinary circumstances. Without seeming to advocate *lay preaching*, he argues from various considerations, that “truth revealed to anyone carries along with it an immovable persuasion of conscience, that it ought to be published and spoken to others.”² From Acts 8.1-4, he says it appears “that all the *faithful members* of the church, being thus dispersed, went everywhere preaching the word, having no warrant but the general engagement of all Christians to further the propagation of Christ’s kingdom.”³ In extraordinary or peculiar circumstances, therefore, he contends that it is the duty of every man to make known as extensively as possible, the portion of truth with which he is acquainted.

50

In ordinary circumstances, he maintains that it is the duty of the people of God,

“for the improving of knowledge, the increasing of charity, and the furtherance of that holy communion that ought to be among the brethren, to assemble together of their own accord, to consider one another, to provoke unto love and good works, to stir up the gifts that are in them, yielding and receiving mutual consolation by the fruits of their most holy faith.”⁴

He endeavours to show that such practices soberly conducted, are not interferences with the pastoral office; but ought to be encouraged by all the servants of Jesus Christ, as much calculated to promote the progress of knowledge and holiness. While he everywhere reveals sufficient respect for the institution of the gospel ministry, there is none of that selfish and narrow jealousy of encroachment upon its rights; none of that morbid fear of its honour and dignity; none of that supercilious treatment of the people — the *Laity* — who have so frequently been discovered by men in office — those who savour more of the pride of power, and the spirit of corporation, than the liberality of Christianity, and disinterested zeal for the salvation of men.

In the course of this Treatise, Owen twice mentions a Latin tract, “*De sacerdotio Christi contra Armin. Socin. et Papistas.*” Besides treating the priesthood of Christ, it seems to have been intended as an answer to the views of the Dutch Remonstrants on Liberty of Prophecy. This production was designed, at first, for the satisfaction of a few private friends; and he tells us it was “*nondum edito*,”⁵ when he published his *Duties of Pastor and People*. Nor does it appear to have ever been published — as before this could take place, his mind underwent an important change on the subject of religious liberty.

51

¹ Rev. of Schism, p. 34.

² Ibid. p. 38

³ Ibid. p. 39.

⁴ Rev. of Schism, p. 48.

⁵ *Nondum edito*: not yet published.

As everything on this subject is interesting, the candid avowal of his change of sentiment on this important topic, contained in the following passage, is worthy of attention: —

“I remember about fifteen years ago, that meeting with a learned friend, we fell into some debate about the liberty that began then to be claimed by men, differing from what had been (Episcopacy), and what was then likely to be established (Presbytery); having, at that time, made no further inquiry into the grounds and reasons of such liberty than what had occurred to me in the writings of the Remonstrants — I delivered my judgment *in opposition to the liberty pleaded for* — which was then defended by my learned friend. Not many years after, discoursing the same difference with the same person, we found immediately that we had changed stations; I was pleading for an indulgence of liberty, and he for restraint. Whether that learned and worthy person is of the same mind now that he was then, I do not know directly. My change here I own; my judgment is not the same in this particular that it was fourteen years ago. And in my change, I have good company whom I need not name. I will only say, it was at least twelve years before the Petition and Advice, ¹ in which the Parliament of the three nations has come to my judgment on it.” ²

This passage exhibits the openness and candour of Owen in a very interesting light; and it also shows that his changes did not follow, but preceded the revolutions of public opinion. It must have been no small gratification to him to see his sentiments afterwards embraced by so large and enlightened a portion of the community.

52

And it is gratifying to the biographer of Owen to have it in his power to state that the changes of sentiment and progress of public opinion during more than a century and a half since Owen's alteration, so far from detecting the mistakes, or exposing the danger of his sentiments, have only more fully elucidated their importance, and established their truth beyond controversy — and, he trusts, also beyond danger.

’Tis liberty alone, that gives the flow’r
Of fleeting life its lustre and perfume;
And we are weeds without it. All constraint,
Except what wisdom lays on evil men,
Is evil: hurts the faculties, impedes
Their progress in the road of science; blinds
The eye-sight of Discovery; and begets
In those that suffer it, a sordid mind,
Bestial, a meagre intellect, unfit,
To be the tenant of man’s noble form.”— *Cowper’s Task*, B.v,

Previous to Owen's introduction to the parish of Fordham, the parish itself and the surrounding country had been exceedingly neglected. Therefore, immediately upon his obtaining the living, he set himself most resolutely to correct the evils in which it was immersed. Publicly, and privately, he appears to have laboured for the people's good. Among other means which he employed, was that of catechising them from house to house; a mode of instruction peculiarly adapted to their condition, and which has often been blessed by God to the souls of men. To enable him to more effectually prosecute this plan, in the end of the year 1645, he published, “The Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, unfolded in two short Catechisms; in which those principles of religion are explained, the knowledge of which is required by the late ordinance of Parliament, before any are admitted to the Lord's Supper.” 12mo. pp. 60.

53

¹ The Petition and Advice were presented to Parliament in 1657. So that Owen's change of sentiment about religious liberty, must have taken place in or about 1645.

² Preface to Defence of Cotton against Cawdry, pp. 65-67; published in 1658.

The first part of this small production he calls the lesser Catechism, intended for young persons, and to be committed to memory; the second, the greater Catechism, designed for the instruction of the grown-up people, and to assist them in instructing their families. They are both tolerably simple, and on the whole, well-adapted to the purpose for which they were prepared.

The Address to his “Loving Neighbours and Christian Friends,” reveals the deep anxiety he felt for their spiritual welfare, and notes some of the means he employed to promote it.

“My heart’s desire and request to God for you, is that you may be saved. I say the truth in Christ also, I do not lie, my conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness, and continual sorrow in my heart, for those among you who as yet walk disorderly, and not as befits the gospel — little labouring to acquaint themselves with the mystery of godliness. You know, brethren, how I have been among you and in what manner for these few years past; and how I have kept back nothing that was profitable to you; but I have shown you and taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying to all repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. With what sincerity this has been performed by me; with what results and success received by you, God the righteous Judge will one day declare. In the meantime, the desire of my heart is to be servant to the least of you in the work of the Lord; and do that in any way which I can conceive profitable to you, either in your persons or your families.”

This language shows how much he was in earnest about his work, and reveals the same spiritual and benevolent mind which he cultivated and maintained to the end of his course.

54

Both Catechisms are strictly of a doctrinal nature: the omission of moral duties he explains, by declaring his intention to publish, in a short time, an Exposition of the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, with the Articles of the Creed, in the same form. Before this intention could be executed, however, he was either removed from Fordham, or his mind had undergone a change which prevented the fulfilment of his promise.

The fame of Owen was now beginning to extend, which occasioned his being called to appear in a wider field of labour and influence. On the twenty-ninth of April, 1646, being the day of the monthly fast observed by Parliament, he was appointed to preach before that august assembly. The sermon, which was published by command of the House, and for which he received its thanks by Mr. Fenner and Sir Peter Wentworth, was founded on Acts 16.9. It is entitled, “A vision of unchangeable free mercy, in sending the means of grace to undeserving sinners.” It contains a great variety of matter, and toward the end, an earnest expostulation about the destitute state of Wales, and some other parts of the country.

“When manna fell in the wilderness from the hand of the Lord,” he exclaims, “everyone had an equal share. I would there were not now too great an inequality when in the hand of man. Some have all, and others none; some sheep daily picking the choice flowers of every pasture, others wandering upon the barren mountains, without guide or food.”

His dedication of the sermon to the long Parliament is in Latin; and on account of the high eulogium which it pronounces on that body, it deserves to be introduced here.

55

“*Amplissimo Senatui*, etc., etc. To the most noble Senate, the most renowned assembly of England; — most deservedly celebrated through the whole world, and to be held in everlasting remembrance by all the inhabitants of this island; — for strenuously, and faithfully, asserting the rights of Englishmen; — for recovering the liberty of their country, almost ruined by the base attempts of some; — for administering justice boldly, equally, moderately, impartially; — for dissolving the power of a hierarchical tyranny in ecclesiastical affairs, and abolishing the popish newly invented antichristian rites; — for restoring the privileges of the Christian people; — for enjoying the powerful preservation of the Most High in all these, and in innumerable other things in council and war, at home and abroad: — To the illustrious, honourable, select Gentlemen of the Commons in Parliament assembled, this Discourse, humble, indeed, in its pretensions; but being preached before them by their desire, is now published by their command...”

It must be acknowledged that this is no ordinary praise. When we consider the conduct of the Long Parliament up to this period, how natural it was for a lover of liberty, justice, and religion, to view all its conduct in the most favourable light; and when we consider the admissions in its favour, even of its enemies, the language of Owen will occasion less surprise. Lord Clarendon acknowledges that, “there were many great and worthy patriots in the House, and as eminent as any age had ever produced — men of gravity, of wisdom, and of large and plentiful fortunes.” Hume, almost in the words of Owen, calls it a “famous Assembly, which had filled all Europe with the renown of its actions.”

56

After this, it will not excite wonder that Milton should praise its “illustrious exploits against the breast of tyranny, and the prosperous issue of its noble and valorous counsels.” Without bestowing unlimited or indiscriminate approval, it may be safely affirmed that it comprehended many whose stern integrity, and high independence of mind, would have done honour to the proudest periods of Roman glory. Many of its measures have never been excelled in the wisdom with which they were framed, the boldness with which they were advocated, or the intrepidity and perseverance with which they were executed.

But the chief value of Owen’s discourse now, is the assistance it affords us in tracing the progress of his mind on some of the subjects which then agitated the country, and at which we have already glanced. From the Sermon, and a “Country Essay for the practice of Church Government” annexed to it, it appears that though Owen still remained in the Presbyterian body, it could scarcely be said that he was *of* it. The discourse itself contains his decided disapproval of the views and spirit of many in that profession.

“They are,” he says, “disturbed in their optics, or having false glasses, all things are represented to them in dubious colours. Whichever way they look, they can see nothing but errors, errors of all sizes, sorts, sects, and sexes, from beginning to end; which have deceived some men — and not of the worst — and made them think that all before was nothing, in comparison to the present confusion.”¹

Referring to the same thing in the Essay, he says: “Once more, uniformity has become the touchstone among most men, however different their persuasions otherwise. Dissent is the only crime; and where that is all that is culpable, it shall be made all that is so.”²

57

About this time, it appears that he had much discussion with the ministers of the county of Essex, on the subject of Church Government.³ This occasioned his being very variously represented, and led him at the suggestion of others to put together, in a great hurry, his thoughts on Church Government, and publish them with his sermon.⁴ The substance of it had a good while before been circulated in manuscript;⁵ and the great object of it is to try to unite both parties — Presbyterian and Independent — or at least to moderate their zeal. While he professes to belong to, or hold some of the principles of the former,⁶ he explicitly declares, at the same time, that he “knew no church government in the world, already established, of which he was convinced of the truth and necessity in all particulars.”⁷ The details of the plan, however, contain more of Independency than of the other system; perhaps, as much of it as could be acted on, along with

¹ Works, p. 206.

² Works, p. 215.

³ Pref. to Def. of Cotton, p. 25.

⁴ Works, p. 215.

⁵ Ibid p. 219.

⁶ Ibid. p. 218.

⁷ Ibid. p. 218.

obedience to Parliamentary injunctions. He also intimates his conviction that “all *national disputes* about Church Government would prove birthless tympanies.”¹

The tract contains an explicit declaration of his sentiments on two important subjects: the folly and uselessness of contention about conformity, and the necessity and importance of toleration. He protests against giving men odious appellations on account of their religious sentiments.

58

And he exposes the absurdity of that species of exaggeration in which both parties then indulged.

“Our little differences may be met at every stall, and in too many pulpits, swelled by unbefitting expressions to such a formidable bulk, that poor creatures are startled at their horrid looks and appearance; while our own persuasions are set out in silken words and gorgeous apparel, as if we sent them into the world a-wooing. Hence, whatever it is, it must be temple-building, — God’s government, — Christ’s sceptre, throne, kingdom, — this is the only way. And for want of which, errors, heresies, and sins spring among us; plagues, judgments, punishments come upon us. Such big words as these have made us believe that we are mortal adversaries — that one kingdom, communion, and heaven, cannot hold us.”²

He had refused, it appears, to subscribe petitions to Parliament about Church Government, which gave great offence; but he assigns very satisfactory reasons for it: reasons, however, that show he was far alienated from the religious party then in power.

Owen had made great advances on the subject of toleration, though he had not yet arrived at the perfection of his sentiments on this subject.

“Toleration is the alms of authority; yet men who beg for it think so much is at least their due. I never knew someone to contend earnestly for a toleration of dissenters, who was not one himself; nor any contend for their suppression, who were not themselves of the persuasion which prevails.”³

He does not, however, maintain the necessity of universal toleration. And yet, when his limitations come to be examined, and the means he would employ in repressing error and supporting truth are attended to, his views are, on the whole, highly enlightened and liberal.

59

He uses some strong language about the iniquity of putting men to death for heresy, declaring that he “had almost said, it would be for the interest of morality to consent generally to the persecution of a man maintaining such a destructive opinion.”

“I know,” he says, “the usual pretences for persecution:”

— “such a thing is blasphemy:”

but search the Scriptures, look at the definitions of divines, and you will find heresy in whatever head of religion it may be, and *blasphemy* is very different.

— “To spread such errors will be destructive to souls.”

So are many things which yet are not punishable with death; let him who thinks so go kill Pagans and Mahometans.

— “Such a heresy is a canker.”

But it is a *spiritual* one; let it be prevented by spiritual means. Cutting off men’s heads is no proper remedy for it. If state physicians think otherwise, I will say no more, except that I am not of the college.”⁴

There is a prodigious contrast between these sentiments, and those of the Presbyterian writers quoted in this chapter. Their violence and illiberality appear more dreadful and improper when brought into contact with the moderation and liberality of Owen. His mind was rapidly maturing

¹ Ibid. p. 220.

² Works, p. 216.

³ Ibid. p. 224.

⁴ Works, p. 229.

in the knowledge of the great principles of civil and religious freedom; and by advocating it, he was destined to acquire for himself a distinguished reputation, and to confer upon his country a most invaluable boon. He was already, in the career of discovery, advanced considerably beyond most men of his time.

60

Undismayed by the collisions and disorders which seemed to arise out of the enjoyment of liberty, his generous soul exulted in the important blessing, and confidently anticipated from it the most glorious ultimate results. Satisfied that the cause of God did not require the support of man's puny arm, nor the vengeance of his wrath, he fearlessly committed it to Him who is engaged to preserve it, and who has said, "Vengeance belongs to me; I will repay." Rom 12.19

On a report that the sequestered incumbent of Fordham was dead, the patron presented another to the living, and dispossessed Owen. It would appear from this, that in such cases Parliamentary presentations did not permanently interfere with the rights of the patron; and that a person presented in the place of someone who was ejected for insufficiency, held the parish only during the life of the sequestered minister. With the loss of Fordham, terminated Owen's connexion with the Presbyterians. His mind had been in a state of preparation for this for some time.

Every change of religious sentiment is important to the person who makes it, and ought to be gone into with caution and deliberation. To be given to change is a great evil, and indicates a weak and unsettled mind. On the other hand, to be afraid of change is frequently the result of indifference or sinful apprehension of consequences. It is the duty of every Christian to follow the teaching of the Spirit in the word of revelation, and to recollect that he must be accountable for his convictions in the end. The attempt to smother them is always improper; and when successful, it must injure the religious feelings of their subject. To allow hopes or fears of a worldly nature to conquer our persuasion of what the word of God requires, is to forget the important intimation of our Lord, — that if anything is loved more than He, it is impossible to be his disciple.

61

By such conduct, the tribulations of the kingdom may often be avoided; but its consolations and rewards will also be lost. "If any man serves me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant be also; If any man serves me, my Father will honour him." Joh 12.26

CHAPTER III.

Owen's settlement at Coggeshall — View of Independency — The Brownists — Causes which retarded and promoted the progress of Independency in England — Owen becomes an Independent — Publishes *Eshcol* — A Treatise on Redemption — His views on this subject — Controversy occasioned by it — Publishes two Discourses on the deliverance of Essex — Remarks on some sentiments contained in them.

Owen being deprived of Fordham was attended with no loss, either of a pecuniary or spiritual nature. As soon as the people of Coggeshall, which is only about five miles distant from Fordham, heard of it, they sent him a pressing invitation to become their minister; to which the Earl of Warwick, the patron, immediately acceded by presenting him with the living. Coggeshall is a considerable market town in Essex, about forty-five miles distant from London, and was once a manufacturing place of some note. The church, which is still standing, is a spacious and lofty edifice, dedicated to St. Peter; and the pulpit in which Owen preached, though not now used, still remains. ¹

His immediate predecessors in this place were John and Obadiah Sedgwick, brothers, who successively occupied this charge. They were respectable Presbyterian ministers, and authors of various works which were then extensively read. The latter, whom Owen succeeded, was a member of the Assembly; he became preacher at St. Paul's Covent Garden, 1646; was in 1653 appointed one of the Tryers, and died at Marlborough, his native place, to which he had retired after resigning all his preferments in 1658. ²

63

Coggeshall afforded Owen a more extensive field of usefulness than he had enjoyed at Fordham. The congregation consisted of nearly two thousand persons; who were generally sober, religious, and intelligent. A very intimate and ardent attachment soon took place between him and them, which was productive of much mutual satisfaction. His ministry was attended with considerable success; and nothing, probably, but circumstances which he could not control, would have removed him from this beloved flock. It was here that he began to act as an Independent or Congregationalist, by forming a church on the principles of that profession. Before stating the circumstances which produced Owen's connexion with this body of Christians, I trust it will not be deemed a digression to give a brief sketch of its sentiments, and its history up to the period of his joining it.

The distinguishing principle of Independency may be expressed in a single sentence; namely, That a church of Christ is a *voluntary* society of Christians, regularly assembling in one place, and with its officers possessing the full power of government, worship, and discipline in itself. As a voluntary society no man can, or ought to be compelled to join it; nor can it be compelled by any external authority to receive, or retain, any individual in its communion. As a *Christian* society none are fit to enjoy its privileges, except those who appear to have believed the truth, imbibed the spirit, and submitted to the authority of Christ. To admit persons of a different description, must tend to defeat the object of its association, which is entirely of a spiritual nature, and to introduce corruption and disorder. It is a regular, and not an ambulatory or occasional assembly.

64

For conducting its spiritual offices, bishops or pastors are appointed; and deacons or servants to manage its few temporal concerns. Without persons suitably qualified for these duties, and conscientiously discharging them, its constitution must be imperfect, and all its procedure will be marked with irregularity and disorder. It has the power of conducting its worship in such a manner as may, consistently with the Scriptures, most tend to general edification. In its

¹ Private Information.

² Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. iii, p. 295.

government and discipline, it is accountable to the Great Head of the church, but not to any other tribunal. This view of the character and constitution of a church, it is presumed, is characterised by that simplicity which distinguishes every arrangement in the kingdom of Christ; it is adapted to the endlessly diversified circumstances in which Christianity may be placed in the world; it answers every purpose of religious association; and it is supported by the general principles, the particular precepts, or the recorded example of the apostles and primitive believers. A society of this description can be managed only by the authority of the word of God, cannot be compelled to receive the commandments of men for doctrines, and can never allow alliance with or incorporation into a temporal kingdom. It is our object to state, not to advocate at present, the principles of Independency. ¹ Among its friends, there have been diversities of judgment on minor points, but every consistent Independent has held substantially the sentiments expressed above.

65

Others, as well as Independents, have successfully shown that this was the constitution of the primitive churches for at least the two first centuries of the Christian era. ² It appears gradually to have merged in a species of Episcopacy, and was finally swallowed up with everything valuable in Christianity, in the vortex of papal abomination. The constitution of the church was among the last subjects the Reformers were likely to study, and from their peculiar circumstances, the one they were most likely to misunderstand. Believing, as they did, that Christianity could scarcely exist without state patronage, and that conscience was the subject of human legislation, the simple form of Independency was not likely to occur to them; or if it did occur, it would be speedily rejected as unsuitable to the state of the church, and of the world.

As far as a name can fasten reproach, it has often been attempted to render the Independents odious by tracing their origin to Robert Brown who, after having professed the sentiments of the body, and suffered grievously for them, returned to the bosom of the Church of England, and died miserably at a very advanced age. ³ Although Brown was, for a time, a very zealous defender of this form of ecclesiastical polity, there is no reason for ascribing to him, either the merit or the disgrace of originating it. Long before he was heard of, perhaps before he was born, there were persons in England who held and acted on these sentiments as far as was practicable in their circumstances.

66

Bolton, though not the first in this way, was an elder of a separate church in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's days, ⁴ Penry says in his address to Queen Elizabeth, "If we had Queen Mary's days, I think we would have been as flourishing a church to this day as ever any; for it is well known that there were then in London, and elsewhere in exile, more flourishing churches than any tolerated by your authority." ⁵ In the year 1567, a number of persons were imprisoned belonging to a society of about a hundred, who appear to have been of this persuasion. ⁶ In a speech made by Sir Walter Raleigh in the House of Commons, 1692, on a law to transport the Brownists, he observes this: "If two or three thousand Brownists meet at the sea side, at whose charge will they be transported? Or where will you send them? I am sorry for it, but I am afraid there are nearly twenty thousand of them in England. And when they are gone, who will maintain their

¹ See for this purpose, "Conder on Protestant Non-conformity." A work which deserves the highest praise for its amiable spirit, its scriptural views, and its hitherto unanswered reasonings.

² Mosheim's Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians before the time of Constantine, vol. i. pp. 263-267; translated by Vidal. Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical Hist. i. lect. vi. et passim. Owen's Inquiry, etc. chap v.

³ Fuller's Ch. Hist, book ix. pp. 167-169. Baillie's Dissuasive, pp. 13-15.

⁴ Robertson's Justification, p. 50.

⁵ Brook's Lives, Art. Penry, vol. ii. p. 51.

⁶ Ibid. Art, Hawkins, vol. i. pp. 133-149.

wives and children?"¹ If their number was such at this date, they must have been in the country many years before.

The Brownists, as they have been nicknamed, were treated with great severity both by Churchmen and Non-conformists. They were the first consistent dissenters from the Church of England, though they undoubtedly carried some things further than moderate men in moderate times would approve. There were a few forward fiery spirits among them, who expressed themselves with too much asperity of others. This produced discord among themselves, and exposed them to the vengeance of their adversaries who, with an equal lack of religion and humanity, gloried over their faults and insulted their misfortunes.

67

In palliation of their real or supposed improprieties, however, much may be said. They were placed in circumstances entirely new, and had no experience in the mode of managing the principles they had adopted. They were surrounded by enemies, whose conduct often tended to inflame and exasperate, but seldom to enlighten or convince. The evils they had witnessed and endured in a worldly persecuting hierarchy, drove them to the furthest length they could go in opposition to it. Some of them were men of learning, and the body of them were men of principle who rejoiced to be counted worthy to suffer for the sake of Christ. The names of Ainsworth, and Canne, and Robinson, will always be cherished with respect by the lovers of sacred literature. And the souls of Copping and Thacker, Greenwood and Barrow, Penry and Dennis, are now before the altar above, for the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ. Men who suffered the loss of all things for conscience' sake, and who loved not their lives unto death, should not be wantonly reproached. It especially ill becomes those who belong to a community which arose out of the ashes of Brownism, and which profited by its mistakes and its sufferings, to join with others in ridiculing or defaming it. It should be recollected too, that the chief accounts which we have of the Brownists are from the pens of their adversaries. Such testimony should always be received with caution. And when we perceive the vituperation, indecency, and palpable injustice which prevail in many of the publications issued against this much-hated sect, we must conclude that such authorities as Paget and Edwards, and even those of Baillie and Hall, are not entitled to implicit deference.

68

Such as they were, the principles of this body obtained considerable publicity before the end of the sixteenth century. A variety of spirited pamphlets, chiefly anonymous, were published by members of it; and churches were formed which met mostly in private, till by the Act of 1593, those who survived the effects of dungeons and gibbets,² were condemned to indiscriminate banishment. Most of them retired to Holland, which was then the land of liberty; and in Rotterdam, Middleburgh, Leyden, Amsterdam, and Arnheim, they were permitted to constitute churches according to their own model. There, in 1596, they published a Confession of their Faith, in Latin and English, and addressed it to the Continental and British Universities. Their conduct in Holland seems to have been in general very exemplary, till most of them moved to New England, and founded that flourishing colony into which they introduced those enlightened principles of religious liberty which have obtained so firm an establishment in America.

Mr. John Robinson, who was educated at Cambridge, and beneficed near Yarmouth, with some of his people, renounced their connexion with the Church of England, and moved to Holland where he became pastor of the Congregational Church at Leyden, about 1609. So great was the number of English exiles at this place, that the church at one time consisted of three hundred

¹ Townsbend's Historical Col. p. 176.

² *Gibbets: gallows.*

members. According to the testimony of friends and enemies, Robinson was a learned, amiable, and devoted servant of Christ; and the church under him seems to have merited and enjoyed a high Christian character. ¹

69

While Robinson was at Leyden, Mr. Henry Jacob, another English exile, of eminent learning and talents, was pastor of the church at Middleburgh. These two excellent men were assisted by the celebrated Dr. William Ames, better known by his Latin name, Amesius. With distinguished reputation, he had filled the Divinity Chair of Franeker for many years. Afterwards he became joint pastor of the Congregational Church at Rotterdam, and colleague to the unfortunate Hugh Peters. These men adopted those views of fellowship and Government which have since distinguished the body of British Independents.²

Various circumstances concurred to induce Mr. Jacob to return to his native country about 1616, where he immediately set about forming a Church in London, on Congregational principles. This is generally thought to have been the first Church of this description in England; but Edwards asserts that the Church at Duckenfield, in Cheshire, was formed before any of the exiles came over from Holland. When we reflect how extensively these principles were disseminated throughout England, it is probable that in many parts of it there were persons ready to embrace the first opportunity of reducing to practice the sentiments which they had previously received.

It may well be supposed that the progress of the Independent Churches during the despotic reigns of James and Charles, must have been very slow. In general, they were obliged to meet privately; and even then, they were liable to frequent and violent interruptions. Mr. Jacob's church in London, however, seems to have enjoyed a continuity of existence through most of this period, and was favoured with the labours of a succession of excellent men. Mr. Jacob himself continued pastor till 1621, when, with the consent of the Church, he moved to Virginia.

70

He was succeeded by Mr. John Lathorp, who remained pastor till 1636, when the oppressions of the times drove him and a number of the church, to take refuge in America. His successor was Mr. Henry Jessey, who continued in office till the time of which we are now writing.³

Various causes combined after 1640 to promote the increase and respectability of the Independent body throughout England. The state of the country became favourable to freedom of inquiry on religious subjects. A very general disgust prevailed towards established Episcopacy, which had been long excited by the conduct both of the church and the court. Respect for old established forms and received opinions rapidly gave way; and the minds of men received an impulse, which in many instances no doubt, led to error and extravagance. But on the whole, it was favourable to the progress of truth. The influence of error is never so destructive as when its subjects are in a state of torpor and unconcern. The wildness of fanaticism, and the uproar of persecution, are not so unfavourable to the march of knowledge, as the gloomy security of a bigoted superstition. In the one case, some good will appear amidst much evil; in the other case, the whole mass is sunk in hopeless and deathlike apathy.

The return, at this time, of many individuals from Holland, where they had long been exiled on account of their religious sentiments, excited attention to Congregational principles. Many of those who had left England chiefly from dissatisfaction with the forms and spirit of Episcopacy, had become Independents in Holland.

¹ Prince's Chron. Hist. i. p. 32. Morton's New Eng. Mem. p. 2. Baillie's Diss. p. 17.

² Brook's Lives, Articles Robinson, Jacob, Ames.

³ Wilson's Hist. of the Diss. Churches. i. pp. 36-43.

This change had been effected not so much by the zeal of the party previously settled there, as by the opportunity afforded during their residence in that country, to study the Scriptures unbiased by the influence of an established system, and freed from all temptations of a worldly nature. Such at least is the account given of their change by Goodwin, Nye, Burroughs, Simpson, and Bridge, in their celebrated Apologetical Narrative, presented to the Westminster Assembly.¹ The return of such persons, and their influence among their former friends and flocks, must have created a considerable sensation.

By this time too, the Congregational cause had obtained a firm footing in New England, and churches there were growing up and flourishing under its auspices. American pamphlets were imported, which disseminated the sentiments of the churches in that quarter. Thus the heresy, which had been expelled from England, returned with the increased strength of a transatlantic cultivation, and the publications of Cotton and Hooker, Norton and Mather, were circulated throughout England, and during this writing and disputing period, produced a mighty effect.

Another thing which contributed greatly to the spread of Independency was the meeting and transactions of the Westminster Assembly. This celebrated body met by appointment of Parliament on the first of July 1648, and continued to meet with more or less regularity till the twenty-second of February 1648-9, having held eleven hundred and sixty-three sessions during that time. It consisted of a number of Ministers and Laymen of various descriptions, chosen by Parliament to assist it, by counsel and advice, but invested with no power or authority.

It was nearly of one mind on doctrinal subjects; but of very different sentiments on church government and discipline. Some were decided Episcopalians; a few were Erastians,² or men of no fixed sentiments on these subjects. At the beginning, the body was moderate Conformists; but pushed on by the Scotch Commissioners, they would at last be satisfied with nothing short of the Divine right of Presbytery, and a Covenanted uniformity. Ten or eleven members were wholly or partially Independents.³ The character of the Assembly has been variously represented. Without any question, it comprised a large portion of religion and learning; yet its proceedings were often marked with those imperfections which uniformly attach to all Assemblies of uninspired men. The debates which occurred in this body on the subject of government and discipline, called forth the strength both of the Presbyterians and the Independents on all the leading questions in which the two systems differ. Many and long were the discussions which took place, both in writing and by speech. As might be expected, the Independents were invariably out-voted; but it will not be supposed that an Independent would admit that they were out-reasoned.

The leaders of the Independent party were men of as profound learning, talents, and piety as any of whom the opposite side could boast; and their invincible patience, considering the opposition they had to encounter, deserves to be honourably mentioned. Truth never suffers from discussion. The publication of the Assembly's debates, and the pamphlets which they occasioned, diffused

¹ Nar. pp. 3, 4.

² *Erastian: the doctrine that the state is supreme over the church in ecclesiastical matters.*

³ The names of these persons were Thos. Goodwin, Philip Nye, Jer. Burroughs, Sydrach Simpson, William Bridge, William Greenhill, Peter Sterry, William Carter, Joseph Caryl, John Unry, John Philips. The first five on this list went by the name of the *Dissenting Brethren*, as they generally took the lead in the public discussions, and were mostly employed in drawing up the printed papers. There were above one hundred Ministers in the Assembly, which sufficiently explains the reason why the Independents were usually outvoted.

information on the disputed points, and increased the number of dissenters from Presbytery and Episcopacy.

Whatever is due to these causes, it would be wrong to ascribe the progress of Independency entirely to their influence. There was another — the most important of the whole. But in stating this, I must borrow the words of others, to escape the charge of partiality. “The rapid progress of the Independents,” says the impartial Mosheim, “was no doubt owing to a variety of causes; among which justice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and sanctity of their manners.”¹ This candid admission of Mosheim is corroborated by the testimony of Baxter, who was very far from being a friend to Independency. “I saw,” he says, “that most of them were zealous, and very many learned, discreet and godly men, and fit to be very serviceable in the Church. — Also, I saw a commendable care of *serious holiness and discipline* in most of the Independent Churches.”²

Such were some of the causes which promoted the increase and respectability of this body, shortly before Owen connected himself with it. It was neither its number nor its respectability, however, which produced his adoption of its sentiments, as will immediately appear. The following account is given by Baillie of its state in 1646, the very time at which Owen joined it.

74

It partakes of the colouring of that writer’s party prejudices; but is on the whole by no means discreditable to the Independents, though he ascribes to political management, what may be more easily accounted for from the operation of the causes already enumerated.

“Of all the bypaths in which the wanderers of our time are pleased to walk, this is the most considerable; not for the number, but for the quality of the erring persons. There are few of the noted sects which are not a great deal more numerous; but what this way lacks in number, it supplies by the weight of its followers. After five years’ endeavours and great industry, within the lines of the city’s communication, they are said to as yet consist of much within one thousand persons — men, women, and all who to this day have put themselves in any known congregation being reckoned of that way. But setting aside number for other respects, they are of so eminent a condition, that not any nor all the rest of the sects are comparable to them. For they have been so wise as to engage to their party some of the chief noted in both houses of Parliament, in the Assembly of divines, in the Army, in the city and country committees; all of whom they daily manage with such dexterity and diligence for the benefit of their cause, that the eyes of the world begin to fall upon them more than upon all their fellows.”³

“Contrary to the progress of other sects,” says a Scotch Historian, “the Independent system was first addressed, and apparently recommended by its tolerating principles, to the higher orders of social life. It was in the progressive state of the sect, when in danger from the persecuting Spirit of the Presbyterians, that it descended to the lower classes of the community, where other sectaries begin their career.”⁴

75

The Presbyterian interest was rather declining about this time. This arose chiefly from its extreme violence and inveterate hostility to the toleration of all other parties. The people of England were not generally prepared to enforce the uniformity for which it contended; and as nothing else would satisfy, the whole of the other sects agreed and united to resist it, however they differed from each

¹ Ch. History cent xvii. sect. ii. part ii.

² Baxter’s own Life part ii. p. 140.

³ Dissuasive p. 53.

⁴ Laing’s Hist, of Scotland, vol. i. p. 275. — On the language of Laing, I beg to observe that if the Independency in England was first embraced by the higher class of society, it has never been the religion of the lower class only. The great body of its supporters have all along been found in the middling, or mercantile and commercial class of the population. Whether they are the fools or fanatics of the country may be easily determined.

other. As the Presbyterian cause declined, that of the Independents rose — till in the end, the former, struggling for power, entirely lost its influence; and the latter, seeking existence, acquired ascendancy.

The progress of Owen's mind on the subject of Church Government has already been noted. For a time he appears to have hesitated between Presbytery and Independency. It fortunately happens that we can give an account of the circumstances which led to his decided adoption of the latter system in his own words. The following passage is peculiarly important.

“Not long after [the publication of his *Duties of Pastor and People*] I set myself seriously to inquire into the controversies then hotly agitated in these nations. I was not acquainted with any one person, minister or other of the Congregational way; nor had I to my knowledge seen any more than *one* in my life.

76

My acquaintance lay wholly with ministers and people of the Presbyterian way. But sundry books being published on either side, I perused and compared them with the Scriptures and with one another, as I received ability from God. After a general view of them, as was my manner in other controversies, I fixed on one to take under particular consideration, which seemed most methodically and strongly to maintain what was contrary, as I thought, to my present persuasion. This was Mr. Cotton's book 'Of the Keys.' I engaged in the examination and confutation of it, merely for my own satisfaction, with what diligence and sincerity I was able. What progress I made in that undertaking I can manifest to anyone by the discourses on that subject, and criticisms ¹ on that book, yet abiding by me. *In the pursuit and management of this work, quite beside and contrary to my expectations at a time in which I could expect nothing on that account but ruin in this world, without the knowledge, or advice of, or conference with any one person of that judgement, I was prevailed on to receive those principles which I thought I had set myself in opposition to.* And indeed, this way of impartially examining all things by the word, comparing causes with causes, and things with things, laying aside all prejudiced respects to persons or present traditions, is a course that I would admonish all to beware of, who would avoid the danger of being made Independents.” ²

In answer to Cawdry's charges of inconsistency, he expresses himself on this subject again, as follows:

77

“Be it here declared then, that at one time I apprehended the *Presbyterial*, Synodical Government of Churches, as fit to be received and walked in (when I did not know if it aligned with those principles which I had taken up, upon my best inquiry into the word of God). I now profess myself to be satisfied that I was then under a mistake; and I do now own, and I have for many years lived in, the way and practice of what is called Congregational.” ³

This language requires no comment; it is a manly and explicit avowal of his change of sentiment, and a candid explanation of the circumstances which led to it. Between the years 1644 and 1646, it appears he had been engaged in examining the constitution and government of the Church. For some time his mind was undecided; but towards the latter part of the above period, he fully adopted those views in which he continued steadfast, and which he from time to time defended till the end of his life. I have been more particular on this subject, because everything relating to the progress of such a mind as Owen's is deserving of attention; because the facts brought forward show that his change was neither a hasty nor an interested one, but produced entirely by the force of truth and conviction; and because he appeared at the head of his brethren of the Congregational order during the long period of forty years, it became more necessary to state how he had been led to embrace their sentiments. As it is also often ignorantly asserted that Owen continued

¹ [Animadversions: harsh criticisms.](#)

² Review of the nature of Schism, in reply to Cawdry, pp. 34-36.

³ Preface to Cotton's Defence against Cawdry, pp. 61, 62.

through life a Presbyterian, justice required that his true sentiments should be exhibited. It clearly appears from his own words that he was *never* a Presbyterian; and that at an early period, he withdrew from all connexion with that body, from some of whom (as it will afterwards be shown), he received no small degree of abuse and ill-usage on account of his secession.

78

The consequence of his change of sentiment was his forming a church at Coggeshall on Congregational principles, with which he remained till the commonwealth appointments broke up his connexion — but which has continued in a flourishing state to the present day.

Soon after the formation of the Church in this place, he published a small treatise: “*Eshcol: or Rules of Direction for the walking of the saints in fellowship, according to the order of the Gospel,*” 1647. It has since gone through many editions. In the preface, he states four principles as the basis of his rules, and on which he considered most persons agreed who were seeking a scriptural reformation:

- that particular congregations or assemblies of believers, under officers of their own, are of Divine institution
- that every believer is bound to join himself to some such congregation
- that every man’s voluntary consent is required for his union with it
- and that it is convenient that all believers in one place should, unless too numerous, form one congregation

Most Presbyterians as well as Independents would agree in these principles. The same remark is applicable to his rules, which are purposely so expressed as to avoid occasion for dispute; and so that Christians of every description may derive benefit from them. His sentiments as an Independent, however, appear. For in explaining Mat 18.17, he observes “that by *church* cannot be understood the Elders of the Church alone, but rather the whole congregation.” It is divided into two parts: the first on the duty of Members of Churches to their Pastors; and the second on their duty to one another.

79

The former contains seven rules, and the latter fifteen — all of them judicious, well supported by Scripture, and calculated to promote, in an eminent degree, the comfort, edification and usefulness of the Churches of Christ.

Eshcol was followed by a work of deeper learning and research, “*Salus Electorum, Sanguis Jesu; or the death of Death, in the death of Christ: A treatise of the redemption and reconciliation that is in the blood of Christ, with the merit thereof, and the satisfaction wrought thereby, etc.* by John Owen, Pastor of the Church of God which is at Coggeshall, in Essex.” 1648, 4to. pp. 333.

This work is dedicated to the Earl of Warwick, the nobleman to whom he had been indebted for the presentation to Coggeshall: a man of unimpeachable Christian character and great sweetness of temper; a valuable and steady friend to the persecuted Puritans, and known before (and long after) his death by the distinguished designation of The Good Earl of Warwick.¹ It has the attestations of Stanley Gower, and Richard Byfield, Presbyterian ministers of considerable eminence, and members of the Westminster Assembly. They both speak of the work in terms of the highest commendation, though the latter professes to know nothing of Owen, even by name!

The work is entirely devoted to an examination of one branch of the Arminian controversy: the nature and extent of the death of Christ. It is a subject of much importance in itself, and the fruitful source of numerous and extended discussions.

¹ Biog. Brit. v. p. i23.

The subject had occupied the attention of Owen for more than seven years, during which he had examined everything which he could procure written in former or later times on it. ¹ The volume which is the result of this labour, is distinguished by all that comprehension of thought, closeness of reasoning, and minuteness of illustration, which mark the future productions of our author. It is divided into four parts. In the first, he treats the eternal purpose, and distinct concurrence of the Father, Son, and Spirit, respecting the work of redemption. In the second, he removes the false and supposed ends of the death of Christ. The third contains arguments against universal redemption; and the last answers the objections of Arminians to particular redemption.

In every part of the work, much important and scriptural sentiment occurs; but I am disposed to think that Owen is more successful in the two latter, than in the former parts; in objecting to the sentiments and language of Arminians, than in placing the doctrine of Scripture, on the subject which he treats, in its true and simple aspect. There is too much minute reasoning on the debtor and creditor hypothesis. Forgetting that if sin is a *debt*, it is a *moral* debt, which cannot be discharged by a payment in kind, but which may be compensated in another way, deemed suitable and satisfactory by the offended party. The atonement of Christ is a glorious expedient devised by infinite wisdom and mercy, to remedy the disorders that have taken place in God's moral government; to justify his ways to men; to open the channel of mercy; to maintain the honours of justice; to magnify the Lawgiver; and to glorify the Saviour.

Some Calvinists maintain that the sacrifice of Christ is, in its nature as well as design, limited to the elect — to procure the removal of their transgressions, and to obtain spiritual blessings for them alone. Arminians, on the other hand, maintain that the atonement of Christ, in its nature as well as its intention, extends to all; and that it is chiefly designed to put all mankind into a state capable of being saved. On both sides, there seems to be a confounding of the death of Christ with the purpose of God respecting its extent. The sovereign intention of God in regard to the application of the atonement, is surely a thing distinct from the atonement itself — though in the Divine plan, it is closely connected with it. The same remedy would have been necessary for the salvation of one sinner if God had so restricted its application; while in its own nature, it is sufficient to save a thousand worlds, if Jehovah was so pleased to extend and apply it. The sufficiency and suitableness of the remedy, arise from the fact that *Christ* is worthy, the one for whose sake the Father forgives and restores to favour the offending rebel. Such is the nature of sin that nothing less than a testimony of infinite displeasure against it, would justify the Lawgiver in showing mercy to one transgression of even one offender. Such is the infinite worth of the sacrifice, arising from the divine character of the sufferer, that it is enough to purge away the transgressions of *all* who believe.

Inattention on the part of many Calvinists to the glorious *sufficiency* of the atonement, has led to the wildest *Antinomianism*; while overlooking the sovereign limitation of it, or its applied *efficiency*, has led Arminians to an equally objectionable *Neonomianism* — or to ascribe salvation not so much to the death of Christ, as to the sinner's obedience to a new law, which he is enabled to obey by being put into a salvable state, through the work of Christ.

The Calvinists at the Synod of Dort, appear to me to have stated the subject very correctly when they say:

“Christ's satisfaction is of infinite value and price — abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of all the world. But the declaration of the gospel is that whoever believes in Christ crucified shall not perish, but

¹ Preface.

have eternal life. This declaration should be promiscuously and indiscriminately announced to all men to whom God, of his good pleasure, sends the gospel; and it is to be received by faith and repentance. But the fact that many who are invited by the gospel, neither repent nor believe, but perish in infidelity, arises from no defect or insufficiency in the oblation of Christ on the cross, but is entirely their own fault.”¹

The following passage of Owen’s work fully coincides with these views:

“It was the purpose of God that his Son should offer a sacrifice of infinite worth and dignity, sufficient in itself for redeeming all and every man, if it had pleased the Lord to employ it to that purpose; yes, and of other worlds also, if the Lord were to freely make them and redeem them. This is its own true internal perfection and sufficiency. That it should be applied to any, made a price for them, and become beneficial to them, is *external* to it, does not arise from it, but merely depends on the *intention and will of God*”²

He proceeds to show that on this ground the gospel ought to be preached to every creature:

“Because the way of salvation which it declares is wide enough for all to walk in. There is enough in the remedy it brings to light, to heal all their diseases, to deliver them from all their evils.

83

If there were a thousand worlds, the gospel might on this ground be preached to them all, if they will only believe in him, which is the only way to draw refreshment from this fountain of salvation.”³

If these views of redemption were strictly adhered to, which I do not think is done even by Owen himself in this very work, the controversy concerning its extent would be reduced within very narrow limits. The principle on which men are called to believe the gospel, is *not* God’s decree of election — *not* that Christ has died for them — but the revealed sufficiency of the atonement for *all* who believe the testimony respecting it. This is unaffected by any decree of God, and it remains unalterably true whether men believe it or not.

Those who would understand the nature of the debate on this subject at an early period, will do well to read the “*Salus Electorum*” of Owen. But those who wish to see the modern state of the question, will find in the masterly reasonings of Dr. Williams in his work on *Equity and Sovereignty*, and in his *Defence of Modern Calvinism*, the ablest defence of the views of that part of the Calvinistic scheme which are now generally adopted.

In the course of this work, Owen frequently replies to the language of a treatise on the “*Universality of Free Grace*,” by a Thomas More, who appears to have been an illiterate person; and I suppose the same one whom Edwards describes as “a great sectary, who did much hurt in Lincolnshire, Norfolk, and Cambridgeshire; who was also famous in Boston, Lynn, and even Holland; and who was followed from place to place by many.”⁴

84

At the end of the volume also is a short appendix, by way of answer to an undescribed work of Mr. Joshua Sprigge. This gentleman was educated at Oxford, and graduated M. A. at Edinburgh. He must have been a person of some note, as in 1673 he married the widow of Lord Say. He was the author of various works, both political and theological; but I have not ascertained which of them Owen refers to in his appendix.⁵

An answer to this work was published by Mr. John Home, entitled “*The Open Door for Man’s approach to God; or a Vindication of the Record of God, concerning the extent of the Death of*

¹ Acta Synodi Dordiechti, p. 251.

² p. 173.

³ p. 175.

⁴ Gangrena, part ii. p. 86.

⁵ Wood’s Athen. ii. p. 578.

Christ, in answer to a Treatise on that subject, by Mr. John Owen, 1650, 4to. pp. 318. The author was minister at Lynn in Norfolk, from which he was ejected in 1662. He was an Arminian on the subject of Redemption, but not on some of the other points, and is said to have been a holy, excellent man. He wrote a variety, chiefly of controversial pieces, of which a long list is given by Palmer.¹ This reply to Owen treats him very respectfully. In the preface, he says that he chose to reply to his work rather than any other, on account of Owen's reputation for ingenuity and learning, in which he acknowledges that time, opportunity and diligence, had given him much advantage. He takes up the work chapter by chapter, and discovers some portion both of learning and acuteness. His arguments are generally the same with those of other Arminians, while he yet seems to differ from them on the subjects of grace and election. Some of his remarks and interpretations of Scripture were not unworthy of Owen's attention. However, he thought differently, for he thus speaks of his opponent: "For Mr. Home's book, I suppose you are not acquainted with it; if I could have met with any uninterested person who said it deserved a reply, it would not have lain so long unanswered."²

85

Colchester was, about this time, besieged by the Parliamentary army; and Lord Fairfax, the general, had his headquarters at Coggeshall. He thus became acquainted with Owen, who appears to have acted as chaplain to him for a time.³ Fairfax was then considered the head of the Presbyterian party. But it appears from the Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson,⁴ that he was an Independent at bottom — though he allowed himself to be overruled by his wife at home, as he was by Cromwell in the council. Owen appears to have had a high opinion of his religious character. Even Hume says of him, "He was equally eminent for courage and for humanity; and though strongly infected with prejudices or principles derived from party zeal, in the course of his public conduct, he never seems to have been diverted by private interest or ambition, from adhering strictly to those principles."⁵

Owen preached two sermons, one to the army at Colchester on a day of thanksgiving — on account of its surrender; the other was preached at Rumford, to the Parliament's Committee, which had been imprisoned — it was occasioned by their deliverance. Afterwards he published these together, as they were preached from the same passage, Habakkuk 1.1-9. He prefixed two dedications: one to Lord Fairfax, and the other to the Committee and some of the Parliament's officers.

86

He designated them, "A memorial of the deliverance of Essex county and Committee." In these discourses are some strong statements about the impropriety, and iniquity of human interference with religion. "Arguments for persecution," he says, "have been dyed in the blood of Christians for a long season; ever since the dragon gave his power to the false prophet, they have all died as heretics and schismatics. Suppose you saw, in one view, all the blood of the witnesses which has been let out of their veins on false pretences; suppose that you heard in one noise, the doleful cry of all pastorless churches, dying martyrs, harbourless children of parents inheriting the promises, wilderness wandering saints, dungeoned believers — perhaps, it would make your spirits tender as to this point."⁶

¹ Noncon. Mem. iii. pp. 5-7.

² Epistle prefixed to *Vindiciae Evangelicae*.

³ Dedication to the Two Sermons

⁴ p. 251, 4to. ed.

⁵ Hist. of Eng. vii. p. 26.

⁶ Works, p.259.

There are some passages which seem to encourage more of a warlike spirit than I think quite justifiable on Christian principles. To stir up men to defend or fight for the privileges which Christ has bestowed on his church, is a violation both of the letter and the spirit of his word. To view religious rights as civil privileges, and to maintain the lawfulness of defending them on this ground, is quite a different matter. Christianity justifies no man, as a Christian, in fighting for anything connected with it; but it is perfectly consistent with its principles to defend what belongs to us as men, or as natives of a country whose constitution secures the enjoyment of Christian or of civil privileges. It bestows no particular rights or immunities of a civil nature on its professors; on the other hand, it deprives no rights of which they may be previously possessed.

87

One of these warlike passages which has given much offence, and of which a very unfair use has been made, is the following. After noting that former mercies and deliverances, thankfully remembered, strengthen faith and prevent despondency, he exclaims:

“Where is the God of Marstone moor, and the God of Naseby! This is an acceptable expostulation in a gloomy day. Oh! what a catalogue of mercies this nation has to plead in a time of trouble! God came from Naseby, and the Holy One from the west! His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. He went forth in the north, and he did not withhold his hand in the east. The poor town in which I live is more enriched with a store of mercies in a few months, than with a full trade of many years,” etc.

This passage is quoted by L’Estrange as a proof that Owen was one of those fanatics who believed that success was an evidence of the goodness of a cause.¹ Dr. Grey also, commenting on a passage of Hudibras, affirms on the same ground, that Owen was of this sentiment.² But this is a gross perversion of his meaning. It is a mere rhetorical application of the words of Scripture, with the design of impressing the importance of remembering past mercies and deliverances.

However, as the sentiment that success is an evidence of Divine approval has often been imputed to Owen and the party with which he acted, it is important that we can produce his own reply to the charge.

88

“A cause is good or bad, before it has success one way or other; and that which does not have its warrant in itself, can never obtain any from its success. The rule of the goodness of any public cause, is the eternal law of reason, with the just legal rights and interests of men. If these do not make a cause good, success will never mend it. But when a cause on these grounds is indeed good, or is really judged such by those who are engaged in it, not to take notice of the providence of God in prospering men in the pursuit of it, is to exclude all thoughts of Him and His providence from having any concern in the government of the world. And if I, or any other, have at any time applied this to any cause that is not warranted by the only rule of its justification, it in no way reflects on the truth of the principle which I assert; nor does it give countenance to the false one which he ascribes to me.”³

If this quotation does not satisfy the reader that Owen, and I might add most of the men who acted with him, never held the absurd and impious sentiment ascribed to him, he must be unreasonably sceptical. Owen, no doubt, had the same views as Paul, of the character of those who do evil so that good may come; ⁴ of whom even a heathen poet tolerably expresses his dislike:

“Careat successibus opto;
Quisquis ab eventu facta notanda putat.” — *Ovid*.

¹ Dissenters Sayings, part ii. p. 11.

² Hudibras, part iii. canto ii.1. par. 1415. [This is a heroic narrative poem written by Samuel Butler, 1662-78.]

³ Reflections on a slanderous Libel, — Works, p. 620.

⁴ Rom. 3.8.

CHAPTER IV.

Owen preaches before Parliament on the day after the execution of Charles I. — The Independents not guilty of putting the King to death — Testimonies on this subject — Remarks on Owen's Sermon — Charges against it — Essay on Toleration annexed to it — Doctrine of Religious Liberty owes its origin to Independents — Writers on this subject — Brownists and Baptists — Jeremy Taylor — Owen — Vane — Milton — Locke — Cook's account of the origin of Toleration among the Independents — A different account of it — Smith and Hume — Neal — Owen preaches again before Parliament — His first acquaintance with Cromwell — Is persuaded to accompany him to Ireland.

On the thirty-first of January, 1649, Owen was called to preach before Parliament, on the most trying occasion on which he ever appeared before that assembly: this was the day after the decapitation of Charles I. A lengthened discussion respecting the causes which produced, and the persons who were engaged in this dismal affair, would be foreign from the design of this work. But as the religious party with which Owen acted has received a large portion of the blame for this transaction, it cannot be deemed improper to show that it has been greatly wronged in this. That any body of religious persons should be guilty of such lawless and unjustifiable procedure, would be sufficient to brand it with deserved and indelible disgrace. But a little acquaintance with the true state of things will evince that no religious sect can justly be charged with the crime of putting the king to death.

90

The parties immediately concerned in this tragical scene, were the array, the parliament, and the high court of justice. The army was a collection of all the fierce republican spirits which had been produced by the anarchy, the excitement, and the success of the preceding years. It comprehended a great number of religious persons belonging to various professions, and many of no definite profession whatever — those who might pretend to religion, but in reality, fought for revolution and plunder. In it there were Presbyterians, and Independents (properly so called); and under the latter designation, there was a crowd of anomalous fanatics who took refuge in the general name and respectable character of the Congregational body. There were Baptists and Fifth Monarchy men, Seekers and Antinomians, Levellers and Ranters,

“All monstrous, all prodigious things.”¹

Cromwell and his officers ruled the army and, as it suited their purpose, sometimes provoked its religious feelings, and at other times on its revolutionary frenzy. They can be considered as belonging decidedly to no religious body; though they naturally favoured the Independent rather than any other, as from its principles, they could more easily manage it in political matters.

The Parliament, by the numerous changes it had undergone, was reduced to a mere *caput mortuum*² by the army. After Colonel Pride's purge, “none were allowed to enter it,” says Hume, “but the most furious and determined of the Independents, and these did not exceed the number of fifty or sixty.” Hume never distinguishes between the civil and the religious Independents, nor would it have suited either his political or his religious creed to do so. Some of the persons composing the Rump Parliament were no doubt connected with the religious body known by this name, and to such men as Colonel Hutchinson.

91

However much we may think they erred, it will not be easy to deny the claim of religious character. But many of them, we know, never considered themselves Independents, nor were they considered so by others — nor can it be shown that any considerable number of them were so.

¹ From Milton's *Paradise Lost* — a description of hell.

² *Caput mortuum*: dross or worthless remains.

“Tis certain to a demonstration, that there were men of all parties then left in the house — Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and others — so little foundation is there for the conclusion that Independents, and *these only*, put the king to death.”¹

The same remarks are equally applicable to the high court of justice which, being composed chiefly of officers of the army and members of the commons, partook of their respective characters. Few of the individuals who composed it, so far as I can discover, ever ranked under the banner of the Congregational body. The testimonies of Whitelocke,² Wellwood, Du Moulin, Baxter, Burnet, and of the Convention Parliament itself (which restored Charles II), support the views now given. The reader will find the substance of these collected in Neal,³ who justly observes that the violent writers on the other side, “constantly confound the Independents with the army, which was made up of a number of sectaries, the majority of whom were not of that distinguishing character.”⁴ As Neal’s testimony, however, may be unjustly supposed to be influenced by partiality, it is gratifying to be able to adduce the language of a writer who is far removed from all suspicion of this kind, and whose opinion on this (as on most other subjects of ecclesiastical history), is entitled to the highest respect. Says the candid and impartial Mosheim,

92

“I am well aware that many of the most eminent and respectable English writers have given the Independents the denomination of Regicides; and if, by the term *Independents*, they mean those licentious republicans whose dislike of a monarchical form of government carried them to the most pernicious and extravagant lengths, then I grant that this denomination is well applied. But if, by the term Independents, we are to understand a *religious* sect, the ancestors of those who still bear the same title in England, it appears very questionable to me whether the unhappy fate of the worthy prince above-mentioned, ought to be imputed entirely to that set of men. Those who affirm that the Independents were the only authors of the death of King Charles, must mean one of these two things: either that the Regicides were animated and set on by the seditious doctrines of that sect, and the violent suggestions of its members; or that all who were concerned in this atrocious deed were themselves Independents, zealously attached to the religious community now under consideration. Now, it may be proved with the clearest evidence that neither of these was the case. There is nothing in the doctrines of this sect, so far as they are known to me, that seems in the least adapted to incite men to such a horrid deed; nor does it appear from the history of these times that the Independents were a whit more exasperated against Charles, than the *Presbyterians* were. And as to the latter supposition, it is far from being true that all those who were concerned in bringing this unfortunate prince to the scaffold were Independents; since we learn from the best English writers, and from the public declarations of Charles II., that this violent faction was composed of persons of different sects. That there were Independents among them may be easily conceived.”⁵

93

The subsequent reasonings of this historian respecting the distinction between the civil and religious Independents, are also highly important, but too long to be quoted here. Though in a note, his translator Maclaine endeavours to shake the force of his reasonings, what he says amounts to very little, as the facts of the case are all on the side of Mosheim. Eachard and Bates (the physician) both observe that several of the Independents joined with the Presbyterians in declaring against the design of putting the king to death — in their sermons from the pulpit, in conferences, monitory letters, petitions, protestations, and public remonstrances.⁶ None of their

¹ Neal’s Hist. of the Pur. iii. p. 550.

² [Bulstrode Whitelocke \(1605-1675\) — lawyer, writer, parliamentarian, and Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England.](#)

³ Ibid. pp. 549-554.

⁴ Ibid. p. 549.

⁵ Eccles. Hist. cent. xvii. sect. ii. part ii. Note.

⁶ Neal iii. p. 593.

ministers expressed their approval of it, except Hugh Peters, and John Goodwin, neither of whom has strong claims to be considered as belonging to the regular body of Independents; not the former on account of his fanaticism, nor the latter on account of his Arminianism. It also deserves to be noticed that few of the religious Independents suffered after the restoration on account of their real or supposed connexion with the death of Charles.

In stating these things to vindicate the Independents from the calumnies which have been heaped upon them, I consider myself to be doing a service to religion in general, which always suffers when its professors are reproached. The real causes of the king's death are not to be found in the principles or members of any religious body; but are to be traced, most probably, to the duplicity and fickleness of Charles himself — to the unconstitutional and despotic principles perpetually instilled into his mind by his immediate attendants and confidential friends; and to the perilous circumstances of the democratic leaders, who had gone too far to recede, and were driven to this desperate stroke for their own salvation.

94

With some it may be enough to involve Owen in the guilt of the Regicides, that he was employed by them to preach on such an occasion, as the day after the king's death. The apology made by him in regard to another affair is perhaps quite as applicable here. His superiors were persons "whose commands were not to be questioned." They were aware of the importance of having their conduct sanctioned, even in appearance, by a preacher of Owen's respectability, and on this account, it is probable that he was chosen to discharge a function which it is impossible to suppose he would have coveted. Perhaps they expected he would defend or apologize for their measures. If they did, they must have been grievously disappointed, as the discourse maintains a profound and studied silence on the awful transaction of the preceding day. It is founded on Jer. 15.19, 20. It was published with the title, "Righteous zeal encouraged by Divine protection," from which a direct application to the recent events might be expected. Extremely little of this occurs, however. The text and context were both very suitable to the circumstances of the country, and in a general way, he uses them for this purpose. But he is exceedingly cautious of committing himself by expressing an opinion either of the court, or of the country party. This plainly implies that, while he was not at liberty to condemn, he was unwilling to justify. He tells the Parliament very faithfully that, "much of the evil which had come upon the country, had originated within their own walls;" and he warns them against "oppression, self-seeking, and contrivances for persecution."

95

Mr. Asty speaking of this discourse remarks: —

"He appeared before a numerous assembly; it was a critical juncture, and he was not ignorant of the tempers of his principal hearers; he was then a rising man, and to justify the late action was the infallible road to preferment. But his discourse was so modest and inoffensive, that his friends could take no just exception to it, nor his enemies take advantage of his words another day." ¹

This last observation is not quite correct. For this discourse occasioned to its author a large portion of abuse and misrepresentation. Dr. Grey, in his examination of Neal's history, endeavours to show from this sermon, that Owen approved of the death of the king. For this purpose two passages are detached from their connexion — and so that nothing may be lacking to fix the guilt of the preacher, words are printed in italics as emphatic, on which he never intended any emphasis should be laid. Grey shall have the full benefit of the alleged evidence without note or comment from me.

"The famed Dr. John Owen, in a sermon preached the day after the king's murder, has the following remarkable passages, which I think plainly reveal his approval of that *execrable parricide*. 'As the flaming

¹ Owen's Memoirs, p. 8.

sword,' he says, 'turns every way, so God can turn it into every thing. To those who cry, give me a king, *God can give him in his anger*; and from those who cry *take him away*, He can take him *away in his wrath*. — When kings turn seducers, they seldom lack a good store of followers. Now, if the blind lead the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch. When kings command unrighteous things, and the people suit them with willing compliance, none doubts that the destruction of them both is just and righteous.”¹

96

He must be desperately prejudiced against Owen, indeed, who does not see that this language bears as hard on the people as on the ill-fated king; and had I been disposed to quote passages to show that Owen disapproved of the death of Charles, I should have selected these as well suited for this purpose.

Grey, in the passage we have now quoted, merely follows the steps of Anthony Wood, who prefers the same charges against Owen's sermon, and on the same grounds. He only goes a little further, and says that Owen “applauded the regicides, and declared the death of that most admirable king to be *just and righteous*.”² Wood himself was in this, as in several other instances of his abuse of Owen, the servile copyist of Vernon; whose vile anonymous libel is the storehouse out of which all the future defamers of Owen supplied themselves with accusations both in matter and form.³

To sum up the whole, the University of Oxford, on the twenty-first of July, 1683, in the fervour of its zeal and loyalty, condemned the positions of this sermon as pernicious and damnable, and ordered them to be burnt by the Marshal in the school quadrangle before the members of the University.⁴ This act of cowardly revenge on a man whose learning, moderation and piety had once graced their highest honours, took place within a month of his death; when he must have been insensible alike to their praise or their contumely. It was well that their power was then feebler than their inclinations, or they would probably have substituted the author in place of his writings.⁵

97

But what renders this discourse peculiarly valuable, is the Essay on toleration annexed to it. Owen had thought long and deeply on this subject, and he now published the fruit of his deliberations; — not when he and his party were struggling for existence, but when they had obtained in great measure the protection and support of the supreme power. As this is a subject of vast importance, and as I consider the most enlightened views of religious liberty to have originated with the Congregationalists, I hope to be excused for entering into some detail upon it.

The right of man to think for himself on the subject of religion, to act according to his convictions, and to use every lawful means for promoting his sentiments among others, was neither understood nor enjoyed in any heathen country at the beginning of the gospel. Intercommunity of worship was the utmost extent of Pagan liberality; but this was a very different thing from religious liberty. Properly, it was permission to unite or agree, rather than liberty to differ. The foreigner was perhaps allowed to practise in private the rites of his own faith — but to publicly

¹ Grey's Examination, vol. iii. p. 358.

² Athen. Ox. vol. ii. 758.

³ Letter to a Friend, etc. pp. 15-18.

⁴ Decree of the Univ. of Ox. 1683.

⁵ Only two of the twenty-seven propositions of this celebrated Decree are extracted from Owen's writings. The rest are from those of Knox, Buchanan, Calderwood, Goodwin, Baxter, etc. Dr. Jane was the principal promoter of it; and when it was presented to Charles II, in the presence of the Duke of York and the chief persons of the Court by Dr. Robert Huntington (afterwards Bishop of Raphoe), it was very graciously received. — *Birch's Life of Tillotson*, p. 174, The cause of the injured, however, was in due time avenged in the same style. For on the twenty-third of March, 1710, the House of Lords ordered the Oxford Decree to be burnt by the hands of the hangman.

profess dissent from the established superstition, and to attempt to introduce a new faith, or the worship of “strange gods,” were universally held to be crimes justly punishable by the judges.

98

On this account, notwithstanding all the professed indifference of heathenism to religious worships and opinions, Christianity experienced the utmost rage and fury of intolerance. Its disciples refused to unite the service of Jesus with that of Mars or Jupiter. And turning from these dumb idols themselves, they also sought to turn others away from them. Hence, it was spoken of as “a new and mischievous superstition;” its followers were branded as Atheists in respect to the gods, and incited with hatred in respect to men. Their persevering adherence to the cause which they believed to be Divine, was considered merely a sullen obstinacy, deserving only the severest punishment. The simple declaration in the presence of a judge, “*Christiatus sum*”¹ was deemed quite sufficient to justify being sent immediately to the lions, or the block. But indeed, while civil liberty was so little understood as it was in the most celebrated states of the ancient world, it would have been strange if the rights of conscience had been respected.

Unhappily, when Christianity acquired the ascendancy, and became blended with secular power, its mistaken or pretended friends adopted and acted on the same pernicious principles, and directed their operation either against idolators, or against the heretical schismatics from their own belief. It is truly deplorable to think of the Christian blood that was shed by men calling themselves Christians. During the entire reign of Papal darkness and tyranny, intolerance was displayed in awful scenes of devastation and carnage; the blood of saints intoxicated the scarlet-coloured whore,² and cried for vengeance against her before the altar of God. The Reformation, which brought relief from many evils, did not altogether remove this.

99

None of the first Reformers seem to have understood the principles of religious liberty. They inconsistently advocated a right for themselves, the exercise of which they denied to others. All the Protestant governments held the lawfulness and necessity of punishing heretics and idolators; and among crimes against the State, they ranked dissent from the established faith. Henry VIII indiscriminately put to death Papists and Protestants who denied his supremacy. Edward VI, urged on by Cranmer, drenched his hands in innocent blood on account of religion. And Elizabeth in numerous instances followed the unhallowed example of her father. At Geneva, sedition and heresy were interchangeable terms; and those who did not submit to the discipline of the church were subjected to civil excision, and deprived of their rights as citizens.

The great body of British Puritans, after all they had suffered from it, were far from seeing the evil of persecution. Most of them appear to have believed in the lawfulness of supporting the true religion by coercive and restraining measures. The first correct views of religious liberty are to be ascribed to the Brownists. From them, and from the Baptist and Paedo-baptist Independents who sprung from them, came everything that appeared on this topic for many years. In the year 1614, one of those people, Leonard Busher, presented to king James and Parliament, “Religion’s Peace, or a Plea for Liberty of Conscience.” The leading object of this treatise is to show that the true way to make a nation happy is “to give liberty to all, to serve God as they are persuaded is most agreeable to his word — to speak, write, and print peaceably, and without molestation, in behalf of their several tenets and ways of worship.”

100

¹ “I am a Christian.”

² That is, the whore of Babylon – considered then to be the Romish Pope.

This valuable tract contains the most scriptural and enlightened views of religious liberty. It exposes in a series of seventeen arguments, the iniquity and impolicy of persecution; and in the most moving manner, it invokes the king and Parliament to grant the inestimable blessing of toleration. Robinson's "Justification of separation from the Church of England," published in 1639, contains the most accurate statements on the distinct provinces of civil and spiritual authority. The same remark is applicable to an anonymous pamphlet, by some Brownist in 1644, entitled "Queries of Highest Consideration," presented to the Dissenting Brethren, and the Westminster Assembly. Burton's "Vindication of the Churches commonly called Independent," also produced in 1644, shows that "the Magistrate must punish evil *actions*, but has no power over the *conscience* of anyone — to punish a man for that — so long as he makes no other breach of God's commandments, or the just laws of the land." ¹ In that same year, Roger Williams of New England, an Independent Baptist, published his "Bloody tenet of Persecution for the cause of Conscience;" in which he maintains that "persons may, with less sin, be forced to marry whom they cannot love, than to worship where they cannot believe." He broadly denies that "Christ had appointed the civil sword as a remedy against false teachers." This gentleman obtained the first charter for the State of New Providence, of which he was constituted Governor. And to his honour, it deserves to be recorded that he was the first *Governor* who ever pleaded that liberty of conscience was the birth-right of man. He granted it to those who differed from himself, when he had the power to withhold it.

101

It would be tiresome to mention all the pamphlets which appeared about this time from the same quarter. For I have not met with anything written by Episcopalians or Presbyterians down to this period, which contains reasonable sentiments on the subject. In the Westminster Assembly, it was debated at great length, and with great keenness. The Presbyterians and Independents ranked on opposite sides in the controversy, and fought, according to Baillie, "*Tanquam pro aris et focis*." ² Toleration was considered the grand and fundamental principle of Independents — the god of their idolatry; and it would have been happy for the world, if so bloodless a divinity had always been the object of worship. This was in the estimation of many at that time, the opprobrium of the Independents; it will now perhaps be granted as their distinguished honour, that in the midst of much opposition, they manfully advocated a most important, but little understood, and unjustly abused right. And when opportunity afforded, they "did to others, as they would have others do to them."

In 1647, Jeremy Taylor published his "Liberty of Prophesying; showing the unreasonableness of prescribing to other men's faith, and the iniquity of persecuting differing opinions." This is the first work produced by a churchman on this subject, which is deserving of any notice. It contains, on the whole, rational and scriptural views of the impropriety of exercising authority in religion. But there are some circumstances which detract greatly from its value. He argues chiefly from the difficulty of expounding the Scriptures so as to arrive at any certain conclusion on some subjects — from the incompetence of Popes, Councils, or the Church at large, to determine them — from the innocence of error in pious persons — and from the antiquity and plausibility of various sentiments or practices generally held to be erroneous.

102

It is more on such grounds as these that he rests his defence of toleration, than on the natural rights of men and the plain language of Scripture. In many parts of the book, it is difficult to determine whether Taylor is arguing from his own personal conviction, or merely as an advocate to serve his cause at the lime. Though a churchman, he was a dissenter when he wrote the *Liberty*

¹ p. 40.

² [As for hearth and home.](#)

of Prophesying — he was then pleading to Episcopacy for toleration. He must either have written what he did not himself fully believe, to serve a temporary purpose; or in a few years his opinions must have undergone a wonderful change. With the return of monarchy, Taylor emerged from obscurity, wrote no more on the *Liberty of Prophesying*, and was a member of the privy council of Charles II. From there proceeded all the persecuting edicts against the poor Non-conformists. *Liberty* deserves to be viewed, therefore, either as the special pleading of a party counsellor; or else as the production of Jeremy Taylor, imploring relief for himself — deprived of his benefice and the privileges of his profession. *Bishop* Taylor, later “enlightened” by his elevation to the Episcopate, and enjoying (with his party) security and abundance, became ashamed of it. In his own conduct, he published the most effectual confutation of his former opinions or sincere beliefs.

How different was the conduct of John Owen! We have already noted the state of his mind respecting liberty of conscience. He had pleaded for it to a certain extent before; others we have seen had published some of the same sentiments. But he has the honour of being the first man in England who advocated, *when his party was uppermost*, the rights of conscience, and who continued to the last to maintain and defend them.

103

In his treatise “Of Toleration,” annexed to his sermon, he examines the arguments against it, brought from Holy Writ and other considerations. At the end, he states his own defence of religious liberty. In the first part, he examines particularly the arguments alleged in the testimony of the Scotch General Assembly, and exposes their fallacy. He next considers most of the other arguments, which have been alleged in defence of persecution or coercion, and proceeds to note the duty of the Magistrate to the truth, and to persons professing it — to those who oppose and revile it — and to those who dissent from it. Without professing to be of the same mind with him in all the particulars of the last topic, we must admit that there is so much moderation in his views, and so many exceptions to guard against the abuse of them, that it appears as if he himself felt the difficulties which were involved in supposing that the civil Magistrate (who had the truth on his side) was bound to provide places of worship and means of support for those who were engaged in promoting it; and to discourage or remove external inducements to embrace false worship. He does not seem to have attended to the difference between what the Magistrate is bound to do *as a Christian* (if he is one), and what he is called to do *as the head of the civil community*. Notwithstanding his mistake here, he explicitly, and by a variety of arguments, maintains that the Magistrate has no right to meddle with the religion of any person whose conduct is not injurious to society nor destructive of its peace and order.

104

“Gospel constitutions in the case of heresy or error. do not seem to favour any course of violence under civil penalties. It is foretold that heresies must be, ^{2Pet 2.1} but this is to identify those who are approved, not destroy those who are not. By *destroying*, I mean with temporal punishment. For all the arguments produced for the punishment of heretics, excepting capital censures — and these being the tendency of all beginnings of this kind — I mention only the greatest, *including all other arbitrary penalties*, being but steps in walking toward the utmost censures. Admonitions and excommunications upon rejection of admonition, are the highest constitutions against such persons — waiting with all patience on those who oppose themselves, lest at any time God grants them repentance to acknowledge the truth. Imprisoning, banishing, slaying, is scarcely a patient waiting. God does not so wait on *unbelievers*. Perhaps those who call for the sword on earth are as unacquainted with their own spirits, as those who called for fire from heaven, Luke 11. And perhaps the parable of the tares gives us a positive rule as to this whole business. For the present, I will not fear to assert that the answers to it, borrowed by our divines from *Bellarmino*, will not endure the trial.” ¹

¹ p. 314. fol. works.

This passage alone is sufficient to show the extent and liberality of Owen's opinions; the circumstances in which they were published, and the perseverance with which they were held, are full evidences of the sincerity of their author. While noting his exertions in this noble cause, I cannot allow myself to pass over some other names which are entitled to a distinguished place in the list of enlightened defenders of religious liberty. The first is the celebrated, defamed, and unfortunate Sir Henry Vane.

105

With all his mysticism, he appears to have felt the power and imbibed the spirit of the gospel; and he possessed the most exalted views of civil and religious freedom. In his "Retired Man's Meditations," published in 1655, he accurately defines in a single sentence, the limits of human authority: "The province of the Magistrate is this world and man's body; not his conscience, nor the concerns of eternity."

Milton, who knew Vane well, expresses in one of his sonnets the high opinion which he entertained of his religion, and of his skillful discernment on the subject which we now treat:

To know both spiritual pow'r and civil, what each means.
What severs each, thou hast learn'd, which few have done:
The bounds of either sword to thee we owe:
Therefore on thy firm hand religion leans
In peace, and reckons thee her eldest son."

Milton himself must ever be reckoned one of the ablest advocates of this important doctrine. In his treatise on "Civil Power in Ecclesiastical causes," he maintains that, "it is not lawful for any power on earth to compel in matters of religion," and that "two things had ever been found working much mischief to the cause of God: force on the one side restraining, and hire on the other side corrupting its teachers." In his "Way to establish a free Commonwealth," Milton eloquently exclaims, "Who can be at rest, who can enjoy anything in this world with contentment, who does not have liberty to serve God and save his own soul according to the best light which God has planted in him to that purpose, by the reading of his Revealed Will and the guidance of his Holy Spirit." And in his "Speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing," he admirably exposes the absurdity and iniquity of the theological as well as political gags and licenses, and pours out a flow of the most beautiful and impassioned eloquence on this most interesting subject. ¹

106

Both Vane and Milton, let it be ever remembered, were Independents on the subject of Church Government. Locke, whose immortal treatise on toleration, in accuracy of statement and cogency of reasoning, placed all its predecessors far behind, has left almost nothing to be done by succeeding writers. Though Locke was a Churchman, the main argument of his treatise is the grand principle of Dissent. Many who extol the Philosopher, forget that he plowed with the heifer of an Independent. Locke was a student of Christ Church while Owen was Dean. It can scarcely be doubted that he was indebted to the head of the College for the germ of his future work.

The preceding statements will perhaps enable the reader to understand the truth of Hume's Observation:

"Of all Christian sects, this (the Independents) was the first which, during its prosperity as well as adversity, always adopted the principle of toleration. And it is remarkable that so reasonable a doctrine owed its origin not to reasoning, but to the height of extravagance and fanaticism." ²

¹ Milton's Prose Works.

² David Hume, *The History of England*, chap. 58, London, 1762.

It would, indeed, be very remarkable if it were true. But with Hume, extravagance and fanaticism are only terms of reproach for scriptural sentiments and religious zeal. If Hume were better acquainted with some of the Independents, he would have found them not so incapable of reasoning as he alleges; and he might have discovered that their tolerating principles were not the result of accident or caprice, but of the ideas which they entertained on other parts of Christianity.

107

I am aware that their sentiments on the subject of religious liberty, are attempted to be accounted for from the operation of accidental circumstances. It has been said,

“The Independents were originally few in number. And thus subjected to the contempt and severity of persecution, they expatiated on the importance and blessedness of religious freedom. Innumerable sects — many of them professing the wildest tenets, and actuated by the most gloomy and savage enthusiasm — arose in England during the struggles between the King and the Parliament. And these sects naturally supported the Independents. Thus the ardour for toleration, which had originally been excited in them (as it had been in other denominations) by an eagerness to escape from suffering, became the spirit of their system — from policy, and from an anxiety to check or subdue the Presbyterians. It continued to be so, *after* they had acquired power. This is because they were aware that the slightest departure from it would have separated from them the different sects, and thus restored preponderance to the enemies whom they had so much cause to dread.”¹

All this may seem very plausible to a person superficially acquainted with the period. But it is natural to ask why persecution did not drive others — the Presbyterians for instance — to advocate toleration? Why did political motives not induce them to make friends by the same means? Were the Independents the only politicians during that period of anarchy?

108

Would not others have been likely to see through the veil of hypocrisy now woven for the Independents by Dr. Cook, and not have left to him the honour of the discovery? It is evident that he has not attended to those parts of the system of Independency which necessarily, and independent of all external circumstances, produce the love and the defence of religious liberty.

Till the Professors of Christianity obtained possession of secular power, or became the object of its patronage, they never thought of compulsory measures for promoting the faith, or restraining the religion of others. The renunciation of all dependence on civil authority in matters of religion, and of all connexion with temporal governments, forms an essential part of consistent independency. The abandonment of everything like force for promoting or preserving the interests of the Gospel, follows as a matter of course. Another principle of Independency is the necessity of genuine conversion, to qualify and entitle men to enjoy the privileges of the kingdom of Christ. The absurdity as well as the unlawfulness of using any means but spiritual to produce this change, and to bring men into the church, must be very obvious. So fully were the sentiments of the Independents understood on this point during the period of which we are speaking, that Baillie represents them as their capital opinion, and the chief cause of their separation from others.² He declares that if they were acted on, forty for one would be excluded from the best reformed churches.³ In connexion with these leading principles of the system, may I just note a third which contributes to the same result: every member of an Independent Church is understood to take part in the discipline of that church.

109

¹ Cook's *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. iii. pp. 94, 95.

² Dissuasive, p. 155.

³ Letters from the Assembly, vol. ii. p. 85.

He is never required to act except according to his own convictions, and he can no longer be retained in it, than he is satisfied that its procedure is according to the word of God. If Independents judge it to be unlawful to compel one another to act contrary to their convictions, they must hold the unlawfulness of interfering by force to compel or restrain others.

These are the principles out of which the tolerating conduct of Independents arises. Its fundamental doctrines are favourable to all that is valuable in the civil and religious privileges of men. A persecuting Independent is a monster, because he is acting in opposition to the life and glory of his own system. Others may persecute consistent with their principles; but he can only do it in the face of his. To withdraw from national churches, protest against authoritative synods, and refuse subscription to human creeds — and yet to employ the arm of power to propagate their own sentiments, or to defend the use of it by others, would be an exhibition of the grossest folly, or the practice of the greatest knavery ever known in the world. To maintain the necessity of conversion in order to enjoy the kingdom of God, and to promote conversion at the point of the sword, would be the incongruities of madmen, and not the actions of rational beings.

As I have quoted the opinion of one northern philosopher on Independency, I will perhaps be excused for quoting another. Dr. Adam Smith, after noting what the effect would be of entirely withdrawing political influence and positive law from religion, and leaving the various sects to the natural progress of truth or error, observes this:

“This plan of ecclesiastical government, or more properly, of *no* ecclesiastical government, was what the sect called Independents — a sect no doubt of very wild enthusiasts — proposed to establish in England toward the end of the Civil War. If it had been established, though of a very unphilosophical origin, it would probably by this time have produced the most philosophical good temper and moderation with regard to every sort of religious principle.”¹

110

This passage reveals the same philosophical contempt for religious persons, and the same unphilosophical mode of accounting for facts and opinions which were beyond the sphere of his own understanding, which are marked in the language of his friend and countryman, Hume. It clearly shows, however, that Smith’s opinion of the tolerating principles of the Independents was the same as that of the historian of England. It reveals the strong conviction which the philosopher had of the salutary influence of these sentiments. If Hume and Smith had been capable of entering into the views we have just been stating, they would probably have given the Independents credit for knowing something of the philosophy of Christianity, and of man too — and might have been led to see that these principles are conducive not only to “philosophical good temper,” but to something of higher and more durable importance.

I can scarcely allow myself to apologise for this long apparent digression. The subject is one of so much importance, and the part which Owen took in discussing it, so naturally led me to consider it, that I felt it impossible to slightly pass it over. If Britain is in great measure indebted to the Puritans for her CIVIL LIBERTY, then it is proper to show that she has been indebted to the INDEPENDENTS for all that is rational and important in her views of RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

111

I know it may be said that, though the Independents possessed better theoretical sentiments on the subject of toleration than others, when they possessed power, they acted in the same manner as other parties have done. Even Neal exclaims, “How defective was their instrument of Government under Cromwell! How arbitrary the proceedings of their tryers! How narrow their list of fundamentals! And how severe their restraints of the press!”² The conduct of the New

¹ Wealth of Nations, vol. iii. p. 154. — 5th Ed, 1776.

² Preface to vol. iv. of History of the Puritans.

England Congregationalists toward Baptists and Quakers, has also been referred to as evidence of the persecuting disposition of Independents when they possess power. As all these subjects will come before us in subsequent parts of this work, I must waive any consideration of them now. I am far from thinking that every Independent fully understood and practised all his own principles. But the more the subject is investigated, the more I am satisfied that the statement of Hume will be found to be correct.

It does not appear that Owen's silence on the subject of the King's death lost him the favour of Parliament. For on the nineteenth of April following, we find him again preaching before it and the chief officers of the army, when he delivered his celebrated Sermon on the "Shaking and translation of the heavens and the earth;" for which, the next day, he received the thanks of the house, and an order to print it. In his dedication to the Commons, he apologises for his inability to do justice to the subject, from the little time he had to prepare it, and "the daily troubles, pressures, and temptations he had to encounter in the midst of a poor and numerous people." It is a long and important discourse, containing many free sentiments expressed with great vigour and plainness.

112

He exclaims, as if inspired by a spirit of prophecy, "The time shall come when the earth will disclose her slain, and not the simplest heretic will have his blood unrevenged; nor shall any atonement or expiation be allowed for this blood, while a toe of the image or a bone of the beast is left unbroken."¹ Nor does he leave us at any loss to ascertain who are the antichristian powers to which he refers. He asks,

"Is it not evident that the whole present constitution of the government of the nations is so cemented with antichristian mortar, from the very top to the bottom, that without a thorough shaking they cannot be cleansed? This plainly reveals that the work which the Lord is doing relates to the untwining of this close combination against himself and the kingdom of his dear Son; and he will not leave it till he has done it. To what degree this shaking shall proceed in the several nations, I have nothing in particular to determine, the Scripture not having expressed it. This alone is certain: it shall not stop nor receive its period, before the interest of Antichristianity is wholly separated from the power of these nations."²

It was this sermon, I apprehend, that introduced Owen to the acquaintance of Cromwell,³ who then heard him for the first time, and was much pleased with the discourse. Owen intended to return home within two days after preaching.

113

But calling before he left town, to pay his respects to General Fairfax, with whom he had become acquainted at the siege of Colchester, he accidentally met with Cromwell there. When Owen waited on his excellency, the servants told him, he was so much indisposed that several persons of quality had been refused admittance. However, he sent in his name, requesting it be mentioned to the General — that he only came to express his obligations for the many favours received from him. In the meantime, Cromwell came in with a number of the officers. Seeing Owen, he immediately walked up to him, and laying his hand on his shoulder in the familiar manner which he used with his friends, he said "Sir, you are the person I must be acquainted with." Owen

¹ Works, Pol. Ed. p. 329.

² Ibid. 335.

³ Mr. Asty's *Memoirs of Owen* connects his acquaintance with Cromwell with his Sermon from Rom 4.20. preached Feb. 28, 1649. But this must be a mistake arising from the confusion sometimes occasioned by the old and new mode of beginning the year. That Sermon was preached in 1656 according to our reckoning. On the same day 1649, he dates his address to the house prefixed to his discourse after the King's death, from Coggeshall. And the Sermon on Rom. 4 itself shows that he had been in Ireland; consequently, it must have been preached subsequent to his acquaintance with Cromwell.

modestly replied, "That will be much more to my advantage than yours." "We shall soon see that," said Cromwell. Taking him by the hand, he immediately led Owen into Fairfax's garden, where he told him of his intended expedition to Ireland, and requested that he would accompany him for the purpose of regulating the affairs of Trinity college. Owen objected, on account of his charge of the church at Coggeshall. But Cromwell would take no denial, and from entreaties he proceeded to commands. He told him his youngest brother was going as standard-bearer in the army, and he employed him to use his influence to induce compliance. He also wrote to the church at Coggeshall on the subject, which was exceedingly averse to part with its beloved pastor — till at length Cromwell told them he must, and should go. Owen, finding how things stood at last, consulted some of his brethren in the ministry, who advised him to comply. He finally began to make some preparation for the journey. ¹

114

Such was the commencement of Owen's intimacy and connexion with Oliver Cromwell. The friendship now begun, lasted the greater part of Cromwell's life, and produced very important consequences for Owen. It is evident from the attentions he paid Owen, and the honours which he conferred on him, that Cromwell had a high regard for him. That Owen had a reciprocal respect for Cromwell, is no less certain. It was a respect founded on what he believed respecting the private worth, the personal talents, and the public virtues of that extraordinary man. On few subjects is it so difficult to speak with candour and justice, as on the character of Cromwell. By his friends, or his enemies, he has been represented as a saint or a demon; adorned with every virtue, or degraded with every vice, of human nature. His character was certainly made up of inconsistencies; and his history is full of paradoxes. Whether good or evil most preponderated in his conduct will perhaps be estimated, as men are friends or enemies of his political measures. He is by no means entitled to unmingled praise; and unqualified censure is equally undeserved. He did much to promote the glory of his country. If not a religious man himself, he yet promoted religion in others, and was eminently the friend of religious liberty at home and abroad. If he did not always act as he should, it can scarcely be denied that few men who have grasped the rod of power, have used it with so much moderation, and so generally for the good of others, as Oliver Cromwell.

¹ Memoirs, pp, 9, 10.

CHAPTER V.

Owen preaches before Parliament — Joins the army — Character of the array — Arrives in Ireland—Labours in Dublin — First controversy with Baxter — Character of Baxter — Preaches before Parliament on his return from Ireland — Measures of the Commonwealth to promote religion in that country — Owen appointed to accompany Cromwell into Scotland—Preaches in Berwick and Edinburgh — State of religion in Scotland — Testimony of the English Ministers—Of Binning — Rutherford — Burnet — Neal—Kirkton — Owen's return to Coggeshall — Appointed to the Deanery of Christ Church — Account of this office — Remarks on his acceptance of it — Strictures of Wilton — Owen preaches before Parliament — Death of Ireton — Owen preaches his Funeral Sermon — Character of Ireton — Preaches again before Parliament.

SEVERAL months elapsed between Owen's first interview with Cromwell, and being under the necessity of accompanying him to Ireland. On the 7th of June, 1649, the city of London made a grand entertainment in Grocer's hall, for the general, the officers of state, and the House of Commons — to which they repaired in great pomp after hearing two sermons from Owen and Goodwin. On the following day, the house referred it to the Oxford committee to prefer the preachers to be heads of colleges in that university, and returned their thanks for the sermons. ¹ The discourse which Owen preached on this occasion is printed in the collection of his sermons and tracts, entitled "Human power defeated." At the foot of the first page, it is said to have been occasioned by the defeat of the Levellers at Burford on the preceding 18th of May. In the discourse, there are repeated allusions to the designs and ruin of that party. They were a body of fanatical desperados, who were enemies to civil magistracy, to the regular ministry of the gospel, and to all stated ordinances.

116

About four thousand of them assembled at Burford under the command of a person named Thomson — formerly condemned for sedition, but pardoned by the general. Colonel Reynolds, and afterwards Fairfax and Cromwell, fell upon them while they were unprepared for defence. They took four hundred of them prisoners, and subdued the rest. ²

On the 2d of July, Owen received his commission from Parliament to go to Ireland as chaplain to Lieutenant General Cromwell; £100 per annum was ordered to be paid to his wife and children in his absence. ³ This was no great reward for leaving his family and an affectionate congregation. About the middle of August, he sailed from Milford Haven with the army, which consisted of fourteen thousand men. Prior to its embarkation, a day of fasting and prayer was observed. After three ministers had prayed (of whom Owen was probably one), Cromwell himself, and Colonels Gough and Harrison. expounded some parts of Scripture very suitable to the occasion. The influence of these exercises, and such conduct on the part of its commanders, must have produced a very powerful effect on a body so constituted as the army of the Commonwealth. It was under a severe discipline — not an oath was to be heard throughout the whole camp. ⁴ The soldiers spent their leisure hours in reading their bibles, singing psalms, and in religious conferences. ⁵

117

Nor are we entirely dependent on the testimony of friends for this view of the Parliamentary troops. Chillingworth says,

"I observed a great deal of piety in the commanders and soldiers of the Parliament's army. I confess their discourse and behavior says they are Christians; but I can find little of God or godliness in our men. They will not seek God while they are in their bravery, nor trust Him when they are in distress. I have to make

¹ Whitelocke's Mem. p.-371.

² Hume vi. p. 125.

³ Whitelocke, p. 398.

⁴ [That is, no cursing.](#)

⁵ Neal, iv. p. 4.

a fuss to get them on their knees, to call upon God, or to resign themselves to Him when they go about any desperate service, or are thrown into any difficult situation.”¹

The testimony of Lord Clarendon, comparing the two armies, is much to the same purport. “The royal army,” he says, “was a dissolute, undisciplined, wicked, beaten army — whose horse their friends feared and their enemies laughed at — being terrible only in plunder, and resolute in running away.”² Elsewhere he describes the other forces as “an army to which victory is entailed, and which humanly speaking, could hardly fail of conquest wherever it should be led — an army whose sobriety and manners, whose courage and success, made it famous and terrible over the world — which lived like good husbandmen in the country, and good citizens in the city.”³

Such was the army commanded by Cromwell, which gained all his battles and to which, for a time, Owen was attached as one of the chaplains. It consisted of a body of warriors which fought with more than mortal courage, animated not merely by *amor patriae*,⁴ but by more powerful principles — what they considered the *amor Dei et gloriae aeternae*,⁵.

118

In the course of the same month in which it embarked, it arrived safely in Dublin, where Owen took up his lodgings in Trinity college. It is no part of my business to follow the progress of the army, or to describe its victories, Owen remained in Dublin during the greater part of the period he spent in Ireland. His health was somewhat affected, and “he was burdened with manifold employments, and with constant preaching to a numerous multitude of people, as thirsting after the gospel as ever he conversed with,”⁶ Nor were his labours without fruit. I have accidentally discovered two individuals, Dorothy Emett, and Major Manwaring, who ascribe their first convictions, to his preaching in Dublin. Many more, we may hope, will appear at another day.

“Mr. Owen,” says Dorothy Emett, “was the first man by whose means and ministry I became sensible of my condition. I was much cast down, and could have no rest within me; and thus I continued till his going away from us; and at his going he bid me to believe in Christ, and be fervent in prayer.”

She afterwards obtained comfort.

“I heard Mr. Owen in Dublin,” said Major Manwaring, “who did me much good, and made me see my misery in the want of Christ.”

I extract these testimonies from a curious and scarce book by John Rogers, “The tabernacle for the Sun,” in which the experience of a number of members of the Independent church in Dublin is recorded.⁷ I feel the more pleasure in quoting them, as they sufficiently confute an unfounded saying ascribed to Dr. Owen — that he never knew that he had been useful in converting one sinner. I am very sure that Owen had no reason for such a discouraging view of his labours. What he did in arranging the affairs of Trinity college cannot be ascertained, as the registers of the university prior to the Restoration no longer exist. Whatever he was entrusted with, we are sure he would endeavour to conscientiously discharge it; though it must have been extremely difficult to effect anything of great importance in the circumstances in which Ireland then was, and during a residence of only a few months.

119

¹ Maizeaux’ Life of Chillingworth, p. 331.

² Clarend. Rebel, iv. p. 729

³ Clarend. Lives of Lord Chancellors, ii. p. 126.

⁴ [Love of country.](#)

⁵ [The love of God, and eternal glory.](#)

⁶ Owen’s Death of Christ, fol. works, p. 47.

⁷ Book ii. chap. 6.

While in Dublin, however, amidst all his labours, he found time to prepare a reply to some remarks of Baxter's, on his work on Redemption. This he published in London, about May the next year. "Of the death of Christ, the price he paid, and the purchase he made — and the doctrine concerning these things, formerly delivered in a treatise against universal redemption, vindicated from the exceptions and objections of Mr. R. B." 4to. This was the commencement of a series of discussions and confrontations between Baxter and Owen, which continued on one subject or another till the death of both these eminent men. Justice obliges me to state that Baxter was invariably the aggressor, as Owen seems never to have meddled with him except in self-defence. Whatever his reasons were, Baxter seldom omitted an opportunity to put a blot on Owen's conduct or writings. And not content with wrangling during his life, he left a legacy of reproach on the memory of his brother, which would continue to operate long after his death. ¹

The work of Baxter, to which this is a reply, is his "Aphorisms of Justification," in an Appendix to which he made some criticisms on Owen's views of redemption. Baxter was a man of eminent piety and indefatigable zeal; who laboured hard to make that which was crooked straight, and to number that which was wanting — to reconcile conflicting opinions, and to harmonize contending spirits.

120

Pure in his intentions, but often injudicious in his measures, his labours frequently produced only disappointment and trouble. He was the most *metaphysical* man of his age, constantly employing himself in making distinctions where there was no difference, or in attempting to show that the most opposite sentiments allowed for the same explanation. A professed enemy to controversy, yet perpetually engaged in it, he multiplied disputes by endeavouring to destroy them. He was neither a Calvinist nor an Arminian; and yet at times he was claimed by both. He was neither a churchman nor a dissenter; but sometimes wrote against the one, and sometimes against the other — till all parties might quote him as an advocate, and meet him as an enemy. To no man, perhaps, were the words of the heathen satyrist ever more applicable: —

Tenet insanabile vulnus
Scribendi cacoëthes.²

Of this he seems to have been at times sensible, as he frankly acknowledges that he had written *multitudo librorum* [a multitude of books] which contained *multa vana et inutilia* [much that was empty and useless]. He was nearly of the same standing with Owen — he was inferior in learning, but Owen's equal in acuteness, in patience of research, and in the abundance of his labours. The differences between them on various subjects, lay more, perhaps, in *words* than in *things*. It must be regretted that a degree of sharpness marked the conduct of their discussions, which the importance of the points at issue, and the meekness of wisdom, will by no means justify.

121

A particular account of Owen's reply to Baxter would now be very uninteresting, as he admits himself that the contention lay more about "expressions than opinions." It is, in fact, a piece of dry scholastic discussion, partaking more of the character of theological logomachy,³ than almost any other performance of our author. He was doubtless led to this by the subtlety of his opponent, who employed all his acuteness to detect error in Owen's views of the death of Christ, and the particularity of its design. Owen, however, stoutly defends his original statements and successfully unravels the web in which his ingenious adversary endeavoured to entangle him. A simpler reference to the plain language of Scripture, and less attachment to merely human forms of

¹ Easter's own Life, passim.

² [An incurable itch for writing, possesses many — from the Satires of Juvenal, first century A.D.](#)

³ [Logomachy: an argument about words or the meaning of words.](#)

expression, would certainly have been advantageous to both. A prolix¹ contention as to whether the death of Christ was *solutioejusdem*, or only *tantundem* — that is, whether it was a payment of the very thing which by law *we* ought to have paid, or if it was a payment of something held by God to be an equivalent — does not promise much profit or gratification to the mind. A man's views of the atonement, as the sole ground of his acceptance, are not likely to be much affected whichever of the two sides he embraces. Yet this seems to be the turning point of the debate between Owen and Baxter.

However trifling the difference may appear, Baxter published an answer to Owen's *Vindication* in the "Confession of his Faith." 4to. 1655. The object of this, was to explain himself more fully on the subjects of repentance, justification, sincere obedience, etc. In the course of this volume, he introduces Owen, and tries to fasten on him the charge of Antinomianism. Owen replied to this at the end of his *Vindiciae Evangelicae*, vindicating his former sentiments, and complaining of injustice on the part of Baxter.

122

Determined to have the last word, even if only by way of assigning reasons for *not* writing, Baxter rejoined and recriminated in an Appendix to his "Five Disputations of Right to the Sacraments." 4to. 1656. So interminable at times are the debates of systematic theologians. Baxter, however, acknowledged afterwards that he had meddled too rashly with Owen, and that he was then too raw to be a writer.²

Immediately after his return from Ireland, he was called to preach before Parliament on a day of solemn humiliation throughout the kingdom — February 28th, 1650. This discourse, entitled, "The Stedfastness of Promises, and the Sinfulness of Staggering," reveals the deep interest he took in the welfare of Ireland. He says,

"I wish there were for the present, one gospel preacher for every walled town in the English possession in Ireland. The land mourns, and the people perish for lack of knowledge: many run to and fro, but it is upon other designs — knowledge is not increased. They are sensible of their wants, and cry out for supply. The tears and cries of the inhabitants of Dublin after the manifestation of Christ, are ever in my view. If they were in the dark, and loved to have it so, it might in some respects close the door on our innermost compassion. But they cry out of their darkness, and are ready to follow whoever has a candle. If their being without the gospel does not move our hearts, it is hoped that their importunate cries will disquiet our rest, and extort our help, as a beggar does alms."³

123

He calls upon Parliament not to consider the subjugation of Ireland the only object deserving of their attention; but to appoint a committee for the consideration of its religious state, and to take other steps for supplying the wants and redressing the grievances of that ill-fated country. In consequence of these representations, seconded by those of Cromwell, Parliament passed an ordinance on the 8th of March, for the encouragement of religion and learning in Ireland. By this act, certain lands were devoted to support Trinity college and the endowment of its professors; for erecting another college in Dublin and maintaining its teachers; and for the erection of a free school and the support of the master and scholars.⁴ The university of Dublin being thus revived and put on a new footing, the Parliament sent over six of their most acceptable preachers to give it reputation — appointing them two hundred pounds per annum paid out of the bishop's lands. Until that could be duly raised, it was to be paid out of the public revenue. By these methods,

¹ *Prolix*: overly wordy (unnecessarily so).

² Life, part i. p. 107.

³ Ser. and Tracts, p. 355.

⁴ Neal, iv. p. 76.

learning began to revive, and in a few years, religion appeared with a better face than it had ever done in that kingdom before. ¹ Nothing is more honourable to the Commonwealth government, than the attention it invariably paid to representations respecting the state of religion in all parts of the country, and the measures it employed to advance the interests of the gospel. It was, in fact, a college *de propaganda fide* ²as much as a civil institute. It provided for the spiritual as well as the temporal welfare of its subjects. It did this without making a particular religious profession the test of civil privileges; and it never forced the particular sentiments of the governors on the consciences of the governed.

124

Perhaps policy dictated some of its religious measures, but on the whole, religion was never so little abused by state enactments, or made so little subservient to worldly purposes. I can only account for this by admitting the decidedly Christian character of the body of men then in power. Persons of another description would either have pursued different measures, or have given more of a secular aspect and tendency to religious objects.

Cromwell returned to London the end of May, 1650, and left for Scotland the following month. An order, some time after, passed the House of Commons for Mr. Joseph Caryl and Mr. Owen to proceed to the army in Scotland per the desire of the general.³ According to the declaration of the Parliament, the invasion of Scotland was occasioned by the Scotch declaring themselves enemies to the Commonwealth government, and to all who adhered to it. This was by their folly in proclaiming *in Scotland*, that Charles Stuart was king of England and Ireland, and promising him assistance to invade England. Other things also led the Parliament to believe that the Scots would march into England at the first opportunity, to avenge the quarrel of the covenant, the death of the king, and the loss of their influence. This declaration was published by the Parliament. And another by Cromwell, in name of the army, was addressed in the style of the times, "To all that are saints and partakers of the faith of God's elect in Scotland." The latter contains reasons for putting the king to death and excluding his family from the throne; for erecting a commonwealth and rejecting Presbyterian church government; along with a refutation of the charges of heresy and blasphemy charged against the army.

125

Cromwell, however, did not spend time in paper manifestos. The progress of his arms gave an energy to his declarations — and the battle of Dunbar decided the fate of Scotland, and opened the gates of its metropolis. Owen joined him at Berwick, in obedience to the orders of Parliament. We have no reason to think that he was at all desirous of the kind of employment thus forced upon him. He was united to an affectionate church, fond of rural retirement, and the head of a growing family. The noise of a camp and the din of arms must have been revolting to his feelings, and destructive of his studious habits. In Ireland, he had remained as short a time as possible, and his residence in Scotland could not be more congenial to his wishes. The Scotch were generally opposed to the Parliamentary proceedings, and their ministers were among the most determined enemies of that form of church polity to which Owen was attached. In such circumstances, the preaching of an apostle would have been listened to with distrust and suspicion; and his conduct, however harmless, would scarcely pass without reprehension.

We have two Sermons preached by Owen during his journey to Scotland, and his residence in it. They are both from the same text, Isaiah 56.7. "For my house shall be called a house of prayer for all people." The first was preached at Berwick, on the advance of the army; and the other in

¹ Ibid.

² [For the propagation of the faith.](#)

³ Whitelocke, p. 456.

Edinburgh. In a dedication prefixed to them, addressed “to the Lord General Cromwell,” and dated Edinburgh, November 26th, 1650, he tells Cromwell that, “It was with thoughts of peace that he embraced his call to this place in time of war” — that his chief design in complying with it,

126

“was to pour out a savour of the gospel on the sons of peace in Scotland; that he hoped this had been manifested in the consciences of all with whom he had to deal in the work of the ministry; and that though some were so seasoned with the leaven of contention about carnal things, as to disrelish the weightier things of the gospel, yet the great Owner of the vineyard had not left him without a comfortable assurance that his labour in the Lord had not been in vain.”

The discourses are entitled, “The Branch of the Lord, the Beauty of Zion;” they contain scarcely an allusion to the peculiar circumstances of Scotland.

When the English army took possession of Edinburgh, the ministers of the city retired to the castle for protection. In consequence of this, a very curious correspondence took place between Cromwell and them. The General sent notice to the Governor of the castle, that the ministers might return to discharge their duties, that they would have full liberty to preach, and that none in the army would molest them. They replied that no security being offered for their persons, they resolved to reserve themselves for better times, and to wait upon Him who had hid his face for a while from the sons of Jacob. Cromwell replied to this in a letter to the Governor, which produced an answer from the ministers, and a rejoinder from the General. ¹ The correspondence affords a curious illustration of the sentiments of both parties. As it is printed not only in Thurloe’s State Papers, and Whitelocke’s Memorials, but also in Neal, it is unnecessary to insert it here. ²

127

As the Presbyterian ministers remained in the castle, the ministers of the army took possession of the pulpits, where the people heard them with suspicion and wonder. ³ How long Owen remained in Edinburgh is uncertain, he most probably accompanied the army to the west, and a curious discussion is said to have taken place in Glasgow between some of the Scotch ministers and him, in the presence of Cromwell. At this meeting, it is said that Mr. Hugh Binning so managed the dispute, that he nonplused Cromwell’s ministers. This led Oliver to ask, after the meeting was over, who that learned and bold young man was. On being told his name was *Binning*, he said, “He has *bound* well indeed;” but laying his hand on his sword, “this will loose all again.” ⁴ There is nothing improbable in the meeting; and Cromwell’s pun quite accords with other anecdotes of his conversation.

The state of religion in Scotland, during the ten years preceding the English invasion, and the rule of the commonwealth afterwards, has been much misunderstood. The zealous friends of Presbyterian discipline have represented the period from 1638 to 1649 as the golden age of religion in Scotland, and the following years as exhibiting a lamentable falling off. And indeed, if true religion consists in the regular meeting of church courts, and the overwhelming power of ecclesiastical rulers, the former period would be very distinguished. But if much of the *form* may exist without the *power* of religion, we will be cautious how we judge of the state of religion from the proceedings of Assemblies.

¹ Neal iv. pp. 24-26.

² “These letters,” Hume says, “are the best of Cromwell’s wretched compositions that remain, and maintain the chief points of the Independent theology.” From their phraseology, I strongly suspect they were the production of Owen’s pen.

³ Kirkton.

⁴ Biographia Scoticana, p. 167 — Binning was a man of piety, talents, and learning, as his posthumous works evince. His sermons, considering the time at which he lived, and that he died in his twenty-sixth year, do him very great honour.

It is beyond dispute that there were then many excellent men in the church; but it is equally unquestionable that not a few of the clergy were destitute of genuine piety, and a vast majority of the people were in no better state. The Assemblies were exceedingly zealous in putting down Episcopacy, in establishing uniformity, and in passing persecuting laws; ¹ but they had much less of the spirit of Christ than their office required. The English army and ministers had only a low opinion of the state of religion upon coming into Scotland. According to a testimony from the Army, quoted by Whitelocke, the Church of Scotland was “A Kirk whose religion is formality, and whose government is tyranny, a generation of very hypocrites and vipers.” ² Joseph Caryl, John Oxenbridge, and Cuthbert Sydenham — ministers who attended the army — assert that.

“The experience of the true and deserving shepherds here (the ministers of the church) who are *as dear to their other brethren as sheep to the wolves*, tells them that almost nine out of ten in their flock are not sheep — not fit, *they say*, for civil much less, *we say*, for spiritual privileges.” ³

This language shows the state of parties in the church then; the resolutionists and the remonstrants being something like the moderate and the orthodox among the clergy now. If it is thought that these are the prejudiced statements of enemies and strangers, then an extract or two from the warmest and most upright friends of the church will show that they are far from being too strong.

“The scantiness of gracious men,” says Hugh Binning, in a discourse preached in 1650, “is the spot of judicatories — that there are many children of the world, *but few children of light in them*. This is the spot of Assemblies, Synods, and Presbyteries — that there are *few godly ministers*. Alas that this complaint should be — even among those whose office it is to beget many children to God — how few of them are begotten, or have the image of their Father.” ⁴

The testimony of Mr. Samuel Rutherford, whose piety and attachment to the church will not be questioned, is equally strong, respecting the secular character and measures of the Assemblies.

“Afterward,” referring as I understand him to this period, “our work in public was too much more in sequestration of estates, fining and imprisoning, than in a compassionate mournfulness of spirit toward those whom we saw to oppose the work. In our Assemblies, we were more to set up a state *opposite* to a state — more upon forms, citations, leading of witnesses, suspensions from benefices — than to spiritually persuade and work upon the conscience with the meekness and gentleness of Christ. The glory and royalty of our princely Redeemer and King was trampled on, as any might have seen in our Assemblies. The way that the army, the sword, and the countenance of nobles and officers seemed to sway, was the way that the censures carried. It would have been better had there been more days of humiliation and fasting, and far less of adjourning commissions, new peremptory summonses, and newly drawn up processes.” ⁵

If we pass from the clergy and church courts, to the people, the view given of them by the friends of the church, will not appear more favourable. “What now,” asks Mr. Binning, “is the great blot of our visible church? Here it is: most are not God’s children but are called so; and it is the greater blot that they are *called so*, and are *not*.” ⁶

¹ Acts of Assembly from 1638 to 1649, printed Edin. 1652, pp. 192, 355, et passim.

² Mem. p. 456.

³ Preface to “A Little Stone out of the Mountain,” by Lockyer, 1652.

⁴ Binning’s works, Edin, 1735, p. 518.

⁵ Rutherford’s Testimony, Edin. Printed 1713.

⁶ Binning’s works, p. 518.

Addressing them again, he says,

“Set aside your public service and professions, and is there anything behind your conversation, but drunkenness, lying, swearing, contention, envy, deceit, wrath, covetousness, and the like? Has the multitude not been as civil, and carried themselves as blamelessly, as the throng of our visible church? What do you have more than they? What then are most of you? You bow a knee to God neither in secret nor in your families.”¹

If Principal Baillie’s words already quoted have any meaning, not more than one in “forty of the members of his church gave good evidence of grace and regeneration.”² These testimonies show that there may be much professed zeal for the Lord of Hosts — much clamorous contention about Confessions of Faith, Forms of Church Government, and extirpation of heretics, and yet a deplorable degree of ignorance, depravity, and irreligion.

It does not appear that the influence of the English army, and of Cromwell’s government, was unfavourable to the state of religion in Scotland. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that true religion during this period, was in rather a prosperous state. It is true, Cromwell put down the Assemblies, and curbed the spirit of interference with politics which then so much prevailed among the ministers. But he interfered with none of the other rights of the church; and he encouraged the profession of the gospel in all ranks.

131

I “remember well,” says Bishop Burnet, “of three regiments coming to Aberdeen. There was an order and discipline, and a face of gravity and piety among them, that amazed all people. Most of them were Independents and Anabaptists: they were all gifted men, and preached as they were moved. But they never disturbed the public assemblies in the churches but once. They came and reproached the preachers for laying things to their charge that were false. I was then present. The debate grew very fierce. At last they drew their swords; but there was no hurt done. Yet Cromwell displaced the governor for not punishing this.”³

The power of the church was reduced within a narrower compass. For though it had liberty to excommunicate offenders, or debar them the communion, it might not seize their estates, or deprive them of their civil rights and privileges. No oaths or covenants were to be imposed, except by direction from Westminster. And as all fitting encouragement was to be given to ministers of the Established Church, so others who were not satisfied with their form of Church Government, had liberty to serve God in their own manner. This occasioned a great commotion among the clergy, who complained of the loss of their covenant and church discipline. They exclaimed against toleration as opening a door to all kinds of error and heresy. But the English supported their friends against all opposition.⁴

The strongest testimony as to the prosperous condition of religion in Scotland, is from the pen of Mr. James Kirkton, afterwards one of the ministers of Edinburgh. From his opportunities, he was well able to judge, and from his sentiments as a Presbyterian, he was unlikely to overrate, the salutary influence of the measures of the commonwealth.

132

“They did indeed,” he says, “proclaim a sort of toleration toward Dissenters among Protestants, but permitted the gospel to have its course, and Presbyteries and Synods to continue in the exercise of their powers; and all the time of their government, the gospel prospered not a little, but *mightily*. It is also true, that because the Scotch ministers were generally for the king on any terms, they did not therefore permit

¹ Ibid, p. 516.

² Baillie’s Letters, vol ii. p. 85.

³ History of his own times, vol. i. p. 80.

⁴ Neal, vol. iv. p, 54.

the General Assembly to sit (and in this I believe they did no bad office). For both the authority of that meeting was denied by the Protesters, and the Assembly seemed to be more set upon establishing themselves than promoting religion. — Errors in some places infected some few; yet all these losses were inconsiderable in regard to the great success the word preached had in sanctifying the people of the nation. *And I verily believe there were more souls converted to Christ in that short period of time, than in any season since the Reformation, though of triple its duration.* Nor was there ever greater purity and plenty of the means of grace than in their time. Ministers took pains; people were diligent. And if a man had seen one of their solemn communions where many congregations met in great multitudes — some dozen ministers used to preach; and the people continued for three days at least, in a kind of trance as it were (so serious were they in spiritual exercises) — he would have thought it a solemnity unknown to the rest of the world. — At the king's return, every parish had a minister, every village had a school, *almost every family had a Bible*; indeed, in most of the country *all the children could read the Scriptures, and were provided with Bibles*, either by their parents or their ministers.”¹

133

Nothing needs to be added to these testimonies. When the state of things thus described, is contrasted with the condition of Scotland during the whole government of the four last Stuarts, it will not be difficult for anyone to determine whether the reign of legitimate and covenanted royalty to which the people were so devoted, or the government of a despised and constantly opposed usurpation, deserved the most respect. It will also appear that the meetings and enactments of political, intriguing General Assemblies were by no means so necessary to the advancement of true religion as many have supposed. Also, doing justice to the party with which Owen was most closely connected, requires that I show that its measures and influence were generally favourable to the interests of Christianity.

Owen continued with the army in Scotland till early in 1651 when he returned to his family and flock at Coggeshall. There, however, he was not allowed to rest long. According to the order which passed the House of Commons more than a year before, Owen and Goodwin were preferred to be heads of Colleges in Oxford. Goodwin was now revised to the Presidency of Magdalen College, and Owen was made Dean of Christ Church. The first notice he received of this was the appearance of the following order in the newspapers of the day: “On the 18th March, 1651, the House taking into consideration the worth and usefulness of Mr. John Owen, M. A. of Queen's College, ordered that he be settled in the Deanery of Christ's Church, in place of Dr. Reynolds.” Reynolds had been put into the Deanery of Christ Church and the Vice-Chancellorship of the University by the Presbyterian party. But refusing to take the engagement as true to the government established without King or House of Lords, he was deprived of it.

134

And though, to save the Deanery, he sometime after offered to take the engagement, the Parliament, which was offended at his conduct, took advantage of the forfeiture, and conferred it on Owen.² Baxter says it had previously been offered to Caryl, who refused it;³ but no evidence of this appears. Soon after Owen's appointment was made public, he received a letter from the principal students at Christ Church, expressing their great satisfaction at the appointment, and their desire that he would come among them. Accordingly, with the consent of the Church, he resigned his pastoral office, and took up his residence in Oxford in the course of the same year.⁴

Christ Church College is one of the best foundations in Oxford. It was erected by Cardinal Wolsey. And though it has since undergone many changes, it still remains a monument of the greatness of

¹ Kirkton's History of the Church of Scotland, pp. 54, 55-64.

² Neal, vol. iv. p. 27.

³ Sylvester, part i. p. 64.

⁴ Mem. x.

that ambitious Churchman. The establishment consists of a Dean, eight Canons, eight Chaplains, and one hundred students, with inferior officers. The office of the Dean is to preside at all meetings of the College, and to deliver Divinity Lectures. In the hierarchy, he is next in dignity to the Bishop of Oxford; but the appointment is in the Crown. During the commonwealth, the ecclesiastical functions of the office and the connexion with the church, must have been suspended; but the temporalities ¹ of the Deanery were not sequestrated along with the other Dean and Chapter lands.² This was probably on account of its relation to the University. The emoluments of the office are now very considerable, and must have been so even in the time of the commonwealth.

135

Owen's account of this appointment and of himself are characterised by his natural modesty, and Christian humility.

“I now clearly found that I who dreaded almost every academic employment, as being unequal to the task, and at a time too when I had entertained hope that through the goodness of God in giving me leisure and retirement, and strength for study, that the deficiency of genius and penetration, might be made up by industry and diligence, was now so circumstanced that the career of my studies must be interrupted by more and greater impediments than ever. For what could be expected from a man not far advanced in years, and who had for some time been very full of employment? I was accustomed only to the popular mode of speaking. And being entirely devoted to the investigation of the grace of God through Jesus Christ, I had taken leave of all scholastic studies. My genius is by no means quick; and I even forgot, in some measure, the portion of polite learning that I might have formerly acquired. The most weighty and important task of lecturing in public, was put upon me. This would strictly and properly require the whole time and attention of the most grave and experienced divine. And in discharging it, if I had not been greatly assisted and encouraged by the candour, piety, submission, and self-denial of the auditors, and by their respect for the Divine institution, and their love of the truth with every kind of indulgence to the earthen vessel — I would have long lost all hope of discharging that province, either to the public advantage or my own satisfaction and comfort.” ³

136

It appears, at first, rather surprising that an Independent would have accepted an office that has always been reckoned part of the ecclesiastical establishment, but both Baptists and Independents were then in the practice of accepting the livings — that is, the temporalities of the Church. They did not, however, view themselves as parish ministers, who were bound to administer all the ordinances of religion to the parish population. They occupied the parochial edifices, and received a portion of the tithes for their maintenance; but in all other respects, they acted according to their own principles. The times were unsettled; the Episcopal clergy were thrown out by the state, either on account of their principles or their conduct; the funds of the church were not otherwise disposed of. And because the Dissenters were discharging the duties of public teachers, many of them (among whom was Owen) considered it lawful to receive a portion of those provisions to which no other class of men had then a better claim. It cannot be doubted that this state of things would soon have introduced very serious evils among them; but these were prevented by another revolution which restored Episcopacy, and graciously threw the Dissenters on their own resources. The Dean of Christ Church, however, was no further connected with the Establishment than, as President of his College, he held a situation of important influence, and was legally entitled to the support attached to his office. He himself solemnly assures us that he never sought the office, and was actually averse to it.

¹ [The worldly possessions and paid offices of a church \(its property and livings or benefices\).](#)

² Neal, vol. iv. 14.

³ Pref. Ad. Div. Jus.

“While I was diligently employed in preaching the gospel, the Parliament of England promoted me to a Chair in the celebrated University of Oxford, by their authority and influence — though with reluctance on my part.”¹

137

From such declarations, and the former disinterestedness of his conduct, we are bound to believe that a sense of duty alone induced him to accept the Academic Chair. But I freely acknowledge that he and his brethren who accepted of the livings of the Church, exposed themselves (not unfairly) to the charge of inconsistency preferred against them by Milton. That spirited writer, with his usual energy, declared that he,

“hated that Independents should take that name, as they may justly take it from their freedom of Christian doctrine, and church discipline that is subject to no superior judge but God alone — and yet seek to be *Dependents* on the magistrates for their maintenance. These two things, *Independence and State hire* in religion, can never consist long or certainly together. For magistrates at one time or other will pay none but those whom, by their committees of examination, they find conformable to their interests and opinions. And hirelings will soon frame themselves to that interest and those opinions which they see best pleasing to their paymasters. And to seem right themselves, they will force others as to the truth.”²

The Dean of Christ Church was called to preach before Parliament on the 24th of October 1651. It was the thanksgiving day appointed for the destruction of the Scotch army at Worcester, “with sundry other mercies.” This celebrated victory, “the crowning mercy” of Cromwell, completed the ruin of Charles II and the subjugation of Scotland; and it established the authority of the commonwealth in the three kingdoms. In the dedication of this sermon to Parliament, the Dean expresses himself very strongly concerning the principles and conduct of the people of Scotland in the war, which the battle of Worcester terminated.

138

“With what deceivableness of unrighteousness, and lies in hypocrisy, the late grand attempt in Scotland was carried on, is in some measure now made naked to the loathing of its abominations. In digging deep to lay a foundation for blood and revenge; in covering private and sordid ends with a pretence of glorious things; in outlining a face of religion upon a worldly stock; in concealing distant aims and bloody animosities to compass one common end (that a theatre might be provided to act several parts upon); in pleading necessity from an oath of God to most desperate undertakings *against* God, it does not give place to any which former ages have been acquainted with.”

The views of Owen on this subject were no doubt influenced by the persons with whom he generally acted. But there were certainly great inconsistencies in the proceedings of the Scotch leaders; and many things were very provoking in their conduct to England. Correct religious sentiments and sound policy would have dictated different measures both toward Charles, and the people of England from those which they had pursued. The sermon preached on this occasion is entitled, “The Advantage of the Kingdom of Christ in the Shaking of the Kingdoms of the world, or Providential Alterations in their subservience to Christ’s Exaltation.” It contains many free and eloquent passages, especially on the danger of human governments interfering with the principles and rights of the kingdom of Christ; and on the abomination and extent of the Antichristian apostasy.

“He that thinks Babylon,” says the preacher, “is confined to Rome and its open idolatry, knows nothing of Babylon, nor of the New Jerusalem. The depth of a subtle mystery does not lie in gross visible folly. It has been insinuating itself into all the nations for sixteen hundred years; and to most of them it has now become as the marrow in their bones.

¹ Ad. Div. Jus. Pref.

² Prose Works, p. 282. — Symmon’s Ed. vol. iii. p. 389.

Before it is wholly shaken out, these heavens (ecclesiastical powers) must be dissolved, and this earth (civil governments) must be shaken — their tall trees hewed down and set a howling, and their residue transplanted from one end of the earth to another.”¹

Henry Ireton, son-in-law to Cromwell (by Bridget, his eldest daughter), died while Lord Deputy of Ireland, on the 26th of November, 1651. His body was brought over to England, and buried in Westminster Abbey on the 6th of February, 1652, with great funeral solemnity.

“If he could have foreseen what was done,” says Ludlow, “he would certainly have made it his desire that his body might have found a grave where his soul left it, so much did he despise those pompous and expensive vanities; having erected for himself a more glorious monument in the hearts of good men, by his affection to his country, his abilities of mind, his impartial justice, his diligence in the public service, and his other virtues, which were a far greater honour to his memory than a dormitory among the ashes of kings.”²

Owen preached the funeral sermon on this occasion in the Abbey Church of Westminster. It was published with the title, “The labouring Saint’s dismissal to his rest,” and dedicated to Col. Henry Cromwell, the youngest son of the Protector. It is difficult to ascertain the true character of Ireton. According to Burnet, “he had the principles and temper of a Cassius.” Noble represents him as the most artful, dark, deliberate man of all the republicans, by whom he was in the highest degree beloved.³

And Hume acknowledges that he was a memorable personage, much celebrated for his vigilance, industry, and capacity. That he was a man of talents and disinterestedness, is admitted by all parties; that he was a republican need not be denied; that he was a man of piety, there is strong reason to believe. The testimony of Ludlow, who must have known him well, is highly honourable; that of Heath, though intended as a reproach, is scarcely less to his credit: “He was absolutely the best prayer maker and preacher in the army, for which he may thank his education at Oxford.”⁴ To deserve this character in an army of praying and preaching men, argued for no ordinary attainments of a religious nature. Owen, who must have known him intimately, expresses in a single sentence (a very long one I admit), his opinion of this republican hero.

“My business is not to make a funeral oration; only I suppose that without offence I may desire that in courage and permanency of business, in ability and wisdom for counsel, in faithfulness to his trust and in his trust, in indefatigable industry in the pursuit of the work committed to him, in faith on the promises of God and acquaintance with his mind in his mighty works of providence, in love to the Lord Jesus and all his saints, in tender regard to their interest, delight in their society, contempt of himself and all his for the gospel’s sake, with eminent self-denial in all his concernments, in impartiality and sincerity in the execution of justice — that in these and like things, we may have many raised up in the power and spirit in which he walked before the Lord and the inhabitants of this nation.”⁵

On the thirteenth of October following, Owen was again called to preach before the House on a day of solemn humiliation. In one passage of this sermon, we have a striking picture of the unsettled, chaotic state of religion during this period of confusion.

¹ Sermons and Tracts, p. 403.

² Ludlow’s Mem. vol I, p. 331. Ed. 1761.

³ Mem. of the Protect. House of Cromwell, vol. ii. p. 298.

⁴ Flagellum p. 121.

⁵ Sermons and Tracts, p. 428.

“What now is the state of things by the lust of men? Some say, there is no gospel at all. Others say, if there is, you have nothing to do with it. Some say look, *here* is Christ; others say, look *there*. Some make religion a colour ¹ for one thing, others for another. Some say the magistrate must not support the gospel; others say the gospel must subvert the magistrate. Some say, your rule is only for men as men, you have nothing to do with the interest of Christ and his Church; others say, you have nothing to do to rule men, except on account of their being saints. If you would have the gospel, say some, then down with its ministers; and if you would have light, take care that you have ignorance and darkness. Things are being carried on as if it were the care of men that there might be no trouble in the world, but that the name of religion might lie at the bottom of it.” ²

It is surely gross injustice to charge the man who thus strongly regrets and deprecates the religious confusion of the times, as one of the leading instruments of producing that confusion. Owen always had correct views of the importance and necessity of order; and neither his sentiments nor his conduct necessarily produced disorder in either church or state. But it is no strange thing for the greatest benefactors of their country to be rewarded with reproach and misrepresentation.

¹ To create an appearance or justification for something, so as to hide its true character.

² Sermons, p. 137.

CHAPTER VI.

Division of the Memoirs at this period — Owen made Vice-Chancellor — Attends a Meeting in London, called by Cromwell to promote union — Created D.D. — Elected M.P. for the University — Cromwell's Instrument of Government — Debate about the Construction of the Article respecting Religious Liberty — Remarks on Neal's account of it, and the Meeting of Ministers respecting it — Owen appointed an Ejecting Commissioner and Tryer — Conduct of the Tryers — Owen delivers Poocke — Baxter's account of the Tryers — Owen's measures for securing Oxford — Correspondence with Thurloe — Attends a Meeting at Whitehall about the Jews — Preaches at the Opening of a New Parliament — Again on a Fast day — Assists in defeating Cromwell's attempt to make himself King — Deprived of the Vice-Chancellorship.

The period during which Owen was Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, was by far the busiest and most important of his life. It is thus proper to arrange our memoirs of its transactions, in such a manner as to exhibit a correct view of his general conduct, his connexions with the University, and his several publications. Each of these topics, therefore, will form the subject of a distinct chapter.

Oliver Cromwell was chosen Chancellor of Oxford in the month of January, 1651. But being mostly in Scotland with the army, and finding it inconvenient to attend to the affairs of the University, he delegated in the following year, the Dean of Christ Church and some other heads of Houses, to manage everything which required his consent as Chancellor of the University. By letters dated September 9th, 1652, he nominated Owen to be Vice-Chancellor in place of Dr. Dan. Greenwood; and on September 26th, he was accordingly chosen by the unanimous suffrage of the Senate,¹ "notwithstanding his urgent request to the contrary."

143

He does not speak of himself as having undertaken this difficult office in deference to the opinions, solicitations, and commands of the leading men of the University and in the State, by whom it had been in a great measure forced upon him. "By accepting it," he declares, "he had knowingly sacrificed his peace, and all his studious pursuits."² Full credit will be allowed him for sincerity in these declarations when the circumstances of the University (which will be noted afterwards) are brought forward.

In October 1653, the Vice-Chancellor was called to London by Cromwell to attend a meeting of ministers of various denominations for the purpose of considering their differences of sentiment, and of devising, if possible, some plan of union. The following curious account is given of this meeting in the newspapers of the day.

"Several ministers were addressed by his Excellency, the Lord Gen. Cromwell, to persuade those who hold Christ the Head, and so hold the same in fundamentals, to agree in love that there be no such divisions among people professing godliness, as there has been, nor railing or reviling each other for differences only in form. There were Mr. Owen, Mr. Marshall (Presbyterian), Mr. Nye (Independent), Mr. Jessey (Baptist), Mr. Harrison, and others, to whom the advice and counsel of his Excellency was so sweet, so precious, and managed with such judgment and graciousness, that it is hoped it will much tend to persuade those who fear the Lord in spirit and truth, to labour for the union of all God's people."³

144

Whether this was a serious proposal of Cromwell's; or a political attempt to discover through the medium of their leaders, the sentiments of the various sects; or a mere hypocritical farce raised for the sake of producing a particular effect, I do not pretend to determine. It does not appear that the persons who were themselves consulted, suspected any evil, and perhaps none was intended. Nothing of importance, however, resulted from the meeting. It is much easier to propose plans of union, than to carry them into effect. Religious differences will never be healed by state

¹ Wood's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 777

² Pref. Ad. Jus. Div.

³ Papers collected in the Cromwelliana.

interference or political management. The most likely way to effect it is by teaching men to respect the supreme and exclusive authority of the word of God, and by leaving every individual to follow the dictates of his conscience respecting it. Peace and union are desirable; but not at the expense of truth and principle.

While in London about this business, the University conferred on Owen the degree of Doctor in Divinity. The diploma is dated the 22d December, 1653, and describes him as “*In Palaestra Theologica exercitissimus, in concionando assiduus et potens, in disputando strenuus et acutus,*” etc. His friend, Thomas Goodwin, President of Magdalen College, was diplomated at the same time, and described as “*In scriptis in re Theologica quam plurimis orbi notus.*”¹ Many of the early reformers were decidedly opposed to Theological degrees. Carlostadt refused to submit to the title of Doctor, and chose rather the designation of Brother Andrew.

145

Zuinglius could not hear the title without horror. Grynaeus, Sebastian Munster, and Myconius never assumed it: the last, indeed, when urged to accept the degree, as required by a law of the University, offered to resign his professorship rather than submit to it. Melanchthon and Oporinus both refused to accept of it. All these learned men seem to have thought such distinctions are inconsistent with obedience to our Lord’s injunction in Mat. 23.8-10.² Erasmus said, with his usual jocularly, “The title of Doctor makes a man neither wiser nor better.” It is gratifying to be able to give the sentiments of Owen on this subject. At the time in which he flourished, such degrees were not so common as they have since become. And most of those who received them, probably deserved to enjoy them, as far as learning and theological attainments go. But Owen submitted to the honour with great reluctance. Cawdry, in one of his attacks on Owen, insinuates that he had been offended by Cawdry not constantly calling him “reverend Author” and “reverend Doctor.” Owen replies to this insinuation with great spirit.

“Let this reverend author make what use of it he pleases, I can only tell him again, that these insinuations become neither him nor any man professing the religion of Jesus Christ, or that has any respect for truth or sobriety. Can any man think that in his conscience he gives any credit to the insinuation which he makes here, that I should thank him for calling me *reverend Author* or *reverend Doctor*? As for the title of *reverend*, I give him notice that I have very little valued it ever since I considered Luther’s saying: ‘*Nunquam periclitatur religio nisi inter Reverendissimos.*’ So that, as to me, he may forbear it for the future, and call me as the Quakers do, and it will suffice.

146

As for that title of *Doctor*, it was conferred on me by the University in my absence, and against my consent, as they expressed it under their public seal. Nor does anything but gratitude and respect toward them make me once own it. Freed from that obligation, I would never use it again. Nor did I use it until some were offended by me, and blamed me for my neglect of [these titles].”³

Cromwell having dissolved the Long Parliament, found it necessary to call another in the year 1654. A writ was issued to the University of Oxford to choose but one burgess to represent it; on the 27th of June, Dr. Owen was chosen the representative. The Parliament met on September 3rd, but he sat only for a short time,⁴ his election being questioned by the Committee of privileges — on account of his being in the ministry. This part of Owen’s conduct occasioned some infamous misrepresentations. Cawdry asserted, that “when he was chosen a Parliament-man, he refused to

¹ Wood’s Fasti, vol. ii. pp. 782, 783.

² Werenfelsli opuscula, pp. 304, 305. — Hornbeek, Sum. Cont. pp. 754, 756. **Mat 23:8** "But do not be called ‘Rabbi’; for One is your Teacher, the Christ, and you are all brethren.”

³ Preface to Cotton’s Defence, pp. 96-98.

⁴ Wood’s Fasti, edited by Gutch, p. 192.

answer whether he was a minister or not;”¹ and the truth of this he rested on the *vox populi* [the voice of the people] — public rumour of Oxford. Wood improves the story, and declares that “rather than be put aside because he was a theologian, he renounced his orders, and pleaded that he was a mere layman, notwithstanding he had actually been created D.D. the year before.”² This is carrying the matter to the climax of absurdity and villainy. To what purpose did they ask the Vice-chancellor of Oxford and Dean of Christ Church, whether he was a minister? Did not all the world know it?

147

Was it practicable for the Doctor to renounce his profession though he had been disposed? Need we then wonder at his indignant reply to Cawdry? “My refusal to answer whether I was a minister or not, on any occasion in the world, is *purum putum mendacium* — a scandalous, malignant falsehood. So it is no truer that it was *vox populi* at Oxford, as pretended.”³ And having occasion to refer to it again, he says, “It is notoriously untrue, and so remote from anything that would give a pretence or colour to it, that I question whether Satan has impudence enough to own himself as its author.”⁴ The anonymous writer of the life of South, published in 1721, repeats the story of Owen’s renunciation. He ascribes to Dr. South the merit of “so managing matters with the doctors, bachelors of divinity, and masters of arts, and the electors, that he was returned with great difficulty. And after sitting a few days, he had his election declared null and void because his renunciation was not reputed to be valid.”⁵

What the Doctor’s reasons were for wishing to become a member of Parliament cannot now be ascertained. He probably considered himself as holding no clerical office during his Vice-chancellorship. He might think it was as lawful for him to be a member of Parliament, as to hold a civil office in Oxford; and that in this situation he might be able to render important service to the university, which then stood in need of all the friends it could muster. As only one member was to be chosen, he was perhaps the fittest person at the time to represent that learned body; and in all probability he was urged to accept the situation, both by Cromwell and the electors, till he could not refuse.

148

Those who reproached him for it ought to have shown that there was something unlawful in it, or that he acted from improper motives. Those who claim a bishop’s seat in the house of lords, can have no religious scruples at a minister going into Parliament. And I need not hesitate to assert that comparatively few of the ecclesiastical legislators of Great Britain have been fitter for the office than Dr. John Owen.

Oliver presented his Instrument of Government to this assembly — “A creature of Cromwell’s, and his council of officers,” says Neal, “and not drawn up by a proper representative of the people.”⁶ This is not very consistent with that historian’s exclamation *against* the defectiveness of the “Independents’ instrument of government under Cromwell.” It could not be the work of the Independents unless they are to be made accountable for everything done by Cromwell and his officers, which would be manifestly unjust. This Instrument provided that,

¹ Independency further proved to be a schism, p. 33.

² Athen. Ox. ii. p. 557.

³ Pref. to Cotton’s Def. p.24.

⁴ Ibid. p. 37.

⁵ p. 8.

⁶ Vol. iv. p. 76.

“Those who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ, though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship, or discipline publicly proposed, shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in the profession of their faith, and the exercise of their religion, so as they do not abuse this liberty to the civil injury of others, and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts — provided this liberty is not extended to popery or prelacy, or to those who, under a profession of Christ, propose and practice licentiousness.”¹

149

This act of toleration, though by no means perfect, reveals considerable enlargement of mind. It would have done well for the country, if the proceedings of its Parliaments had always been as liberal. Popery and prelacy were excluded, not as *religious* so much as *political* systems. And because their adherents were constantly plotting against the Protector’s government, and even in regard to them, the laws were more *in terrorem*,² than intended for execution.

In the debate which arose in Parliament on the article of this Instrument just quoted, it was contended that the clause, “those who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ,” was designed to limit the toleration to those who were agreed on the fundamentals of Christianity. This, I apprehend, Oliver had not contemplated, because a difference in doctrine is the first thing expressed in the article; and the proceedings of the house on this subject seem, by no means, to have gratified him. In whatever way they understood it, it cannot be doubted that the most unrestricted liberty of conscience was intended by the Protector. But in consequence of the debate in the house, a committee of fourteen was appointed to consider *what were fundamentals*; and that committee was empowered to name a divine each, who would meet and return their opinion on this delicate subject. The ministers who met were Drs. Owen, Goodwin, and Cheynel; Messrs. Marshal, Reyner, Nye, Simpson, Vines, Manton, Jacomb, and Baxter. After several meetings, they at last returned a list of sixteen articles in a paper endorsed, “The principles of faith, presented by Messrs. Thomas Goodwin, Nye, Simpson, and other ministers, to the Committee of Parliament for religion, by way of explanation to the proposal for propagating the gospel.”³

150

Baxter gives a long and tiresome account of this meeting, ascribing the whole work of it to Dr. Owen, assisted by Nye, Goodwin, and Simpson. He assures us there was a great deal of wrangling of which, by his own account, he was a principal cause. He says, “Dr. Owen was more hotly and better befriended in the assembly than himself;” and that “he was then under great weakness, and soporous (a scotomatic illness of his head).”⁴ He evidently laboured under his constitutional malady, a disputatious pertinacity.⁵ What is surprising is that, professing all his life to be a lover of peace and unity, he takes credit for defeating the unanimity that would have prevailed had he not been there!

Neal appears to have misunderstood the nature of this meeting, and the design of the framers of these articles. He speaks as if the object of the divines had been to *legislate* on the subject of *toleration*, or to direct the Parliament how far it might proceed in granting liberty of conscience. But the fact was simply this: they were called together by a committee of the house, to state what, in their opinion, was fundamental or essential in Christianity. They had nothing to do with the propriety of tolerating those who differed from them on the points of their declaration. The use to be made of their paper was no concern of theirs. And they conscientiously adhered to the question proposed to them, as they gave no opinion of any kind on the subject of religious liberty. Instead of this, we should conclude from the title of the document, that it was intended for a *different*

¹ Ibid. iv. p. 74.

² [As a warning or alarm.](#)

³ Neal, iv. pp. 97-102.

⁴ Sylvester’s *Baxter*, p. ii. pp. 197-205. Appendix, p. 75. — [symptoms of sleepiness, with restricted vision.](#)

⁵ [A persistent determination to disagree.](#)

purpose — something about the propagation of the gospel. Where then is the occasion for Neal's language about the narrow list of fundamentals given by the Independents?

151

So far from it being narrow, it seems to me to be very wide — almost as general as the Apostles' Creed. I believe most Christians would consider that it contained rather too little than too much. "It appears by these articles," Neal says, "that these divines intended to exclude not only Deists, Socinians, and Papists, but Arians, Antinomians, Quakers, and others." Exclude from *what?* Not from civil privileges, but from holding the essentials of Christianity. "Wise and good men fall into such difficulties when they usurp the kingly office of Christ, and pretend to restrain that liberty which is the birthright of every reasonable creature." ¹

The meeting under consideration, fell into no difficulties, usurped no part of the office of Christ, and did nothing to restrain the liberty of others. "It is an unwarrantable presumption for any number of men to declare what is fundamental in the Christian religion, any further than the Scriptures have expressly declared it." ² If this sentence means that the Bible alone can decide what is necessary to salvation; no Christian doubts it. But if it means that we have no right to declare what, in our opinion, must be believed in order to be saved, it is patently absurd. Every man who preaches the gospel is called to declare this. Every society of Christians has a professed or implied belief on the subject. And there can be no impropriety in our giving an answer, in any circumstances, to what is asked of us respecting it. "Besides," adds Neal, "Why should the civil magistrate protect none but those who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ?" I *also* ask, why? The ministers were not called to answer that question. Who proposed this as the law of toleration? According to our historian himself, it was Cromwell and his officers, or the Parliament! ³

152

Thus the main proof which has been alleged about the intolerant conduct of Independents when possessed of power, completely fails — as this meeting and its acts had nothing to do with determining the bounds either of civil or religious liberty. And whatever its views or conduct were, it should be noted that the majority of the ministers were *Presbyterians*. It will not be supposed that these remarks are intended to vindicate the propriety of putting religious liberty on the footing of even the most enlarged interpretation of Oliver's Instrument. Christianity should not, either in part or in whole, be made the test of civil privileges. It never was intended for any such purpose. And such a use of it is only calculated to corrupt it, by inducing hypocritical professions of belief, and discouraging free enquiry.

At the end of 1653, Owen, Goodwin, Caryl, Lockyer, and others, had been presented to Parliament, and were to be sent as commissioners in a circuit, in groups of three, for ejecting and settling ministers according to the rules then prescribed. But this project not taking effect, Commissioners for the approval of public preachers were afterwards appointed, of whom Owen was one. And in 1654 he was one of the Commissioners appointed in every county for ejecting scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient ministers and school-masters. ⁴ He was, about the same time, appointed one of the visitors for the regulation of the university of Oxford, and for the promotion of the interests of learning in it.⁵ These various appointments must have greatly increased his labours, and multiplied the opportunities of adversaries to annoy and reproach him.

¹ Neal, vol. iv, p. 91.

² *Ibid.*

³ Neal, iv, p. 100.

⁴ Athen. Ox. ii. pp. 556-557.

⁵ Scobel's Acts, p. 123.

The Tryers, as they were called, were thirty-eight in number, consisting of Independents, Presbyterians, and Baptists. They were to enquire particularly “into the grace of God in the candidate, his holy and unblameable conversation, also into his knowledge, and utterance, and fitness to preach the gospel.” Whatever may be thought of the government appointing such a board, or of some individuals forming part of it, every Christian will admit that ministers of the gospel ought to possess the above qualifications. The greatest injury to the church of Christ has arisen from the introduction of ignorant and ungodly men into the office of the ministry. In general, the door has been too wide rather than too narrow, and attention to personal or literary qualifications has often superseded due regard to the more important acquirements of a moral and spiritual nature.

Fault with the conduct of the Tryers has been found in various quarters. Neal exclaims against their arbitrary proceedings; and yet, when he comes to detail those proceedings, his account amounts almost to a complete vindication. Their conduct was not, probably, more arbitrary than might be expected from the general nature of their instructions, and the peculiarity of their business. They have been burlesqued, as endeavouring

To find, in lines of beard and face.
The physiognomy of grace;
And by the sound of twang and nose
If all be sound within disclose.

The most grievous complaints have been uttered, and the most extravagant expressions of astonishment poured out, because they were so fanatical as to speak about grace, regeneration, and experience, as if these were the last things that should be spoken of to ministers of the gospel!

I am far from vindicating all their proceedings. They had a difficult task to perform, and they had to deal with persons of very different principles, both in religion and in politics; — and those who were not approved of would, of course, complain. Had this power been lodged with the bishops of those times, or their chaplains, or with the high Presbyterians, would they not have had their shibboleth, for which ill-natured men might have called them a holy inquisition? ¹

We are able to give a very favourable specimen of the conduct of Dr. Owen, as one of the ejecting Commissioners, in his behaviour toward the celebrated Dr. Pococke. He was Professor of Arabic at Oxford, who was brought before the Commissioners for the county of Berks, on account of a living he had there; and he was likely to receive hard measure from them. Owen’s views of the conduct of these Commissioners will appear from an extract of a letter to Secretary Thurloe.

“There are in Berkshire a few men of mean quality and condition — rash, heady, enemies of tithes — who are the Commissioners for ejecting ministers. They alone sit and act, and are at this time casting out, on slight pretences, very worthy men. One especially they intend to eject next week, whose name is Pococke, a man as unblameable in conduct as any that I know living; of repute for learning throughout the world, being the Professor of Arabic in our university. So that, they exceedingly exasperate all men, and provoke them to the height. If anything could be done to cause them to suspend acting till this storm is over,² I cannot but think it would be good service to his Highness and the Commonwealth.” ³

¹ Neal, iv. p. 109.

² Penruddock’s Uprising — one of a series of uprisings planned by the Sealed Knot (a royalist group commissioned by Charles II in 1653-54), as part of a Royalist insurrection. It was to start March 1655.

³ Thurloe’s State Papers, vol. iii. p. 781.

Not satisfied with writing to Thurloe, and accompanied by Doctors Ward, Wilkins, and Wallis, Owen repaired to the spot where the Commissioners met, where they all laboured with much earnestness to convince them of the strange absurdity of their conduct. Dr. Owen, in particular, with some warmth, endeavoured to make them sensible of the infinite contempt and reproach which would certainly fall upon them, when it would be said that they turned out a man for *insufficiency*, whom all the learned — not only of England, but of all Europe — so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments. Being one of the Commissioners appointed by the Act, he added, that he had now come to deliver himself, as well as he could, from a share in such disgrace, by protesting against a proceeding so strangely foolish and unjust. The Commissioners being very much mortified at the remonstrances of so many eminent men, especially of Dr. Owen, in whom they had a particular confidence, thought it best to put an end to the matter, and discharged Pococke from further attendance. ¹

The conduct of Mr. Howe toward Fuller the historian, in somewhat similar circumstances, was no less creditable to his judgment and liberality.² So much for the arbitrary proceedings of *some* of the Independent Tryers. If we may judge from the results, the necessity of a measure, and the wisdom of its management, then we would form a very favourable opinion of this appointment of the Protector's.

156

Baxter, who was not one of the Commissioners himself, nor any friend of their proceedings, acknowledges that

“They saved many a congregation from ignorant, ungodly, drunken teachers — the sort of men who intended no more in the ministry than to say a sermon, as readers say their common prayers, and so patch a few good words together to talk the people asleep on Sunday; and the rest of the week go with them to the ale-house, and harden them in their sin — and the sort of ministers who either preached against a holy life, or preached as men who were never acquainted with it — all those who used the ministry as a common trade to live by, and were never likely to convert a soul — all these they usually rejected, and in their stead they admitted any who were able, serious preachers, and lived a godly life, of whatever tolerable opinion they were. So that, though many of them were somewhat partial to the Independents, Separatists, Fifth Monarchy men, and Anabaptists, and against the Prelatists and Arminians — yet, so great was the benefit above the hurt which they brought to the church, that many thousands of souls blessed God for the faithful ministers whom they let in, and grieved when the Prelatists afterwards turned them out again.” ³

In the year 1655, considerable dissatisfaction with Cromwell's government existed in different parts of the country; a day was appointed for a general uprising by the royalists. In the West, the conspiracy actually broke out, headed by the unfortunate Colonel Penruddock who, with several others, shortly after suffered for their conduct.

157

The vigilance and determination of the Protector and his friends crushed this dangerous conspiracy. On this occasion, the Vice-chancellor of Oxford exerted all his energy and influence to preserve the public peace, and to support the existing government. In the same letter to Secretary Thurloe, from which I made an extract, he says,

“We are here in a quiet condition. I have raised, and now well-settled, a troop of sixty horsemen, besides their officers. The town also has raised some footmen for their defence. We have some persons in custody on very good grounds of suspicion, and will yet secure them. There is much riding to and fro in the villages near us; but as yet, I cannot learn any certain place of their meeting; so I keep a continual guard, and hope

¹ Pococke's Life, prefixed to his Works, p. 41.

² Calamy's Life of Howe, pp. 20, 21.

³ Sylvester's *Baxter*, part i. p. 72.

some good service has been effected by arming ourselves. The (Gentlemen) of the county have met; they are backward and cold; but something we have gotten them to engage for, is toward raising some troops. If I had a blank commission or two for horsemen, I could on good grounds, I suppose, raise a troop in Berkshire. Various good ministers and others have been with me to assist you to that purpose. If you think it necessary to have the work go on, as surely it is necessary to engage men in such a city as this, in which self-preservation urges on the public interest; pray, send me down one or two commissions to that purpose.”¹

The newspapers of the period record that Dr. Owen had been very active in securing the county, and that the university had raised a troop of horsemen under Captain Kent.

158

Foreign as such pursuits must have been to his habits, and disagreeable to his feelings (as they could not fail to be), they reveal his active disposition, and his public spirit. And they show how determinedly he endeavoured to discharge the trust committed to him as Vice-chancellor of the university. They afforded, however, a most gratifying opportunity for his adversaries to abuse him, and were long-after remembered to his disadvantage.

“When those loyal gentlemen of the west,” says a most virulent reviler, “made an attempt to redeem their native soil from the bondage of their Cromwellian taskmasters, how did this Cromwellian Doctor, like a Major-General rather than Vice-chancellor, carry God in his scabbard, and religion at his sword’s point? How did he make his beadles² exchange their staves for fighting irons? How did he turn his gown into a cloak, and vaunt it with white powder in his hair, and black in his pocket, threatening everyone with disaffection to the government, who would not join with him in his designs? And so he rode up and down like a spiritual Abaddon,³ breathing out nothing against those brave souls but rage and fury, slaughter and blood.”⁴

The Doctor repelled the charge of carrying a sword, by coolly declaring that, “to his remembrance, he never wore a sword in his life.”⁵

About this time, he corresponded with Thurloe, and Cromwell himself, regarding his neighbour, Mr. Union Crooke, of Merton in Oxfordshire, a man whose son was very active in Penruddock’s affair; for which his father was made a Sergeant at Law, and he was liberally rewarded himself.⁶

159

In a letter to Thurloe, dated May 29, 1655, the Doctor refers to a conversation with the Secretary respecting this gentleman. He speaks of him as worthy of a trust, the nature of which he does not explain, though I apprehend it refers to his being made Sergeant. For, in a letter to Cromwell dated October 2, 1655, he speaks of Crooke in this capacity. He refers to the Protector’s favour toward him not long before, in his request on his behalf. And he includes a petition that, as Cromwell was about to make some new judges, Crooke he might be thought of for that employment, as a man of abilities and integrity.⁷ I do not find that Crooke was made a judge; but the correspondence shows the habits of intimacy on which Owen lived with the Protector, and the influence he was supposed to possess.

On the 12th of December this same year, the Doctor was called to attend a conference respecting the Jews. It was held in a drawing-room at Whitehall, in the presence of his Highness, who laid

¹ Thurloe’s State Papers, iii, p. 281.

² *Beadle*: a minor parish official who serves a ceremonial function.

³ *Abaddon*: The destroyer, or angel of the bottomless pit.

⁴ Letter to a Friend, p. 13.

⁵ Reflections on a Libel, Works, p. 617.

⁶ Noble’s Memoirs, ii. p. 533. Ludlow, ii. pp. 71-72.

⁷ Thurloe’s State Papers, vol, iv. pp. 65, 66.

before the council the proposal of Manasseh Ben Israel, a Spanish Jew residing in Holland. This man asked permission for his countrymen to settle and trade in England. The meeting consisted of two judges, seven citizens of London, among whom were the Lord Mayor and the Sheriffs, and fourteen divines, among whom were Dr. Owen, Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Whichcot, Dr. Cudworth, Mr. Bridge, and Mr. Craddock. The judges considered their toleration merely as a point of law, and declared they knew of no law against it; and that if it were thought useful to the state, they would advise it. The citizens viewed it in a commercial light and, because they probably had different trade interests, they were divided in their opinions about its utility.

160

Both these, however, dispatched the matter quickly. But most of the divines violently opposed it, by text after text, for four whole days. Cromwell was at length wearied, and told them he had hoped they would throw some light on the subject to direct his conscience. But instead of this, they had rendered it more obscure than before. He desired, therefore, no more of their counsels; but lest he do anything rashly, he begged a share in their prayers.¹ Sir Paul Ricaut, who was then a young man, pressed in among the crowd, and said he never heard a man speak so well in his life, as Cromwell did on that occasion.²

What part Owen took in this debate we are not informed; but as some of the ministers would have admitted the Jews into England on certain conditions, it is very probable that he was of this number. The Protector's views of the subject, on religious grounds, were far from fanatical — "Since the conversion of the Jews was promised in Scripture, he did not know but that the preaching of the gospel in England, without idolatry or superstition, might be conducive to it." The project failed, but Manasseh received £200 from the public purse for his trouble.

On the 17th of September, 1656, the Doctor preached at the opening of a new Parliament, which the Protector had called for the purpose of confirming his title to the supreme magistracy, in a more constitutional manner than had yet been done. The Sermon was published with a dedication, as usual, to Cromwell and the Parliament, under the title of "God's work in founding Zion, and his people's duty thereupon."

161

In the course of it, Owen expresses his feelings on account of the deliverance which God had wrought for his people very strongly.

"The people of God in this nation," he exclaims, "were despised, but are now in esteem; they were under subjection to cruel taskmasters — some in prisons, some banished to the ends of the earth — merely for the worship of their God. The consciences of all were imprisoned, while iniquity and superstition were established by law. But now, the imprisoned are set at liberty; the banished are recalled. Those who lay among the pots have received dove's wings; conscience is no more imprisoned; their sacrifices are not mixed with their blood; nor do they meet with trembling to worship God. O you messengers of the nations, this is what the Lord has done!"

Every real Christian must have exulted at the revolution in religion which had taken place; and must have been grateful to the instruments by which it had been effected, whatever were their views or characters. Owen's enlightened ideas of religious liberty are stated with great precision in this discourse. After noting what various parties wished the magistrate to do, he thus states his own wishes:

"That the people of God be delivered from the hands of their cruel enemies, that they may serve the Lord all the days of their lives; — that notwithstanding their differences, they may live peaceably one with, or at least, *by another, enjoying rule and promotion as they are fitted for employment*, and as he gives

¹ Public Intel. for Dec. 12th, 1656. Whitlocke's Mem. p. 618. Neal iv. pp. 140-142. Dr. Povey's Anglia Judaica.

² Spence's Anecdotes, p. 216.

promotion in whose hand it is; — that godliness and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ be preserved, protected, and secured from the hand of violence upon it.”

I question, whether the most enlightened advocate of the duties of government, and the liberties of men, could state the subject in more appropriate language than this.

162

The government of Britain has not yet granted all that the enlarged mind of Owen grasped. But in what has been obtained, an earnest ¹ is enjoyed of the ultimate triumph of principle and liberty; — when test, and corporation, and even toleration acts, shall all be abrogated; — when civil distinctions, on account of religious differences, shall forever cease; — when the particular privileges of ecclesiastical corporations shall be set aside, and the names of churchman and dissenter shall only occur in the vocabularies of obsolete terms; — when the great body politic shall consist of men of every religious name, united by the grand and harmonizing principle that conscience is uncontrollable by human laws, and that to worship God according to its dictates, is the undoubted, unalienable, and most sacred right of every rational creature.

Owen again preached before Parliament on October 30th following, being a day of humiliation. The discourse, for which he received the thanks of the house by Major-General Kelsey, is entitled, “God’s presence with a people is the spring of their prosperity.” I do not observe anything particularly deserving of notice in it, except his pleading very earnestly towards its conclusion — for the protection and freedom of the people of God, of all parties; and directing the attention of Parliament to the religious state of Wales,

“Where the unhappiness of almost all men running into extremes, has disadvantaged the progress of the gospel, when we had great ground for the expectation of better things. Some are still zealous for the traditions of their fathers, and almost nothing will satisfy them, except their old road of beggarly readers in every parish. Others again, perhaps out of a good zeal, have harried the people with violence beyond their principles, and maybe sometimes beyond the truth. Between complaints on one side and the other, between misguided zeal and formality, the whole work is almost cast to the ground. The business of Zion, as such, is scarcely cared for by any.” ²

163

The Parliament had not been inattentive to the interests of religion in Wales; though its measures may not always have been productive of lasting benefit to the people. The scandalous and ignorant clergy had been ejected. Instead of them, one hundred and fifty good preachers were planted in the thirteen Welsh counties, most of whom preached three or four times a-week. In every market-town there was a schoolmaster, and in most great towns two. Six preachers were appointed to itinerate in each county, who were indefatigable in their labours; and the whole tithes of the principality were devoted to these purposes, directed by act of Parliament. ³ So that, considering the previous character of the clergy; the mountainous and thinly peopled state of the country; and the difficulty of finding suitable persons who could instruct the people in Welsh — perhaps all was done that human instrumentality at the time could effect.

For a series of years, the love of rule and of power had been continually increasing in the breast of Oliver Cromwell. The dissolution of the long Parliament, the calling and dispersing of other packed assemblies, and the frequent changes of the form of government, all seem to have been preparatory to his laying hands on the regal sceptre, and assuming the forms and titles of majesty. His last Parliament was undoubtedly called for the purpose of sanctioning this concluding act of his ambition.

¹ *Earnest*: a deposit, retainer, or down payment in expectation of full payment later.

² Sermons, p.479.

³ Neal, iv. pp. 116, 120.

From the manner in which it had been collected, it was easily managed; and upon the proposal being made that the Protector should have the crown with the title of king, it was soon agreed to by a considerable majority. A committee was appointed to persuade him to accept, which presented the offer of the crown in the form of a petition, on the fourth of April. There was another party, however, more difficult to manage than the Parliament, and whose sanction was then fully more necessary. This was composed chiefly of the officers of the army. Among them were General Fleetwood and Colonel Desborough. The former was son-in-law, and the latter brother-in-law, to the Protector. They were most decidedly opposed to this measure. And from their influence in the army, Cromwell found it necessary to court their favour. Still, nothing was likely to prevent his taking this foolish step. He had actually appointed the house to meet him for this purpose on the following morning, when an occurrence took place which forever blasted his ambitious design.

Having met Colonel Desborough in the park, Cromwell acquainted him with his resolution — upon which Desborough frankly told him that he gave him and his family up for lost, and that he would not continue to act with him any longer. When Desborough went home, he found Colonel Pride, whom Cromwell had knighted with kindling, to whom he imparted the information he had received.

Pride exclaimed, “He shall not.”

“But how will you prevent it,” rejoined Desborough.

“Get me a petition drawn up and I will blast it,” was his reply.

On this, they both went to Dr. Owen; and having acquainted him with what was going on, they persuaded him to draw up the petition for them.

Next morning it was presented to the house by Colonel Mason and some other officers, and set forth,

“— that they had risked their lives against monarchy, and were still ready to do so, in defence of the liberties of the nation — that having observed in some men great endeavours to bring the nation again under the old servitude, by pressing their General to take upon himself the title and government of king, in order to destroy him and weaken the hands of those who were faithful to the public — they, therefore, humbly desired they would discountenance all such persons and endeavours, and continue steadfast to the old cause.”

This petition being supported by the majority of the officers in town, at once involved the house and Cromwell in the utmost perplexity. But that sagacious politician, upon discovering how things were likely to go, declined with great ostentation of self-denial, the title of king. He accepted his pomp and power under the less common, but expressive designation of PROTECTOR.¹

This disappointment was not likely to be forgotten by Cromwell, either in regard to the officers, or to Owen. The Doctor was most probably applied to, because the officers considered him better qualified than themselves for drawing up a petition. He would frame the petition to suit the sentiments of the persons who were to subscribe it; and it must not, therefore, be considered a proper index of his own views. At same time, there can be little doubt that he agreed with them in the main. He must have dreaded the consequences of this step, both to Cromwell and to the country. By this time, he was probably suspicious of the Protector’s ambition, and must have deprecated the return of former scenes of tyranny, or of civil commotion.

¹ Ludlow, ii. pp. 131-34.

Whatever his reasons were, his conduct did not advance his interest at court; for from this time, he does not appear to have been about Cromwell much. At his inauguration into the office of Protector, we find Lockyer preaching, and Manton, a Presbyterian, praying — the leading Independents either not choosing, or not being chosen, to officiate at that mock coronation. Cromwell's death took place in the same year, and Owen declares that he had not seen him for a long time before. All these are evidences of declining favour; but the most conclusive proof soon followed. On the third of July, the Protector resigned the Chancellorship of Oxford; on the eighteenth, his son Richard was chosen successor. Six weeks after, he dismissed Owen from the office of Vice-Chancellor, and appointed in his place. Dr. John Conant, a Presbyterian, and Rector of Exeter college. ¹

¹ Neal, iv. p. 180.

CHAPTER VII.

State of the University during the civil wars, and when Owen was made Vice-Chancellor — Extract from his first address to it — From his fifth address — Specimen of the state of insubordination which prevailed in it — Learned men in office during his Vice-Chancellorship — Independents — Presbyterians — Episcopalians — Persons of note then educated — Writers, Philosophers, and Statesmen — Dignitaries of the Church — Dissenters — Royal Society then founded in Oxford — Clarendon's testimony on the state of learning in it at the Restoration — Owen's management of the several parties — Conduct to the Students — Preaching — The University presents a volume of poetic addresses to Cromwell — Owen's address — Trick played by Kinaston at Oxford — Owen's conduct toward two Quakers — His views of the Lord's Prayer misrepresented — Refuses to swear by kissing the book — Wood's account of his dress and manners — Extract from Evelyne — Owen addresses the new Chancellor, Richard Cromwell — Takes leave of the University.

We now return to take a view of the university of Oxford during this period, and of the conduct of Dr. Owen as Vice-chancellor. This celebrated seat of learning had been in the most deplorable circumstances during the civil wars. The colleges and halls had gone to ruin; five of them were perfectly deserted; some of them were converted into magazines,¹ and the rest were in a most shattered state; the chambers² were filled with officers and soldiers or let out to townsmen. There was little or no education of youth; poverty, desolation, and plunder — the sad effects of war — were to be seen in every corner; the bursaries were emptied of the public money, the plate melted down for the king's service, and the colleges involved in debts they were not able to discharge.³

168

Such was the wretched state of the university, when Oxford fell into the hands of the Parliament in 1646. It was not till after a most determined struggle of two years from the Royalists being subdued, that the heads of houses who had espoused the royal cause, allowed the Presbyterian clergy, appointed to fill their places, to obtain possession of them. It may easily be supposed that during this violent contest, little attention would be paid by either party to the interests of the university, or to the promotion of learning. When the Presbyterians did obtain the upper hand, a long time must have elapsed before they could bring matters into a semblance of order and management, due to the extreme confusion in which they found everything, and the excited state of the public mind. They were scarcely fixed in their chairs, when their conduct and sentiments became disagreeable to the ruling powers, and other changes were considered. Long before Dr. Reynolds and his brethren lost their places, they must have foreseen the storm which was approaching, and would naturally be discouraged from attempting what they otherwise would have done for the good of the university.

Such was the unsettled state of Oxford, when Owen was appointed to fill the office of Vice-chancellor. The chairs were chiefly occupied by those who were secretly attached to royalty and Episcopacy, or by Presbyterians whose aversion to Independents was not less inveterate; but they submitted (from one motive or another) to the successive changes of that fluctuating period. A few Independents were installed at the expense of Presbyterian exclusions, which could not fail to excite the bitterest enmity.

169

We may, therefore, give Owen full credit for accepting the honour with reluctance and anxiety. To perform the part of a faithful and skilful pilot in such a storm, to reduce such chaos into order, to plunge into the midst of party dissatisfaction and cabal — to please those above and satisfy those below — required no ordinary courage, self-denial, and ability. He expressed his views and feelings in his first address to the learned body, thus:

¹ A munitions storehouse.

² The living quarters.

³ Walker's Suff. of the Clergy, p. 124. Neal, iii. p. 429.

“I am well aware, Gentlemen of the University, of the grief you must feel that after so many venerable names — reverend persons, depositaries, and preceptors of the arts and sciences — the fates of the university should, at last, have placed as leader of the company, the one who almost closes the rear. Nor, indeed, is this state of affairs (of whatever kind it may be) very agreeable to myself, since I am compelled to regard my return to my beloved mother, after a long absence, as a prelude to the duties of a laborious and difficult situation. But complaints are not remedies for any misfortune. Whatever their situation, groans do not become grave and honourable men. It is the part of an undaunted mind, to boldly bear up under a heavy burden. For as the comic poet ¹ says: —

The life of man
Is like a game at tables. If the cast
Which is most necessary be not thrown,
That which chance sends, you must correct by art. — *Coleman*.

The academic vessel, alas! has been too long tossed by storms, and almost entirely abandoned by all those whose more advanced age, longer experience, and well-earned literary titles excited great and just expectations. And so, I have been called upon by the partiality and too good opinion of Him whose commands we must not question, and with whom the most earnest entreaties to be excused were urged in vain — and also by the consenting suffrage of this senate.

170

Therefore, although there is, perhaps, no one more unfit, I approach the helm. I both know and lament in what times, what manners, what diversities of opinion (dissentions and calumnies everywhere raging in consequence of party spirit), what bitter passions and provocations, what pride and malice, our academic authority has occurred. Nor is it only the character of the age that distracts us, but another calamity to our literary establishment, which is daily becoming more conspicuous: namely, contempt for the sacred authority of law and the reverence due our ancestors; the watchful envy of malignants; the despised tears and sobs of our almost-dying mother — the University (with the eternal loss of the class of gownsmen,² and no small risk of losing the whole institution); the detestable audacity and licentiousness (manifestly Epicurean) which is beyond all bounds of modesty and piety, and in which, alas! too many of the students indulge. Am I then able, in this tottering state of all things, to apply a remedy to this complication of difficulties, in which so many and such great heroes have laboured in vain, in the most favourable times? I am not so self-sufficient, Gentlemen. If I were to act the part of someone who is so impertinently disposed to flatter himself — indeed, if the slightest thought of such a nature were to enter my mind — I should be quite displeased with myself. I do not live so far from home, nor am I such a stranger to myself (I do not use my eyes in the manner of witches) as not to know well, how scantily I am furnished with learning, prudence, authority, and wisdom.

171

Antiquity celebrated Lucullus as a prodigy in his nature. Though unacquainted with even the duty of a common soldier, he became an expert General without any difficulty. So that, the man the city sent out inexperienced in fighting, the army received as a complete master of the art of war. Be of good courage, Gentlemen, I bring no prodigies. I have retreated from the obscurity of a rural situation, from the din of arms, from journeys for the sake of the gospel into the most distant parts of this island, and also beyond the sea, from the bustle of the court. I have come here, unskilful also — unskilful in the government of a university.

“What madness is this, then?” you will say. “Why have you undertaken an office which you are unable to execute, far less to adorn? You have judged very badly for yourself, the university, and this venerable senate.” Softly, my hearers, neither hope nor courage wholly fails one who is swayed by the judgment, the wishes, the commands, the entreaties of the highest characters. We are not ourselves the sources of worthy deeds of any kind. ‘He who supplies seed to the sower,’ and who, ‘from the mouths of infants has ordained strength,’ is able to graciously supply all defects, whether caused from without or felt within. Therefore, destitute of any strength and boldness of my own, and of any adventitious aid through

¹ Terence *Adelph.* iv. vi. 21.

² *Gownsmen*: the scholarly teachers of the university, dressed in their hallowed robes of authority.

influence with the university — so far as I know, or have deserved. It nevertheless remains for me to commit myself wholly to Him, ‘who gives to all men liberally and does not upbraid.’ He has appointed an eternal fountain of supply in Christ, who furnishes ‘seasonable help’ to every pious endeavour, unless our ‘littleness of faith’ stands in the way. From there I must wait, and pray for light, for strength, and for courage. Trusting, therefore, in his graciously promised presence, according to the state of the times, and the opportunity which we have obtained through Divine Providence — conscious integrity alone supplying the place of arts and of all embellishments — without either a depressed or servile spirit, I address myself to this undertaking.”¹

172

No human powers, or influence could, in a short time, subdue the formidable difficulties of such a situation. Bad habits of long standing were not going to be quickly or easily corrected. Strong prejudices against learning prevailed among some of the persons in power; and a disposition to innovate and overturn, had gotten possession of the public mind. A combination of firmness and prudence, of perseverance and meekness, was particularly necessary in the existing state of both the country and the university. An attempt was actually made to suppress the universities entirely. Had it succeeded, it would have been attended with the most ruinous consequences., Owen gives the following description of this state of things, in a subsequent oration to the university. It at once exhibits the miserable anarchy of the period, his love of learning, and his indignant contempt for the fanatical desperadoes who had attempted to re-barbarize the country.

“For the first two years we were a mere rabble, and a subject of talk to the rabble. Our critical situation and our common interests were discussed in journals and newspapers, by the most ignorant and despicable. Nor was any creature so miserably stupid as not to entertain fears or hopes on account of our situation. Such was the will of the Sovereign Disposer of events, that mortals might learn to value less whatever is mortal. Nor, perhaps, was it right that the university alone should carry an uninjured flower, while empires and the highest ornaments of the whole world were withering.

173

Meanwhile, very few ventured to heartily defend our cause, which should have been held sacred, but was now exposed to the greatest danger. No indeed, such was the pitch of madness that to have stood up for gownsmen, would have been reckoned a violation of religion and piety. On the other hand, everything that is reprobated among respectable men, and that is really criminal, was most plentifully charged on you every day by the malicious. Those who were more favourably disposed towards us, were nevertheless so occupied with their own affairs that, being deaf to our entreaties, and worn out with almost continual reproaches, all they could do was mere conversation — contriving delays, or uttering pious sentiments that are usual concerning the dead. Therefore, all our affairs being in confusion and in the most imminent danger, destitute of all human aid, no marvel was achieved for us by the use of means — but our most merciful Father looked down on us from heaven. After it had become only too manifest, to what an extreme the audacity, rage, and ignorance of some would have gone — those from whom better things might have been expected — that Governor of all things, quickly defeated all their councils, and all their attempts. Those who three days before were most eagerly intent on swallowing up our interests, were able to provide for their own interests only with difficulty. Of that base attempt against the universities, which (with the anger and opposition of God) some insane creatures in vain engaged in, nothing remains except the signal disgrace, and the never to be forgotten insanity. However, as long as there are men who, with copious eloquence, are able to transmit in eternal records the deeds and decrees of the brave and wise, together with the infamy of the wicked, its authors will probably have reason to repent of that attempt.”²

174

We may be assured that the exertions of the Vice-Chancellor were not lacking to correct these evils, to maintain the rights of the University, and to support its claims to the character of piety and learning. He set himself vigorously to curb the licentiousness of the students. The state of

¹ Oratio, i. pp. 1, 2.

² Oratio, v. p. 20.

morals and order among them, with the degree of firmness and authority which was requisite to keep them in subjection, may be judged by the following incident. At a public Act, when a student of Trinity College was *Terrae filius*,¹ the Doctor, before the student began, told him that he would have liberty to say what he pleased, provided he would abstain from profaneness, obscenity, and personalities. The *Terrae filius* began but soon transgressed all the rules which had been prescribed to him. The Doctor several times desired him to forbear, but still he went on — till at last, seeing he was obstinate, Owen sent the Beadles to pull him down. Upon this, the scholars interposed and would not allow them to come near him. The Doctor determined to pull him down himself. Though his friends near him dissuaded him lest the scholars do him some mischief, Owen said, “I will not see authority trampled on in this manner.” He actually pulled him down, and sent him to Bocardo.² The scholars, standing aside, were surprised by his resolve. ³ He took care, says the writer of his life, to restrain the loose, to encourage the sober and pious, and to prefer men of learning and industry. Under his administration, it was visible that the whole body of the University was returned to good order, and flourished with a number of excellent scholars, and persons of distinguished piety. ⁴ This will be apparent by a brief note of some of the leading men among the Independents, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, then in the University.

175

John Owen was Vice-Chancellor for five years, and filled the next important office in it for nine years. Dr. Thos. Goodwin, whom Wood calls, “One of the Atlases and Patriarchs of Independency,”⁵ was President of Magdalen College during the same period. As a theologian, he was perhaps rather too high a Calvinist; but he was distinguished for his piety, learning, and industry, as the five folio volumes of his posthumous works bear ample testimony. He was thankful Owen was President of St. John’s College.⁶ According to Wood, Goodwin had a good command of the Latin tongue. ⁷ He is described by Calamy as a man of polite learning and excellent temper, who was admired for his uncommon fluency, easiness, and sweetness, in all his compositions. Dr. Owen said of him at his death in 1681, that “he had not left his equal behind, for learning, religion, and good humour.” ⁸ George Porter, Fellow of Magdalen College, was Proctor of the University in the second year of Owen’s Vice-Chancellorship, — a man of good learning, great gravity, integrity, self-denial, and charity. ⁹ Stephen Charnock was Fellow of New College, and Senior Proctor in 1652. His work on the Divine Attributes is a sufficient proof of his talents, piety, and learning. ¹⁰ Samuel Lee, of Magdalen Hall, afterwards Fellow of Wadham College, and Proctor in 1656, was the author of several learned and skilful works. ¹¹

176

¹ The *terræ filius* (son of the soil) was a satirical orator who spoke at public ceremonies of the University of Oxford. At Cambridge, the same sort of orator was called the “prevaricator” — someone whose fanciful lies provoked a debate among the students, as a means to entertain them. It was theater.

² *Bocardo*: a prison located near the church of St Michael; it consisted of rooms in a watchtower by Oxford's North Gate.

³ *Memoirs*, xi.

⁴ *Memoirs*, xi.

⁵ *Athen. Ox.* vol. ii. p. 556.

⁶ *Thankful Owen (1620–1681)*. His management of the college property was far from satisfactory; during his tenure of office, much of the college estates were leased as livings to his friends and relations.

⁷ *Wood's Fasti*, vol. ii. p. 734.

⁸ *Non. Mem.* vol. i. p. 235.

⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 217.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 210.

¹¹ *Non. Mem.* i. p. 105.

Afterwards, Lee became a member of Dr. Owen's Church in London, to which he dedicates his "*Ecclesia Gemens*" in 1667: "To the Holy Church of Christ, lately walking in communion with Mr. Joseph Caryl, and now with Dr. John Owen, before whom these exercises were handled, and to whom they are now humbly presented, by theirs in the fellowship of the gospel, S. L." Ralph Button was Fellow of Merton College, and Canon of Christ Church; an excellent scholar, says Baxter, but of greater excellence as a most humble, worthy, godly man. ¹ He obtained his Fellowship of Merton College, in 1633, entirely by his merit, which led Dr. Prideaux, then Rector of Exeter College, to say that, "all who were elected beside him were not worth a *Button*." ² Jonathan Goddard, M. D. was Warden of Merton College, a man of considerable celebrity as a Chemist and Physician. He was a member of the Royal Society, Professor of Physic in Gresham College, and the author of various Medical works. ³ Theophilus Gale, was Fellow of Magdalen College. Wood describes him as "a person of great reading, an exact Philologist and Philosopher; a learned and industrious person; ⁴ His "Court of the Gentiles" alone furnishes indubitable evidence of this. Thomas Cole was Principal of St. Mary's Hall, and Tutor to John Locke and other celebrated individuals. ⁵ James Baron was Divinity Reader of Magdalen College and (with Thankful Owen) editor of Dr. Goodwin's Posthumous works. ⁶ Francis Howel was Moral Philosophy reader to the University, and Principal of Jesus College. ⁷

177

Lewis Du Moulin, M. D. Cambden Professor of History, was a man of great learning and acuteness, and author of many works. Wood says, "He was a fiery, violent, and hot-headed Independent." ⁸ Mr. Francis Johnson, Master of University College and one of Cromwell's Chaplains, was a man of learning and ability. ⁹ I need not pronounce the praise Mr. John Howe, Fellow of Magdalen College, as he is universally admitted to have been one of the greatest men this country ever produced. ¹⁰, Henry Stubb, Second keeper of the Bodleian Library, afterwards celebrated for his opposition to the Royal Society, was the most noted person of his age, according to Wood. He adds,

"While he continued under-graduate, it was usual for him to discourse in the public Schools, very fluently in the Greek tongue. But since the King's restoration, we have had no such matter, which shows *that education and discipline were more severe then than after, when scholars were given more to liberty and frivolous studies.*" ¹¹

Among the Presbyterians were Dr. Henry Wilkinson, Sr., Margaret Professor of Divinity, a man of learning and public spirit; "A good scholar, a close student, and an excellent preacher," says Wood.¹² Dr. Henry Wilkinson, Jr., Principal of Magdalen Hall, and author of several learned works. "He was ever courteous in speech and carriage, communicative of his knowledge, generous and charitable to the poor, and always minded the common good more than his own interests." ¹³

¹ Ibid, iii, p. 126-7.

² South's Life, p. 10.

³ Ward's Lives, p. 270-3.

⁴ Ath. Ox. vol. ii. p. 451.

⁵ Non. Mem. i. p. 249.

⁶ Ibid, p. 288.

⁷ Ibid, p. 234.

⁸ Fasti, vol ii. p 753.

⁹ Non-con. Mem. vol. i. p. 257.

¹⁰ Calamy's Life of Howe.

¹¹ Athen. Ox. vol. ii, p. 412.

¹² Non-con. Mem, vol. i. p. 241.

¹³ Ibid. vol. i. p. 242.

Dr. Dan. Greenwood, Principal of Brazen Nose College, and formerly Vice-Chancellor. Neal says he had the reputation of a profound scholar and Divine; even Wood acknowledges that he was a severe and good governor.¹ Dr. Edmund Staunton, President of Corpus Christi College. He was so well acquainted with the Scriptures that he was a living Concordance to the Bible, distinguished no less for his amiable manners, than for the extent of his learning and the greatness of his labours.² Dr. John Conant, Rector of Exeter College, of whom Prideaux (who loved a pun, as we have already seen) said, *Conanti nihil difficile*.³ Dr Robert Harris, President of Trinity College, a great Hebrew scholar, Chronologist, and Historian.⁴ Dr. Henry Langley, Master of Pembroke College, a solid and judicious Divine. ⁵ Dr. Michael Roberts, whom Neal speaks of as a good scholar.⁶ John Harmar, Regius Professor of Greek at the University. He was a most excellent Philologist, a tolerable Latin Poet, and the author of several learned works. He was ejected at the Restoration. ⁷

Among the Episcopalians were Dr. Wilkins, Warden of Wadham College, who married the sister of the Protector. After the Restoration, he was made Bishop of Chester; a man justly celebrated for the extent of his philosophical knowledge, his excellent temper, and admirable abilities.⁸ Dr. Seth Ward, afterwards Bishop of Exeter and Salisbury, a timeserver,⁹ but the most noted Mathematician and Astronomer of his age. ¹⁰ Dr. John Wallis, who had been one of the clerks to the Westminster Assembly, Savilian Professor of Geometry, and highly celebrated as a Geometrician. ¹¹

Dr. Pocke, Professor of Arabic, the greatest Oriental scholar of his time. ¹² Dr. Zouch, Principal of St. Alban's Hall, a distinguished civilian. ¹³ Dr. Langbain, Provost of Queen's College and keeper of the records of the University; an excellent linguist, philosopher, and divine; the friend of Selden and of Pocke. He died in 1657, ¹⁴ and was succeeded by Dr. Barlow, who had been tutor to Owen and afterwards became Bishop of Lincoln. Dr. Paul Hood, Rector of Lincoln College and Chancellor of the University in 1660. ¹⁵ Dr. Joshua Hoyle, Master of University College, and King's Professor of Divinity till his death in 1651. He was a person of great reading and memory, and so devoted to his book that he was in a great measure a stranger to the world.¹⁶ Dr. Thomas Hyde, afterwards Professor of Arabic, and author of the learned work "De Religione Persarum." Mr. Samuel Clarke, another eminent Oriental scholar and one of the most learned coadjutors of

¹ Neal, vol. iii. p. 468.

² Non-con. Mem. vol. i. p. 221-8.

³ Ibid, p. 229. - *Conanti nihil difficile* (using his name), means *attempting anything hard*.

⁴ Neal, vol. iii. p. 469.

⁵ Ibid, vol iii. p. 470.

⁶ Ibid, vol. iii. p. 470.

⁷ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 347. — Non-con. Mem. vol. ii. p. 265.

⁸ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 370.

⁹ *Timeserver*: someone who conforms to current ways and opinions for personal advantage.

¹⁰ Ibid, vol. ii. p. 627.

¹¹ Neal, vol. iii. p. 472.

¹² Pocke's Life, prefixed to his works.

¹³ Wood's Athen. vol. ii. p. 166. — *Civilian*: someone skilled in civil law.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 140.

¹⁵ Neal, vol. iii. p. 459.

¹⁶ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 113.

Walton in the Polyglot, then resided in Oxford; as did the ingenious Robert Hooke, and the far celebrated Robert Boyle, who took up his residence in Oxford as the only place in England in which he could enjoy the benefit of learned society, and prosecute to advantage, his philosophical studies. ¹

Such were some of the celebrated men in the several parties who flourished at Oxford during the commonwealth. It may be doubted whether that university ever enjoyed a greater number of persons eminent in their respective professions, or more distinguished for character, talents, and learning. They afford indubitable evidence of the truth of Thurloe's account of Cromwell, that "he sought out men for places, and not places for men;" a remark by no means generally applicable to the kings of the earth.

180

The mere enumeration of their names is sufficient to show the justness of the eulogium which the Vice-Chancellor pronounced on the worth and celebrity of his colleagues in 1653. After speaking of their piety and candour, he thus proceeds: —

"I could not help but give such a public testimony as a regard to truth, and to the duty required from me, to these very respectable and learned men, heads of the Colleges, who have merited so highly of the Church, for their distinguished candour, great diligence, uncommon erudition, and blameless politeness. Many of them are zealously studious of every kind of literature; and many, by their conduct in the early period of their youth, give the most promising hopes of future merit. Thus, I would venture to affirm that no impartial and unprejudiced judge would believe that our university has either been surpassed, or is now surpassed, by any society of men in the world — either in point of proper respect and esteem for *piety*, for manners that are orderly and worthy of the Christian vocation; and for a due regard to doctrines, arts, languages, and all sciences that can adorn wise and good men appointed for the public good." ²

181

Nor will our opinion of the learning and celebrity of Oxford during this period be lowered, if we run over a few of the persons who then received a part or the whole of their academic education. Some of them were afterwards distinguished as philosophers and statesmen; some of them rose to eminent situations in the church, while others adorned the humbler ranks of the Non-conformist profession. Among the first class were: — John Locke. William Penn, the celebrated Quaker and enlightened founder and legislator of Pennsylvania.³ Dr. South, who enjoyed in early life the friendship and patronage of Dr. Owen, though he afterwards showed himself unworthy of both. ⁴ Sir Thomas Millington, M. D., who was afterwards Sedlyan Professor of Natural History. ⁵

¹ Birch's Life of Boyle, pp. 54-56. [Robert Boyle \(1627-1691\) — philosopher, chemist, physicist, and inventor. He is regarded as the first modern chemist, and helped pioneer the scientific method. He is best known for Boyle's Law.](#)

² Pref. ad Diat. Dir. Jus. — The account which the historian Gibbon gives of the state of Oxford in the middle of the last century, when he passed some time in it, is very melancholy, and forms a singular contrast with the view which the preceding statements afford of the learning, industry, and piety which adorned it in the days of *misrule* and *fanaticism*. "If I inquire," he says, "into the manufactures of the Monks of Magdalen, if I extend the inquiry to the other Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, a silent blush or a scornful frown will be the only reply. The Fellows, or Monks of my time, were decent, easy men, who supinely enjoyed the gifts of the founder. Their days were filled by a series of uniform employments — the Chapel and the Hall, the Coffee House, and the Common Room — till they retired, weary and well satisfied, to a long slumber. From the toil of reading, or thinking, or writing they had absolved their consciences; and the first shoots of learning and ingenuity withered on the ground, without yielding any fruits to the owners or the public. As a Gentleman Commoner, I was admitted to the society of the Fellows, and fondly expected that some questions of literature would be the amusing and instructive topics of their discourse. Their conversation stagnated in a round of College business, Tory politics, personal anecdotes, and private slander. Their dull and deep potations excused the brisk intemperance of youth; and their constitutional toasts were not expressive of the most lively loyalty for the House of Hanover." — *Gibbon's Memoirs of his own Life and Writings*, vol. i. p. 38.

³ Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 124.

⁴ South's Life.

⁵ Life of Anthony Wood, p. 85.

Dr. Ralph Bathurst, afterwards President of Trinity College, and nominated to be Bishop of Bristol.¹ Joseph Williamson, afterwards Secretary of State.² Sir Christopher Wren, the celebrated architect.³ Dr. Daniel Whitby, well known for his critical acumen and Anti-Calvinistic zeal.⁴ Anthony A. Wood, the Oxford Antiquary, and the enemy of Puritans and Dissenters; to whose learned pages we have often been indebted. ⁵ Mr. Joseph Glanville, a distinguished writer, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and one of its most strenuous defenders. ⁶ Launcelot Addison, father to the celebrated Joseph Addison. ⁷ He was Dean of Lichfield, and a man of some eminence.

182

Henry Oldenburg, a Saxon; afterwards Secretary to the Royal Society. He married the only daughter of John Dury, the indefatigable but unsuccessful promoter of peace and concord among the Protestant Churches. ⁸ Learning, says Burnet, was then high at Oxford; chiefly the study of the Oriental tongues, which was greatly raised by the Polyglot Bible then expounded. They read the Fathers much there; and Mathematics and the New Philosophy were in great esteem. ⁹

Many of the dignified clergy of the future reigns were also indebted to the Oxford Professors of this period for their education. Such as: — Dr. Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, and Historian of the Royal Society. ¹⁰ Henry Compton, successively a cornet in the guards, and Bishop of Oxford and London; a determined supporter of the Revolution. ¹¹ Dr. Nathaniel Crew, Bishop of Oxford and Durham, and Grand Inquisitor of the Ecclesiastical Commission in the reign of James II, for which he obtained a pardon from William, through the intercession of Dr. Bates. ¹² Dr. Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, and another friend of James II, with whom he afterwards fled to France. ¹³ Samuel Parker, son of a Puritan, and himself known as a *grueller* ¹⁴ at Oxford, but afterward a violent enemy of the Non-conformists and of Dr. Owen in particular. He was made Bishop of Oxford by James II, and died more than suspected of Popery. ¹⁵ Ezekiel Hopkins, Bishop of Raphoe and Derry, a man of piety and abilities, whose Exposition of the Commandments, and other works are still popular. ¹⁶

183

Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and afterwards one of the Nonjurors. ¹⁷ Edward Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester; he was raised to this See for his active services at the Revolution. He was the

¹ Biog. Dict.

² Wood's Fasti, vol. ii, p. 797.

³ Ibid. p. 772.

⁴ Ibid, p. 792.

⁵ Wood's Life.

⁶ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 495.

⁷ Wood's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 780.

⁸ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 792. — Birch's Life of Boyle.

⁹ Hist. of his own times, vol. i. p. 280.

¹⁰ Biog. Dict.

¹¹ Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 185.

¹² Wood's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 786 — Birch's Life of Tillotson, pp.137, 138.

¹³ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 629.

¹⁴ *Grueller*: someone who works to the point of exhaustion, or exacts severe punishment on themselves or others.

¹⁵ Ibid. vol. ii; pp. 616, 621.

¹⁶ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 647.

¹⁷ Wood's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 617. *Nonjuror*: Someone who refuses to swear a particular oath; specifically, a clergyman who refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary in 1689.

author of several works. ¹ Nicholas Stratford, Bishop of Chester. ² Capel Wiseman, Bishop of Dromore, and Timothy Hall, Bishop of Oxford. ³ George Hooper, Bishop of St. Asaphs, and of Bath and Wells, the writer of several learned works. ⁴ Narcissus Marsh, Archbishop of Cashel, an amiable and learned Prelate, and founder of a valuable library in Dublin conducted on the most liberal principles. ⁵ Robert Huntington, Bishop of Kilmore, and distinguished for his attainments in Oriental literature. ⁶ Richard Cumberland, Bishop of Peterborough, well known as the author of a valuable work on Jewish Weights and Measures, and as the translator of *Sanchoniathon*, besides other things. ⁷ Francis Turner, Bishop of Rochester and Ely, one of the seven who were sent to the Tower by king James; but who was afterwards deprived, for not taking the oaths to William. ⁸ John Lloyd, Bishop of St. David's. ⁹ He was a great critic in the Greek and Latin authors, but chiefly in the Scriptures — the words and phrases of which he carried the most perfect concordance in his memory. Wilkins used to say that he had the most learning in ready cash of any he ever knew. He was a great chronologist and historian, and a holy, humble, patient man, ever ready to do good when he had an opportunity. ¹⁰

184

After noting some of the dignified clergy who were formed at Oxford and Cambridge during this period, Burnet adds:

“These have been the greatest divines we have had these forty years. They contributed more than can be well imagined to reform the way of preaching which — among the divines of England before them — was over-run with pedantry. It was a great mixture of quotations from the Fathers and ancient writers, a long opening of a text, with the concordance of every word in it, and giving all the different expositions of it, with the grounds for them, concluding with some very short practical applications according to the subject or occasion.” ¹¹

Among the Dissenters who then received their education at Oxford, were: — Mr. Thos. Cawton, afterwards minister of a church in Westminster, of whom Granger says, “he had few equals in learning, and no superior in piety.” ¹² Mr. Edward Bagshaw, second master of Westminster School, while Busby was at its head; he had some heated controversy with him, as well as with Baxter. He may be said to have lost his life for refusing to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, as he died from the effect of imprisonment on this account. He was the friend of Dr. Owen, who gives his character in the following epitaph which is inscribed on his tombstone in Bunhill fields: —

"Here lies interred the body of Mr. Edward Bagshaw, minister of the gospel, who received from God faith to embrace it, courage to defend it, and patience to suffer for it; when despised by most and persecuted by many. Esteeming the advantages of birth, education, and learning, all eminent in him, as things of worth, to be accounted loss for the knowledge of Christ. From the reproaches of pretended friends, and

¹ Ibid, vol. ii. p. 780.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid, p. 793.

⁴ Biog. Dict.

⁵ Wood's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 793.

⁶ Ibid. — Biog. Dict.

⁷ Fasti, vol. ii p. 796.

⁸ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 802. — Burnet's own Times, iv. p. 110.

⁹ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 685.

¹⁰ Burnet's own Times, i. p. 273.

¹¹ Burnet's own Times, i. p. 278.

¹² Biog. Hist.

persecutions of professed adversaries, he took sanctuary in eternal rest, by the will of God, the 28th December, 1671.”¹

185

Mr. Philip Henry, well known as an eminent Non-conformist himself, and as the father of the more celebrated Matthew Henry, the Commentator. Dr. Owen used to speak highly of his exercises, when Dean of the College of which Mr. Henry was a student. His account of the state of religion in the University while he was at it, deserves to be quoted.

“He would often mention it, with thankfulness to God, what great helps and advantages he then had in the University, not only for learning, but for religion and piety. Serious godliness was in reputation, and besides the public opportunities they had, there were many of the scholars who used to meet together for prayer, and Christian conference, to the great confirming of one another’s hearts in the fear and love of God, and preparing them for the service of the church in their generation.”²

Mr. George Trosse, afterwards minister in Exeter, a man of unwearied diligence, and considerable learning; he wrote several things which were esteemed at the time, and left in six folio volumes a MS. Exposition of the Assembly’s *Catechism*, which still exists. His account of religious exercises in Oxford while he was a student, ought to be noted along with Mr. Henry’s, as throwing light on the state of the University at this period.

“He attended Dr. Conant’s lectures on Fridays, Dr. Harris’s catechetical lectures on Tuesdays, the lecture kept up by the Canons of Christ Church on Thursdays, Mr. Hickman’s ministry at St. Olaves, on the Lord’s days, and also heard many excellent sermons at St. Mary’s.

186

He received the sacrament sometimes from Mr. Hickman, and sometimes from Dr. Langley, the Master of his College. He attended the repetition of Sermons and solemn prayer in the College Hall, on the Lord’s days before supper. And he himself repeated sermons and prayed with a few young men in his chamber, afterwards.”³

John Wesley, ejected from Whitechurch in Dorsetshire, grandfather of the celebrated founder of Methodism, to whom, while a student at Oxford, Dr. Owen showed much kindness.⁴ It is worthy of remark that both by his father and his mother, John Wesley, High Churchman though he was, sprung from Dissenters: Dr. Annesley, his mother’s father, also being a distinguished Non-conformist. Mr. John Quick, the well-known author of the “*Synodicon Gallia Reformata*,” and of an unedited MS. in three folio volumes, now in the Red Cross Street Library, containing lives of eminent Protestant divines, both French and English.⁵ Joseph Alleine, the ejected minister of Taunton; a learned and most devoted man, justly celebrated for his “*Call to the Unconverted*,” which has gone through innumerable editions.⁶ Thomas Tregosse, the ejected minister of Millar and Mabe in Cornwall, and distinguished for his apostolic labours in that country.⁷ John Troughton, blind from the fourth year of his age; yet a good school divine, and metaphysician, and much commended for his disputations when at the University. He wrote several things on the Non-conformist controversy.⁸

¹ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 491.

² Memoirs of Philip Henry, by his Son, p. 19.

³ Calamy’s Continuation, vol. 1. p. 385.

⁴ Non-con. Mem. vol. ii. p. 165.

⁵ Ibid, vol. ii. p. 9.

⁶ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 299. — Non-con. Mem. vol. iii. p. 206.

⁷ Clark’s Lives.

⁸ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 511.

Charles Morton, afterwards a celebrated dissenting tutor at Newington Green; but so infested with the Bishops' processes, that he was obliged to desist and retire to America, where he died. ¹ Samuel Tapper, the friend of Bishops Wilkins and Ward; Thomas Danson, Samuel Blower, John Spilsbury, and James Ashurst, all Dissenting ministers of some eminence, besides many others too numerous to be named in this place. ²

It was during this time, and in Oxford also, that the foundation of the Royal Society was laid; and some of its earliest and most distinguished friends either belonged to the University, or received the elements of their education there. ³ These facts and testimonies show the flourishing state of learning, religion, and science during the latter part at least of Owen's Vice-Chancellorship; and the merit which is due to him in bringing this important seat of instruction out of the dangers to which, at the beginning of his administration, it was evidently exposed — from disorder, party spirit, and fanaticism. If any additional evidence is wanted in support of our representations, and to expose the calumnies propagated against Owen and his friends, it will be furnished by Lord Clarendon whose impartiality on such a subject will not be questioned.

“It yielded,” says his Lordship, “a harvest of extraordinary, good, and sound knowledge, in all parts of learning. And many who were wickedly introduced, applied themselves to the study of learning and the practice of virtue. So that when it pleased God to bring King Charles II back to his throne, he found that University abounding in excellent learning, and little inferior to what it was before its desolation.” ⁴

The Doctor managed the different parties in the University by his gentlemanly behaviour and humility; by his impartiality and decisiveness; and by his generous disinterestedness. He was moderate but firm, dignified, and at the same time full of gentleness. He gained the good wishes of the Episcopalians by allowing a society of about three hundred of them, who used the Liturgy, to meet every Lord's day, over against his own door. This was without disturbance, although they were not legally tolerated. He secured the support and favour of the Presbyterians by giving away most of the vacant benefices to persons of that denomination; and he had the most intimate communication with the Presbyterians of the University. ⁵ Among the students, he acted as a father. While he discountenanced and punished the vicious, he encouraged and rewarded the modest and the indigent. He was hospitable in his own house, generous to poor scholars, some of whom he took into his family; others he assisted by presents of money. ⁶ Foreigners as well as natives experienced his bounty; for some of them — by his favour and that of the Canons of Christ Church — were admitted to free Commons, and the use of the Library. ⁷ He was frequently consulted by persons of distinction respecting their sons who were placed at the University, and entreated to take an interest in them.

He set a personal example of fidelity and laborious diligence, which must have been attended with the best effects; while his labours in the pulpit aided the influence of his academic exertions. The University sermons on the Lord's day afternoons, used to be preached by the fellows of the College

¹ Non-con. Mem. vol. i. 347.

² Calamy's Life of Baxter, and Continuation — Non con. Mem. passim.

³ Thomson's History of the Royal Society, pp. 1, 2.

⁴ History of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 57.

⁵ Memoirs, p. xi.

⁶ Memoirs, p. xii.

⁷ Wood's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 788.

in their course; but this being found not so much for edification, the Vice-Chancellor and Dr. Goodwin divided the labour between them. ¹

189

St. Mary's is a large place of worship, and when the Doctor preached in it, he was always attended by a numerous congregation. There was an Independent church at Oxford at this time, of which Goodwin was pastor. But I am unable to say whether Owen held any office in it. Cawdry asserts that he laboured to gather a church in his own College ² — and if he did, little doubt can be entertained of his success. But this is one of the rumours which that violent writer delighted to spread; and it is therefore, perhaps, entitled to little attention. Every second Sabbath, however, he preached at Stadham, in the neighbourhood, where he bought some property. Thus, between the University and the pulpit — not to speak of other labours which remain to be brought forward — his hands must have been very fully occupied.

During Owen's Vice-Chancellorship, several incidents of a miscellaneous nature occurred which serve to display his talents, or illustrate his principles, or throw some light on the state of the times. I shall now proceed to state these.

On the occasion of the peace which Cromwell concluded with the Dutch in 1654, many addresses and poetic praises were presented to him. Among the rest, the University of Oxford approached his highness with a volume of poems in all languages, entitled "Musarum Oxoniensium ΕΛΛΙΟΦΟΡΙΑ," etc. The dedication of this volume to Cromwell, by Dr. Owen as Vice-Chancellor, is in prose. It is full of expressions of gratitude to the Protector for his favour to the University. After this, we have some verses by the Doctor, which deserve to be inserted, as they are the only specimen existing of his poetic talents [*orig. in Latin*].

190

TO THE PROTECTOR.

Now peace returns in conquering Caesar's train,
Who, kindling, dares not the poetic strain?
Ev'n I, devoted to severer themes.
Nor apt for song, or waking fancy's dreams.
Struck with no vain poetic rage, aspire;
And, lo, an humble teacher, grasps the lyre:
Pregnant, I haste the tuneful throng to join;
For every muse, and every lyre is thine.

Had these fair scenes, unshelter'd by thine arm.
To discord fall'n a prey, and rude alarm,
Not thou, Augustus, wert secure from shame.
Unlike thyself and heedless of thy fame;
Oblivious shades had vail'd thy victories.
And peace appear'd inglorious to our eyes.

But sav'd by thee, the Muses yet survive.
And grateful come to bid thy glories live;
Peace is their song, — restor'd at thy command,
To bless the British plains and every land;
For thee, they twine the wreath of peace, as due
To him who bears its name and emblem too.

Then gracious own, unconquer'd Prince, the lay
By which these friends of peace their homage pay. — Jo. Owen, Acad. Procan.

¹ Life of Philip Henry, p. 17.

² Independency further proved to be a schism, p. 30.

After the Vice-Chancellor, many members of the University follow in order, with various degrees of poetic merit. Zouch, Dr. of Civil Law; Harmar the Greek Professor, and Dr. Ralph Bathurst, names well known in the republic of Letters, contribute to this collection, and join in eulogising Cromwell. Besides these, we find Busby, who so long ruled in Westminster School and complied with every change of government in his time; and Locke, the friend of philosophy and liberty. Dr. South also celebrates the praises of the Protector; and yet afterwards he could represent him as a lively copy of Jeroboam, and say of the leading ecclesiastics of the period, — “Latin was a mortal crime with them, and Greek, instead of being owned as the language of the Holy Ghost, was looked upon as the sin against it — so that, in a word, they had all the confusion of Babel among them, without the diversity of tongues.”¹ But this was Dr. South. The volume is closed with some verses from the printer, who styles himself Leonard Lichfield, Esq. Bedle of Divinity. He lived to perform the same honour for Charles II, as did many of the gentlemen mentioned above. Praise generally follows fortune; and he who has the power of conferring benefits, will never lack flatterers.² In September 1654, a London merchant of the name of Kinaston came to Oxford, with a long beard, pretending to be a patriarch, and said that he wanted a model of the last reformation. A number of the Royalists repaired to him to obtain his blessing, among whom were Henry Langley and Harmar, who presented a formal Greek harangue to him. It turned out, however, to be a trick of Lloyd’s, then a Tutor in Wadham College, who afterwards became, successively, Bishop of St. Asaph, Lichfield, and Coventry.

It was chiefly intended against the Royalists; but as Dr. Owen and some of the Presbyterians had resorted to this Patriarch, or he to them, on account of his wished-for model, they were so offended on discovering the cheat, that Lloyd was obliged to abscond.³

This year, also, Oxford was visited by two female Quakers who created some disturbance, and were rather severely treated. Gough, the Historian of the Friends, represents the Vice-Chancellor as needlessly interfering, and sentencing the poor women to be punished, when the Mayor refused to do so. But on referring to Sewel, who is quoted by Gough as his authority, and who, being a Quaker himself, would not have concealed Owen’s misconduct, the story appears in a different light. After mentioning how the students had treated Elizabeth Heavens, and Elizabeth Fletcher, he notes that they had been committed by two justices to Bocardo, the common prison, for speaking in the church after the minister had finished his discourse. A meeting of the Justices was afterwards summoned, which the Mayor refused to attend, and “to which the Vice-Chancellor also was *required to come*.” Owen charged them with blaspheming the name of God, and abusing the Divine Spirit, to which the Quakers replied. After they were asked to withdraw, the Justices agreed that they should be whipped, which was executed accordingly next morning.⁴ It appears from this account, that the Quakers were put in prison for disturbing the public worship, or speaking where they had no right to speak; that Dr. Owen, by virtue of the civil office which he held in the University, was required to attend a meeting of the Justices to consider their behavior; and that he made some remarks on their religious sentiments and conduct. Sewel charges him with nothing more than this.

¹ Ser. iii.p. 544.

² I examined this curious volume in the British Museum, and extracted Owen’s verses from it; but some account of it is furnished by Dr. Harris in the Life of Cromwell, pp. 369, 370.

³ life of Anthony Wood, pp. 132-136.

⁴ Sewel’s History of the Quakers, pp. 90, 91.

However peaceable and respectable the Quakers are now, it must be admitted, even by themselves, that this was by no means the case with many of the early professors. They frequently disturbed the congregation when engaged in Divine service — addressed those whom they opposed in the most violent and abusive manner — outraged the bounds of modesty and decency, and even endangered the lives of others. These were proceedings which too fully justified the conduct of the public authorities towards them; though many of the visionary offenders should have been sent to a private cell rather than treated cruelly, or publicly exposed.

During Owen's Vice-Chancellorship, a calumnious report was raised about his blaspheming the Lord's Prayer, and putting on his hat as a mark of disapproval, when some preacher in Christ Church, concluded the service by repeating it. This was carried so far that in 1660 Meric Casaubon wrote a formal vindication of the Lord's Prayer. As soon as the report reached the Doctor, he published a solemn denial of its truth, both in French and English. Notwithstanding this denial, the charge was repeated and aggravated by Vernon in his infamous libel. ¹ This led Owen to notice and repel it again in his letter to Sir Thomas Overbury. ² After all this, Wood repeats the slander, and contradicts the Doctor's denial by reports. ³

So persevering are malice and detraction, and so useless is contradiction, when men are determined not to be convinced. Dr. Owen frankly acknowledges that he did not believe that the Lord's Prayer was intended for a standing form in the Church of Christ, and that he had made some free remarks on the improper repetition of it in the English Liturgy, and on the superstitious views which some persons entertained about it. But he just as solemnly declares: —

“I do, and ever did believe, that that prayer is part of the Canonical Scripture, which I would not willingly blaspheme. I do believe that it was composed by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, and have vindicated it from being a collection of such petitions as were then in use among the Jews, as some learned men had, I think, unadvisedly asserted. I do, and ever did believe it to be the most perfect form for prayer that was ever composed; and the words of it so disposed by the Divine wisdom of our blessed Saviour, that it comprehends the substance of all the matter of prayer to God. I do, and did always believe, that it ought to be continually meditated on, that we may learn from it, both what we ought to pray for, and in what manner; neither did I ever think a thought or speak a word unsuitable to these assertions.” ⁴

In 1657, he was brought by Mr. Colt into Westminster Hall, as a witness against Mr. Dutton. On being asked to take the oath, he requested the New Testament be opened before him, and said he would lift up his hand; but he refused to submit to the ridiculous ceremony of kissing the book. The Jury requested the Court to inform them whether this mode of swearing could be admitted; on which Lord Chief Justice Glynn told them the Doctor's oath was perfectly sufficient. ⁵

This trifling anecdote shows us how Owen viewed what some, perhaps, may consider but a small matter; but which enters deeply into the awful abuse and little influence of oaths, for which England is proverbial; and which constitutes a large portion of its national guilt.

The account which Anthony Wood gives of the conduct and manners of Owen while Vice-Chancellor, is too curious to be omitted.

¹ pp. 57, 58.

² Sermons and Tracts, pp. 619, 620.

³ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 557.

⁴ Sermons and Tracts, p. 619.

⁵ Vernon, p. 22. Halliday's Life of Lord Mansfield, p. 172.

“He endeavoured,” says that illiberal writer, “to put down habits, formalities, and all ceremony, notwithstanding he had taken an oath before to observe the statutes and maintain the privileges of the University. While he underwent that office, instead of being a grave example to the University, he scorned all formality, and undervalued his office, by going in *quirpo*, like a young scholar — with powdered hair, snake-bone band-strings or band-strings with very large tassels, lawn band, a large set of ribbands pointed at his knees, and Spanish leather boots, with large lawn tops, and his hat mostly cocked.”¹

This most singular representation has the misfortune to be scarcely consistent with itself. To be an enemy to pomp, and yet a man of dress, to wish to put down form in others, and be at the same time very formal himself, are scarcely reconcilable. It is true that Owen attached little importance to hoods and tippets, and other academic paraphernalia, in which Wood supposed a great part of the glory of an Oxford education consisted. But an extract from Evelyne’s *Journal* will show that he did not interfere with the forms of the University.

196

“July 9, 1654, Dr. French preached at St. Mary’s, on Mat. 12.42 — advising the students to search after true wisdom, not to be found in the books of philosophers, but in the Scriptures alone. In the afternoon, the famous Independent, Dr. Owen, *perstringing* Episcopacy.² On Monday I went again to the schools to hear the several faculties; and in the afternoon waited out the whole Act in St. Mary’s — the long speeches of the Proctors, the Vice-Chancellor, the several Professors — *creation of Doctors by the cap, ring, kiss, etc.* — these ancient ceremonies and institutions not yet being wholly abolished. Dr. Kendal, now inceptor,³ among others, performing his Act incomparably well, concluded it with an excellent oration, abating his Presbyterian animosities. The Act was closed with a speech of the Vice-Chancellor.”⁴

On the subject of the University oath, we can let the Doctor himself speak: —

“I can say, with some confidence that the intention and design of the oath were observed by me with as much conscience and diligence, as by any who have since acted in the same capacity. And being provoked by this man [Vernon] I do not fear to say that, considering the state of affairs at that time in the nation and the University, I do not believe there is any person of learning, ingenuity, or modesty, who was related to that place in those days, who will not grant at least that, notwithstanding some differences from them about things of very small importance, I was not altogether useless to the interest of learning, morality, peace, and the preservation of the place itself.”⁵

197

Wood’s account of Owen’s dress is vastly amusing. We would have been much gratified if he had furnished us with a drawing of this dandy Vice-chancellor. His snakebone bandstrings, and lawn boot tops, would be invaluable antiquarian relics if they could be recovered.⁶ Had Owen been a person of a different description, Anthony would have told us of his turnip head, sepulchral face,

¹ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 556.

² *Perstringing*: criticizing or censuring.

³ *Inceptor*: the commencement speaker.

⁴ Evelyne’s *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 276.

⁵ Works, pp. 618, 619.

⁶ This is not the first time that the Independents had been represented as men of gayety and fashion. “You shall find them the only gallants in the world,” says Bastwick, “so that one who meets them would take them for roasters and ruffians, rather than saints. Indeed, you will find them with cuffs, and those great ones at their very heels; and with more silver and gold upon their clothes and at their heels (for those upstarts must now have silver spurs) than many great and honourable personages have in their purses.” (from Bastwick’s utter routing of the Independent army: *Preface to the Reader*) Who would think that the Independents were the grim-faced hypocrites of the Commonwealth? But for the counterpart of Owen, see Addison’s description of an Independent Divine, supposed to be Dr. Goodwin, *Spectator*, No. 494. Among the other charges brought against them by Edwards is, “Their going in such fine fashionable apparel, and wearing long hair, as ‘tis a shame; they feast, ride on journeys, and do servile business on the Fast days. And let a man but turn Sectary now-a-days, and within one half year, he is so metamorphosed in apparel, hair, etc. that a man hardly knows him.” — *Gangrena*, p. i. page 62.

and sackcloth garb, by which he disgraced the university, and brought all good breeding into contempt. Granger, however, justly remarks that Wood's description of Owen's style amounts to no more than his being a man of good person and behaviour, and liked to go well-dressed. ¹

"We must be extremely cautious," adds that acute writer, "how we form our judgment of characters at this period; the difference of a few modes or ceremonies in religious worship has been the cause of infinite prejudice and misrepresentation. The practice of some of the splenetic ² writers of this period, reminds me of the painter, well known by the appellation of hellish Brueghell, who had so accustomed himself to painting witches, imps, and devils, that he sometimes made but little difference between his human and infernal figures."

198

Nothing could more accurately describe the manner of the Oxford historian. Granger, though a Churchman, expresses himself very honourably of Owen. "Supposing it to be necessary for one of his persuasion to be placed at the head of the University, none was so proper as this person who governed it several years with much prudence and moderation, when faction and animosity seemed to be a part of every religion." ³

At the installation of Richard Cromwell into the office of Chancellor, Owen addressed him in the name of the university, and eulogized in the strongest terms, the character of his father.

"The university of Oxford casts at your feet those inferior sceptres which your great parent was not ashamed to have borne in hands that now almost regulate the balance of power in all Europe, and which were no contemptible omens of his rising glory and honour. If the gownsmen seem to you to act with a higher spirit than suits their condition, if they seem to be puffed up with a certain degree of pride because they are unwilling to be under the care and protection of an inferior patron — that must be ascribed to the exceeding great favour of him who, by his affection, compelled them to forget their lot, and to aspire to the noblest advantages of every description. But it is unnecessary, at present, to expatiate on his praise, or to repeat his good deeds, since all are eager to ascribe to him the best blessings they enjoy; and he has himself obtained immortal honour by his conduct.

199

I therefore purposely omit the eulogy of the wisest and bravest man which this age, fertile in heroes, has produced. Whatever may become of England, it shall ever be known that he was a prince who had at heart the glory of the island, and the honour of religion." ⁴

Part of his concluding address to the university, after Dr. Conant had been appointed his successor, enumerates some of the services which had been rendered to it during his administration. It will therefore form an appropriate conclusion to this section of his Memoirs:

"...persons have been matriculated; twenty-six admitted to the degree of Doctor; three hundred and thirty-seven to the degree of Master of Arts; six hundred and ninety-seven to that of Bachelor of Arts ⁵ — Professors salaries, lost for many years, have been recovered and paid; some offices of respectability have been maintained; the rights and privileges of the university have been defended against all the efforts of its enemies; the treasury is increased tenfold; many of every rank in the university have been promoted to various honours and benefices; new exercises have been introduced and established; old ones have been duly performed; reformation of manners has been diligently studied, in spite of the grumbling of certain profligate brawlers; labours have been numberless; besides submitting to the most enormous expense, often when brought to the brink of death on your account, I have hated these limbs and this

¹ Biog. Hist. iii. p. 301.

² *Splenetic*: prickly, peevish, spiteful.

³ Ibid. p. 302

⁴ Oratio ad Richardum Crom.

⁵ The numbers were left blank in the Oration — I have supplied them as far as I can from Wood; but they may not be quite accurate.

feeble body which was ready to desert my mind; the reproaches of the vulgar have been disregarded, the envy of others has been overcome.

200

In these circumstances, I wish you all prosperity, and bid you farewell. I congratulate myself on a successor who can relieve me of this burden; and congratulate you on one who is able to completely repair any injury which your affairs may have suffered through our inattention. But, as I do not know where the thread of my discourse might lead me, I cut it short here. I seek again my old labours, my usual watchings, my interrupted studies. As for you Gentlemen of the university, may you be happy, and fare you well!"¹

¹ Oratio, v. p. 22.

CHAPTER VIII.

Owen publishes his “Divina Justitia” — His work “On the Perseverance of the Saints” — John Goodwin — The doctrine of perseverance — Kendal — Lamb — Baxter writes on this subject — Owen requested by the Council of State to answer Biddle’s two Catechisms — Biddle — Progress of Socinianism — The “Vindiciae Evangelicae” — Never answered— “On the Mortification of Sin” — Controversy with Hammond about Grotius — Death of Gataker—Selden — Usher.

It might be thought that the labours accompanying the Deanery of Christ church, and the office of Vice-chancellor of the university; of preaching regularly on the Lord’s day; of attending many meetings in London at the request of Government; and preaching occasionally before Parliament; with various other public and important employments, would have so completely occupied Owen, that no time would have been found for writing books. Difficult as it is to conceive how he could, in such circumstances, find leisure for the latter occupation, it was during this period that some of his most valuable and elaborate works were produced. I will now proceed to give some account of these.

The first which claims our attention, is a Latin *Dissertation on Divine Justice*, — “Diatriba de Divina Justitia, etc.; or the claims of Vindictory Justice asserted, 12mo, pp. 296. — Ox. 1653.” It originated, the Doctor tells us, in one of the public disputations in the university, in which it fell to his lot to discourse on the vindictory justice of God, and the necessity of its exercise on the supposition of the existence of sin. Though he had the Socinians chiefly in his eye, it was understood that some very respectable theologians in Oxford, entertained different sentiments from those which he then expressed.

202

A good deal of discussion ensued, in consequence of which he published this Diatriba. It is almost entirely of a scholastic nature, revealing much acuteness and a profound acquaintance with the subject; but it is not likely to be read with much interest now. It resolves itself entirely into a single proposition: — Whether God, considered as a moral Governor, could forgive sin without an atonement, or without such a provision for the honour of his justice, as that which is made by the sacrifice of Christ? Owen, as we apprehend, scripturally and successfully maintains the negative of this proposition (God could not). The affirmative had been held by Dr. Twisse of Newbury (Prolocutor ¹ of the Westminster Assembly) in a work entitled “Vindiciae Gratiae, potestatis, ac Providentiae Divinae,” etc. published in reply to Arminius in 1632; and by Samuel Rutherford of St. Andrews, in his “Disputatio Scholastica de Divina Providentia,” published at Edinburgh in 1619. Both Twisse and Rutherford were learned and able men; but they were on the wrong side in this point, and appear to be at some disadvantage as disputants with Owen. He had been a good deal molested with the reference to human authority on this subject, on which he very properly remarks —

“That gigantic spectre, ‘It is everywhere spoken against,’ should have occasioned me no delay, had it not come forth inscribed with the mighty names of Augustine, Calvin, Musculus, Twisse, and Vossius. And, although I could not help but entertain, for all those persons, that reverence and honour to which they are entitled — yet, I easily got rid of that difficulty. It was partly by considering myself as having a right to ‘that liberty with which Christ has made us free;’ and partly by opposing to these, the names of other very learned theologians — such as Paraeus, Piscator, Mohnaeus, Lubbertus, Rivet, Cameron, Maccovius, Junius (professor-at Samur), and others who, after the virus of Socinianism had spread, cleared up this truth with great accuracy and caution.” ²

203

¹ *Prolocutor*: presiding officer.

² Prefatio.

The subject is confessedly a difficult and abstruse one, in the present imperfect state of our faculties.

“For what we call darkness and obscurity in Divine things,” says Owen, “is nothing else than their celestial glory and splendour striking on our feeble eyes, the rays of which we are unable to bear in this evanescent life. Hence, God himself, who is light, and ‘in whom is no darkness at all,’ and ‘who clothes himself with light as with a garment’ in respect to us, is said to have made ‘darkness his pavilion.’”¹

I cannot deny myself the pleasure of quoting another passage of his preface, on account of both its beauty and its truth.

“I confess there are many other subjects of our religion on which we might dwell with greater pleasure and satisfaction of mind. Such, I mean, as afford freer and wider scope for ranging through the most delightful meads² of the Holy Scriptures, and contemplating in them the transparent fountains of life and rivers of consolation — subjects which, unencumbered by the thickets of scholastic terms and distinctions, unembarrassed by the impediments and sophisms of an enslaving philosophy, lead sweetly and pleasantly into pure, unmixed, and delightful fellowship with the Father, and with his Son.”

204

The work is dedicated “To the most illustrious, and noble Oliver Cromwell, commander in chief of the army of the Parliament of the English Republic, and the most honourable Chancellor of the University of Oxford.” It went through the press (the printer tells the reader) while the “author was absent in London, about the affairs of the university.” This accounts for some errors in the printing of the book; a fault which is too chargeable on many of the works of Owen. A short answer to it was published by Mr. Thomas Gilbert, then in Shropshire, a particular friend of Dr. Owen’s, and the author of his Epitaph.³ The design of this Tract is to show the possibility of pardon without satisfaction; and that the death of Christ was not absolutely necessary, but of Divine free choice. Baxter says that he also wrote an answer to that book in a brief premonition to his Treatise against infidelity, to decide that controversy.⁴ I apprehend the best decision will be found in the reasonings of the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. 10.1-14, which the reader may consult for his own satisfaction, with the assistance of Owen’s Exposition. An English translation of the Diatriba, by Mr. Hamilton, was published in 1789 with a recommendatory preface by Drs. Stafford and Simpson, and Mr. Ryland, Senior.

“It will be granted,” they say, “by all competent judges, that the author reveals an uncommon acquaintance with his subject; that he has clearly explained the nature of Divine justice, and demonstrated it to be, not merely an arbitrary thing depending upon the sovereign pleasure of the supreme Lawgiver, but essential to the Divine nature.”

The translation, on the whole, is well executed, but rather too literal.

205

The next work which the Doctor produced is a more elaborate performance, in English.

“The doctrine of the Saints’ Perseverance, Explained and Confirmed; or, the certain permanency of their acceptance with God, and sanctification from God, manifested and proved from the eternal principles, the effectual causes, and the external means of it; in the immutability of the nature, decrees, covenant, and promises of God; the oblation and intercession of Jesus Christ; the promises, exhortations, and threatenings of the gospel: improved in its genuine tendency to obedience and consolation; and vindicated in a full answer to the discourse of Mr. John Goodwin against it, in his book entitled,

¹ Ibid.

² [Mead is an intoxicating beverage made of fermented honey and water.](#)

³ *Vindiciae Supremi Dei Domini (cum Deo) Initae: Sive Theses aliquot, et Thesium Instantiae oppositae nuper Doct. Audoeni Diatribae de Justitia Peccati Vindicatrice, etc.* Lond. 1655, 8vo

⁴ Baxter’s own life, part i. p. 116.

‘Redemption redeemed.’ “With some digressions concerning the immediate effects of the death of Christ, personal indwelling of the Spirit, union with Christ, the nature of gospel promises, etc.” — Folio pp. 444. Oxford 1654.

It deserves to be noted that he does not assume the title of D.D. on the first page — a proof of the truth of his reply to Cawdry already quoted; and that he counted it a higher honour to be “John Owen, a servant of Jesus Christ, in the work of the gospel,” than a Doctor of Divinity by human creation.

I have given the extended title of the work, because it may serve as an analysis of its contents which, even if it were practicable within reasonable limits, it would not fit our design to attempt it. We have first a dedication to “His Highness, Oliver, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland,” in which he expresses his confidence in Cromwell’s Christian character, and his interest in the subject of the work. Then follows another to the “Heads of Colleges and Halls in the University,” in which he compliments them on their learning, orthodoxy, and steadfastness in the faith.

206

He assures them that “no small portion of the work owed its rise to journeys, and similar avocations from his ordinary course of studies — with some spare hours, for the most part, while absent from all books and assistance whatever.” We then have a Preface to the reader, of forty folio pages, in which he gives a sort of history of the doctrine defended; or of the reception it had formerly met with. And by the way, he enters the lists with Dr. Hammond, on the Episcopal controversy, and the epistles of Ignatius. There is a great deal of learning in the Preface; but it is in so exceedingly rugged a state, as to require no small exercise of patience to labour through it.

John Goodwin, whom he chiefly opposes, was one of the most extraordinary men of his age and profession. He was an Arminian, and a republican; a man of violence and war, both in politics and religion. His opinions, talents, and contests, according to Owen, rendered him an object of no ordinary attention; and his controversial powers were of the highest order. He had a great command of language “trimmed and adorned with all manner of signal improvements.” His expressions swell over all bounds and limits — metaphors, similitudes, parables, all push the current — shallow and wide, but abundantly noisy and imposing —

“Monte decurrens velut amnis, imbres
Quem super notas aluere ripas,
Fervet, immensusque ruit profundo
Pindarus ore.”

One great object of his ‘Redemption redeemed,’ which is neither more nor less than an Arminian system of divinity, is to exhibit the doctrine of his adversaries, as

207

“Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen idem pium”

— a dismal, uncomfortable, fruitless, death-procuring system. Owen takes him up only on one point, and along with the examination of his arguments, brings into view everything of importance which had been urged on the subject by men of the same sentiments in former or in latter times. The work contains a very accurate statement, and a most masterly defence, of the doctrine of perseverance. Every scriptural argument is judiciously brought forward, and no point or circumstance of importance calculated to establish the doctrine, is omitted. Though there is a good deal of controversy, there is not much of the *odium theologicum*.¹ The doctrine is satisfactorily

¹ *Oidium theologicum*: bitterness typical of religious controversies, giving rise to an unyielding refusal to continue a discussion.

vindicated from its alleged tendency to induce carelessness or ungodliness; and is shown to be eminently conducive to the comfort and purification of the people of God. It is rather surprising, when so many of the Doctor's Works have been abridged or republished, that this still remains in the first edition, and is less known than its importance demands. It would be easy to abstract from it all the temporary argumentation with Goodwin, and to leave behind the valuable theological illustration of the doctrine.

The perseverance of the saints is the last of the five contested points between Calvinists and Arminians. But, like all the rest, its defence necessarily involves the discussion of the other four. If the salvation of a sinner is wholly a matter of favour, then it is not conceivable that this favour would commence its operations, and either fail in its ultimate design, or be aborted by the untoward dispositions or fickleness of the creature. This would imply either deficiency in the plan of Sovereign mercy, or caprice in its administration.

208

It forgets that gracious influence is bestowed to correct the tendencies of human corruption, and to preserve from falling, as well as to secure eternal happiness. What is the doctrine of perseverance, but God's method of preserving and perfecting that which he had the exclusive honour to begin? If indeed salvation commences with man, is carried on by his own efforts and completed by his resolution, the matter is entirely altered; and nothing would be more contingent or hopeless than the salvation of any one individual. It may safely be left to the determination of every Christian reader, whether such a scheme has the support of Scripture, is fitted to promote the glory of God, or is adapted to the present state of human nature.

The perseverance of the saints is a doctrine which, rightly understood, has afforded much solid comfort to Christians; and in its very nature it is fitted to produce this effect. The conviction that the unchangeable love and the almighty power of God are engaged for the preservation and eternal happiness of a fallen creature, must produce the strongest emotions of gratitude, and the highest feelings of moral obligation, in those who have scriptural evidence that they are the subjects of Divine mercy. That the doctrine has often been injudiciously stated and not infrequently abused, is an admission that will no more invalidate its truth than that of any other doctrine of grace — to every one of which the same remark will apply. A remarkable illustration is afforded of the perverted application of the doctrine, in the reported conversation between Dr. Thomas Goodwin and the Protector Cromwell on his deathbed. I am far from being satisfied of the truth of the anecdote, as it is told.

209

It is very probable that such a conversation took place, and I do not doubt that Goodwin might use some rather unsuitable expressions. But neither Cromwell nor Goodwin was so fanatical as to believe that a state of salvation was compatible with living in sin, and dying impenitent. We may have been told the truth, but not the whole truth. The omission of a few sentences may have concealed the explanation given by Goodwin of the sentiment that he is said to have uttered, and the cautions against self-deception which he very probably addressed to the dying Protector. The condition of that man must be awfully dangerous, whose past experience of Divine goodness encourages present delinquency; or whom the securities of the covenant of mercy lead to presumptuous transgression. Owen had no suspicion of such being the tendency of his views of this doctrine. That is evident from the whole treatise, and especially from the awful description which he gives of the fearful apostasy of many who had made a profession of the truth. These are occurrences which are not particular to any age or place — though they may be more numerous and apparent at one time than at another. These are the stumbling-blocks, by which woe comes upon an ignorant world; and by which men are prejudiced against the doctrine of Christ. But still the foundation of God stands sure. It would be highly criminal to explain away important truth,

or to deprive the genuine Christian of a legitimate source of comfort, because the hypocrite may soothe himself to sleep by it, or the licentious may profane it. It is the glory of the gospel that it provides mercy for the very chief of sinners; but if any man is encouraged by this, to continue in sin, the same gospel pronounces his doom. The doctrine which Owen defends, encourages hope in God, but it inculcates fear in respect to ourselves; it cherishes confidence, not by leading us to look back on the past, but forward to the future; and it justifies the expectation of final perseverance only while men continue to persevere.

210

Owen was not the only opponent of Goodwin. Dr. George Kendall attacked his ‘Redemption Redeemed’ in another quarter, in his “Vindication of the doctrine commonly received in the Reformed churches, concerning God’s intentions of special grace and favour to his elect, in the death of Christ,” etc. fol., 1653. It has Owen’s imprimatur, as Vice-chancellor, prefixed in Latin. In it he speaks very honourably of the author and his work. Another reply came from the pen of a zealous and popular Baptist minister, Mr. Thomas Lamb, 4to. 1656. Richard Baxter tried his middle course on this, as on other subjects. He published in 1653, his “Judgment about the perseverance of believers,” to which Kendall replied in his “*Sanctis Sancti.*” — Dr. Kendall, he says, “was a little quick-spirited man, of great ostentation, and a considerable orator and scholar; he thought to advance his reputation by a triumph over John Goodwin and me.” Baxter intended to deprive him of this. But for once, he allowed his adversary to have the last word by submitting to the arbitration of Archbishop Usher who, he says, owned his judgment, but desired us to write against each other no more. ¹ After two or three years’ consideration, Goodwin returned a scoffing reply to so much of the Perseverance of the Saints, as was written (according to Owen) in a quarter of an hour. ²

211

Before this work was published, Owen had another task imposed on him — to reply to John Biddle, the Socinian. This singular person, the acknowledged father of English Anti-trinitarians, was born at Wotton-under-edge, in the county of Gloucester. He was educated in Oxford, where he obtained the reputation of a good scholar. By the influence of leading men in the university, he was elected Master of a free school in the city of Gloucester in 1641. There he soon began to intimate his doubts respecting the doctrine of the Trinity. The communication of a small MS. containing twelve arguments against the Deity of the Holy Spirit, led to his imprisonment as the means of his conviction. After obtaining his liberty, he was brought before Parliament; and by its orders, he was detained in custody for five years. While in prison, however, he published “A Confession of Faith, concerning the Holy Trinity,” 1648. In consequence of this, his life was in imminent danger. For the Presbyterian party ³ in the Long Parliament procured an act to be passed by which the person denying in words, or in writing, the Being of God, the Deity of the Son or Holy Spirit, the distinction of the two natures in Christ, or his atonement — if the indictment were found, and the party did not abjure the error — should *suffer death*, without benefit of clergy. In other parts of this unmerciful statute, Baptists, Independents, Episcopalians, and Arminians, are subjected to inferior punishments. So that, had it been enforced, all except Presbyterians would have been exposed to suffering in their persons, liberty, or property. ⁴ It was in reference to such measures, that Milton remarked indignantly, “New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large.” ⁵

¹ Baxter’s own Life, part i. p. 110.

² Pref. to the Div. Origin of the Scriptures, Ox. 1659.

³ Neal, vol. iii. p. 497.

⁴ Scobel’s Acts. Crosby’s Hist. of the Bap. i. pp. 199-205.

⁵ John Milton, “On the New Forcers of Conscience.” In this poem he attacks the Presbyterian leaders for becoming forcers of thought and conscience as bad as Archbishop Laud and his fellow-prelates had been.

The friends of orthodoxy, however, had not allowed Biddle to write unanswered. He was taken up by Nicholas Estwick, in his "Examination of Mr. Biddle's Confession of Faith;" also by Mr. Matthew Poole, in his "Plea for the Godhead of the Holy Ghost;" and by Francis Cheynel, in his "Divine Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." This exchange was more to the purpose than imprisoning or hanging the unfortunate defender of heresy. Biddle still went on publishing, and produced in 1654, "a Twofold Catechism: the one simply called a Scripture Catechism, the other a brief Scripture Catechism for Children." For this last publication he was again brought before Parliament, his books condemned to be burned, and he was himself once more committed to prison. Greater extremities would probably have followed, if the Protector had not befriended Biddle, and finally sent him out of the way. After the restoration, this unfortunate man at last died in prison. ¹ Biddle was a man of learning, and of a bold and independent mind. By his sufferings, perhaps as much as his writings, he attracted attention to a creed that was then little known in England; but its prevalence in that country since then, has almost blotted out the existence of the party in which his sufferings commenced. So mysterious and unexpected are the revolutions and arrangements of Providence.

The progress of Socinianism in England about this time appears to have excited considerable alarm. Some of the foreign divines interfered in the controversy, such as Johann Cloppenburg, Professor of Divinity in West Frisia. He published a Latin Vindication of the Deity of the Holy Spirit, against John Biddle, 4to. 1652.

Nicholas Arnold, Professor of Theology at Franeker, harshly criticized Biddle's Catechisms, in the Preface to his "Religio Sociniana," 1654. And Maresius, Chief Professor of Divinity at Groningen, attacked them very largely in his "Hydra Socinianismi," published that same year. In the course of doing that, he deplores the sad state of England on account of what he supposed to be the progress of this destructive sect. At home, the provincial Assembly of London issued particular instructions for the education and catechising of youth. ² The Council of State, conceiving that some more complete exposure of Socinianism was necessary, laid its commands on Dr. Owen to undertake this important task.

The Doctor lost no time in executing the work which he had been so honourably invited to write. For the very next year he produced a quarto volume of seven hundred pages, full of profound erudition. "Vindiciae Evangelicae, or the mystery of the Gospel Vindicated, and Socinianism examined; in the consideration and confutation of a Catechism, called a Scripture Catechism, written by John Biddle, M. A., etc.; Oxford, 1655." It is dedicated to the Council of State, at whose request it was published. Next, we have a letter to "his brethren the heads and governors of colleges and halls in Oxford." And then follows a historical preface of seventy pages, addressed to all "who labour in word and doctrine in Great Britain." In this part of the work, he gives a learned and important narrative of the progress of Anti-trinitarianism in the world; but particularly since the reformation.

It is replete with curious information respecting the characters and proceedings of the first founders of the party, and certainly does not place them in a very favourable light. I do not have the means to ascertain how far all the sources from which Owen derived his information are to be depended on. Some abatement should always be made from *ex parte* statements; but I have no doubt, he was fully satisfied with the authenticity and correctness of the testimonies on which he

¹ Biddle's Tracts and Life. Toulmin's *Life of Biddle*, Athen. Ox. ii. p. 197.

² Neal, vol. iv. pp. 135, 136.

depended. After the historical Preface, we have an examination of Mr. Biddle's Preface, which extends to forty-four pages more of preliminary discussion. It concludes thus: —

“Having briefly washed the paint from the porch of Mr. Biddle's fabric; and shown it to be a composition of rotten posts and dead men's bones, whose plaster being removed, their abomination lies naked to all. I will enter the building itself to consider what entertainment he has provided there for those whom, in the entrance, he so subtly and earnestly invites to turn in, and partake of his provisions.”

In prosecuting this determination, the Doctor does not confine himself to Biddle's Catechisms. He takes in with it the Racovian Catechism, the joint work of Smalcius and Moscorovius, Polish Socinians. It is considered to contain the sentiments of the great body of foreign Anti-trinitarians. He also notes that the Annotations of Grotius are strongly tinctured with the poison of Socinianism. Wherever Grotius' comments are at variance with the truth, or conceal it, the Doctor faithfully points it out, and endeavours to confute them.

The body of the work is divided into thirty-five chapters in which he treats at great length, and with great minuteness and ability, every point of the Socinian controversy.

215

The Socinian sentiments respecting the Scriptures; the Divine nature and character; the original and present condition of man; the person, character, and undertaking of Christ; the doctrines of grace, election, and perfect obedience; the resurrection of the dead, and the future condition of the wicked, etc. — all undergo the fullest and most rigid scrutiny. They are proved to be very contrary to what is taught in Scripture, as well as subversive of the foundations of Christianity. It is among the most complete productions in this department of polemical theology. And considering the circumstances in which it was composed, and the short time devoted to it, it is a memorable proof of the powerful intellect, and industrious habits of the celebrated author. It is also the first English work in which the Socinian system is fully examined, and fairly overthrown on Scriptural principles. As numerous and important as the works on this controversy are, which have since been published, I do not hesitate to affirm that so far as the argument from Scripture is concerned, there is scarcely anything of importance in those later ones, which will not be found in the *Vindiciae Evangelicae* of Owen. To the honour of the Evangelical Dissenters, it ought to be mentioned that from the period of this publication to the present day, they have never lacked a man to defend with learning and ability, the great truths of our common faith. From the *Vindiciae* of the Vice-chancellor of Oxford, to the publications of Fuller, and Wardlaw, and Smith, a series of works has appeared among them which will not be easily matched by the writers of any body of Christians, domestic or foreign, in ancient or in modern times.

216

One thing in the *Vindiciae* reveals the author's sagacity, and looks almost like a prediction. Referring to the fearless speculations in which many then indulged, and which were the natural results of the freedom from ecclesiastical tyranny which the country had only begun to enjoy, he asks, “Are not the doctrines of free will, universal redemption, apostasy from grace, the mutability of God, the denial of the resurrection, with the foolish conceits of many about God and Christ, ready to gather under the head of Socinianism?” — “If ever Satan settles on a stated opposition to the gospel, I dare boldly say, it will be on Socinianism.”¹ It is a singular fact that the career of many has been substantially what the Doctor describes here: from Calvinism to Arminianism, to Arianism, and finally to Socinianism. Biddle himself is an example of this course. The celebrated Dr. Priestly, the learned and industrious Kippis, the eloquent and eccentric Robert Robinson, were all, I believe, illustrations of the same kind. If we advert from individuals to the progress of

¹ Pref. p. 69.

communities, the history of many of the old Presbyterian societies in England, and of the once celebrated church of Geneva, it will illustrate the same gradual and fatal deterioration.

In conducting this controversy, I will not say that Owen always maintains that unruffled calmness and placid good-nature which distinguish many other publications of his. At times, he shows in the selection of his epithets, and the structure of his sentences, that he was a man of like passions with others. There is nothing, however, of scurrility or personal abuse. He was too much a Christian and a gentleman to indulge the temper of malevolence, or the language of Billingsgate.

217

Where important truth is concerned, he reproveth sharply. And where he discovers *Latet Anguis in herba* [a snake in the grass], he makes no scruple to drag it out, and to strangle it. He uses no ceremony with the greatest names, where the glory of his Master and the souls of men are at stake. He was a stranger to that kind of courtesy which compliments men as “Christians,” whom an apostle would have considered enemies to the cross of Christ. But at the same time, he reveals that the object of his hostility was their *sentiments*, not their *persons*; and that while he could show no mercy to the former, he could pity and pray for the latter.

The following passage contains so much important instruction on the mode of conducting religious controversy, that I have no doubt the reader will be glad to meet with it.

“That direction which with me is *instar omnium* [equivalent], is a diligent endeavour to have the power of the truth contended for, abiding on our hearts, that we may not contend for *notions*, but for what we have a practical acquaintance with in our own souls. When the heart is cast into the mould of the doctrine which the mind embraces; when the evidence and necessity of the truth abide in us; when it is not the sense of the *words*, but of the *things* in our hearts; when we have communion with God in the doctrine we contend for — *then* we will be garrisoned by the grace of God against all the assaults of men. Without this, all our contending is of no value to ourselves. How am I better off if I can dispute that Christ is God, but have no sense that he is a God in covenant with my soul? What will it avail me to evince by testimonies and arguments, that he has made satisfaction for sin, if through unbelief the wrath of God abides on me?”

218

Will it be any advantage to me in the end, to profess and dispute that God works the conversion of a sinner by the irresistible grace of his Spirit, if I was never experientially acquainted with that opposition to the law of God, which is in my own soul by nature, nor with the efficacy of the exceeding greatness of the power of God in quickening, enlightening, and producing the fruits of obedience? It is the power of the truth in the heart alone, that will make us indeed cling to it in the hour of temptation.”¹

These remarks are equally applicable to every religious discussion, as well as to the Socinian controversy — and indeed, to the whole system of Christianity. He is not a Christian who is one outwardly; religion does not consist in a spirit, or even a capacity for disputing about it. We have no more Christian knowledge than what influences the dispositions, and regulates the conduct — all the rest is but barren speculation which inflates the mind, and is opposed to the love which builds up. It is possible to contend for truth in a spirit that is most opposite to its nature; and to most hotly advocate the rights of a cause from which we ourselves may derive no benefit. In all cases, it should be remembered that the wrath of man does not work the righteousness of God.

No answer that I can find, was ever made to this work. I do not know whether this arose from the circumstances of Biddle at the time (which certainly were not favourable to the defence of his sentiments), or from a conscious inability to meet the body of argument contained in the *Vindiciae*. But so it is: the first complete examination of Socinianism, published in England, remains unanswered to this day; and I may add, it will remain unanswerable.

¹ Pref. pp.68-69.

The next thing he published is a short treatise “On the Mortification of Sin in Believers,” 1656. He was led to this by observing the general behaviour of professors of Christ, the snares by which they were entangled, and the injudicious attempts of some to mortify sin without the influence of the gospel principle. ¹ Too much reason has always existed for this complaint. Selfishness, the love of ease and of pleasure, fear of the world’s frown, and desire for its applause, have an awful tendency to cherish that self-delusion by which, it is to be feared, too many who profess Christianity are finally destroyed. This treatise is the substance of some sermons on Romans 8.13. At the desire of those who heard them, Owen was induced to commit them to the press. He was also influenced by another consideration. Having been engaged for some time in the discussion of various controversies (in some degree imposed upon him), he wished to produce something of a different nature, and likely to be more generally useful.

“I hope,” he says, “I may own in sincerity, that my heart’s desire to God, and the chief object of my life in the station in which the good Providence of God has placed me, are that mortification and universal holiness may be promoted in my own life, and in that of others, to the glory of God.”

It is certainly one of the strongest proofs of the greatness of Owen’s mind, and of the eminent degree of spirituality to which he had attained, that amidst the multiplicity of his public labours in which he was deeply engaged — the cultivation of general knowledge, the noise of political warfare, and the perplexities of theological warfare — he found not only the *time*, but the *capacity* for thinking upon such subjects as this.

To maintain the life of godliness and the ardour of devotional feeling, amidst the bustle of a court, or surrounded by the cooling atmosphere of a college — these are attainments of no ordinary kind. Yet, if we may judge of the state of his mind from the tract before us, he must have possessed the faculty of looking off from “things seen and temporal,” when exposed to the full force of their influence, “to things unseen and eternal.” It reveals a profound acquaintance with the corruption of the human heart, and the deceitful workings of the natural mind. Its principles are equally remote from the superficiality of general profession, and from ascetic austerity. It is not the mortification of a voluntary humility, or the infliction of self-devised and unnecessary pain, which it recommends. Rather, it is the gradual weakening and final destruction of the principle of sin, by the operation of spiritual influence, and the application of Divine truth. The life of Christianity consists in this process; and where it is not going on, neither the practice nor the enjoyment of the gospel will be found.

About this time, also, he was involved in a controversy with Dr. Hammond, concerning the sentiments of Grotius about the Deity and atonement of Christ. Grotius was one of the most elegant and distinguished writers of the seventeenth century. During a period which abounded with critics and commentators, civilians and theologians, he appeared in the first rank in all those classes. His name still carries an influence and authority which, comparatively, few others enjoy. He, undoubtedly, studied the sacred books with deep attention, and brought the vast extent of his critical and classical attainments to bear with happy effect on many obscure and difficult passages.

In the elucidation of the Bible from the classic literature of Greece and Rome, he may be considered almost the founder of a school on the Continent, from which have issued many learned and important (and not a few exceedingly pernicious) works on the Scriptures. These are works in which the sacred volume is considered merely as an ancient classic — in which its inspiration and all its peculiar doctrines are either denied, or submerged in critical contention about its words

¹ Preface. [Principle refers to a governing rule of life – that which drives, guides, and measures our conduct.](#)

and idioms — and all that is interesting to a sinner or a believer, has been cooled down by a freezing mixture of Arminianism, Socinianism, and Infidelity. The Scholia of Grotius on the Old Testament,¹ were first published in 1644, and those on the New, in 1641, 1646, and 1650. The two last volumes were posthumous, as their author died in 1645. They excited, as might be expected, great attention in the learned world. But in both these, and some other of his writings, Grotius exposed himself to various criticisms. Suspicions had been long entertained that his views of the Divine character, and the atoning sacrifice of Christ, were not strictly orthodox — though these suspicions had been excited by his silence, or his very guarded language on these subjects, rather than by what he actually advanced. He had published in 1617, a Defence of the Catholic Faith, concerning the satisfaction of Christ, against Faustus Socinus. While he opposed the Socinians, some friends to the atonement were doubtful whether he had rendered any important service to the orthodox belief. Ravensperger, a theological professor at Groningen, soon after published his “Judgment” of this “*Defensio Fidei*” by Grotius.

222

This occasioned Gerardus Joannes Vossius to publish an answer, in defence of Grotius. Crellius replied to Grotius, on the part of the Socinians. He was not answered by Grotius himself — who wrote a complimentary letter to Crellius, and took no further trouble to put either his friends or his enemies right — but by Andreas Essenius, in his “Triumphus Crucis.” While he defends the atonement, and repels Crellius, he is extremely sparing of his praises of Grotius. ²

In the Preface to his work on the Perseverance of the Saints, Dr. Owen had made some observations on the epistles of Ignatius, in connexion with the Episcopal controversy; and also of some of the annotations of Grotius on the Socinian tendency. Hammond, the champion of Episcopacy at the time, took up both these subjects in, “A Defence of Grotius, and an Answer to the Dissertations concerning the epistles of Ignatius.” 1655. Owen, in his “*Vindiciae*,” goes into the sentiments of Grotius more fully. Without alleging the evidence against that celebrated man from his epistle to Crellius, and his conversation on his death-bed, Owen examines all the passages of Scripture which treat the deity and atonement of Christ. And as he goes along, he notes how generally Grotius, in his commentaries, agrees with the Socinians; and that there is scarcely a passage in the Old or New Testament on these subjects, which he does not darken, explain away, or expressly contradict. Against these criticisms, Dr. Hammond published a second Defence of Grotius, in 1655. That produced, in 1656, a quarto pamphlet by Owen: “A Review of the Annotations of Grotius, in reference to the doctrine of the Deity, and satisfaction of Christ; with a defence of the charge formerly laid against them.”

223

In this treatise, he reaffirms and successfully establishes what he formerly asserted; and as Hammond had not met the charge against Grotius directly, Owen intimates that he was likely to continue having the same sentiments, should he see even a “Third Defence.” Accordingly, that soon appeared in “A continuation of the Defence of Grotius, in an answer to the Review of his Annotations.” 1657. Here Hammond rests the defence of his hero on Grotius’ work “*De Satisfactione*;” and on the denial that Grotius’ posthumous work on the epistles was properly his, as it contained sentiments contrary to his declared opinions in his life. Without pronouncing a positive opinion on the subject of dispute, it must be admitted that Grotius afforded strong reasons for suspecting that he either did not believe the doctrines referred to, or that he considered them of inferior importance. Dr. Hammond, the opponent of Owen on this occasion, was a man of talents, learning, and character. He was one of the most ardent defenders of his church, and a most devoted servant of Charles, its royal head; he had no serious objections to

¹ *Scholia*: marginal notes written by a commentator on ancient literature – in this case, on the Bible.

² Watchii Bib. Selecta, tom. i. p. 912.

Charles' love of power and popery. His New Testament commentary shows him to have been a considerable critic, though influenced by strong systematic prejudices. His controversial writings reveal more of learning than of judgment, and mark a greater deference to the authority of Fathers and Councils, than to that of Christ and his Apostles.

It would be improper to conclude this part of the life of Owen, without noting the death of three eminent individuals with whom he had some connexion, and who possessed the greatest share of learning, perhaps, of any persons in England during that period.

224

The first of these is the well-known puritan, Thomas Gataker, who died in 1654, in the 80th year of his age. This learned and laborious man was a member of the Westminster Assembly, but more celebrated for his critical writings than for his connexion with that body. He was undoubtedly the most enlightened biblical critic of his day in England. His treatise, "On the Nature and Use of Lots," 1619, established his character as a theologian. His "Dissertatio de Novi Testamento Stylo," 1648; and his *Cinnus*, 1651 (completed by his son in 1659, under the title of "Adversaria Miscellanea Posthuma"), contained remarks on difficult passages of Scripture, and of other Greek and Latin Writers. They exhibit his profound acquaintance with the Bible, and with the principles of enlightened interpretation. His admirable edition of the emperor Marcus Antoninus's Meditations, with a Latin translation, commentary, and introductory dissertation, 1652, exhibit his vast acquaintance with ancient philosophy, as well as his entire command of Grecian literature. In 1698, the celebrated Witsius published all his critical writings in one volume, folio, entitled, "Opera Critica," which will long remain a monument of his vast erudition, and accurate judgment. Owen and Gataker are introduced in a rather singular connexion, as opponents of that knavish impostor, William Lilly, the astrologer. Strange as it may seem, this fellow was consulted by some of the greatest men of the age — Lord Fairfax, King Charles I, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, Cromwell, etc. The study of astrology was much cultivated in England about this time. John Booker, Dr. Dee, Dr. Forman, Sir Christopher Heydon, are all noted for their practice and defences of judicial astrology.

225

The chief opponents of Lilly, according to his own account, were Gataker, with whom he had a lengthened controversy — Philip Nye, who also "bleated forth his judgment publicly, against him and astrology — and Dean Owen of Christ Church, who, he says, had sharp invectives against me in his sermons; I cried quittance with him by urging Abbot Panormitam's judgment of astrology contrary to Owen's, and concluded that an Abbot was an ace above a Dean." ¹ These are only some of the many proofs that the Puritans and Independents were not the visionary fanatics of the age.

Selden died in the same year as Gataker. He was the glory of England as a patriot, lawyer, and writer. — No layman of the age possessed half the erudition of Selden, and few men have benefitted their country so much by their pen as he did. His "Uxor Hebraica," his "Libri de Successionibus," "De Diis Syris," "De Synedriis Veterum Hebraeorum," etc. show his vast acquaintance with Jewish and Oriental learning; while his works "On Tithes," "Titles of Honour," and "Mare Clausum" — or the right of Britain to the dominion of the surrounding seas — afford no less powerful evidence of his researches as an antiquary, and his attainments as a general scholar. Along with Owen, he was the staunch friend of the university of Oxford. They appear to have combined their influence to save it from various dangers to which it was exposed. ²

226

¹ Lilly's life, by himself, *passim*.

² Walker's *Suff. of the Clergy*, part ii. p. 132.

In the year 1656, the learned and amiable Archbishop Usher died. He was a lover of peace, of moderation, and of all good men. His chronological labours alone are ample proof of his learning and industry. And some of his minor productions afford satisfactory evidence that his critical attainments were far above mediocrity. He was the object of Cromwell's favour, who ordered him a public funeral. And the language of Owen in one of his works shows that there must have been a considerable intimacy between Usher and himself. ¹ The death of such men must have been felt as a public calamity. Their talents were exerted for their country's good, their learning adorned the age in which they lived, and their venerable piety graced the profession of the gospel.

¹ Dedicatory Epis. to the Divine Origin, of the Scriptures.

CHAPTER IX.

The Independents propose to publish a Confession of their faith — Their sentiments on this subject — Confessions published by them on various occasions — Cromwell consents to their meeting for this purpose — They assemble at the Savoy — Agree to a declaration of their faith and Order — Its sentiments on several subjects — Extracts from the Preface written by Owen — Baxter's displeasure with the meeting — Defence of it by Forbes — Chief objection to the Declaration — Not much known even among Independents — Death of Cromwell — State of religion during his Government — His influence on Independency — Tillotson's account of a fast in the family of Richard Cromwell — Strictures on that account — Owen publishes his work on Communion — On Schism — Is answered by Hammond — by Firmin — by Cawdry — Owen's Review of Cawdry — Cawdry's rejoinder — Owen's defence of himself and Cotton — Publishes on the Divine Origin of the Scriptures — His considerations on the Polyglot — Walton's Reply — His controversy with the Quakers — Richard Cromwell succeeds his Father — Owen preaches before his first Parliament — Charged with pulling down Richard — Defended from this charge — Assists in restoring the long Parliament — Preaches before it for the last time — The Independents entertain fears of their liberty from Monk — Send a deputation to him to Scotland — His conduct and character — Owen ejected from the Deanery of Christ Church — Remarks on his political conduct.

In the year 1658, the leading men among the Independent Churches projected a General Meeting for the purpose of publishing a united declaration of their faith and order. The part which Dr. Owen took in this meeting, the misunderstanding which prevails respecting the sentiments of Independents on the subject of Confessions of Faith, and the importance of the document published by the Savoy Assembly (for ascertaining their sentiments at this time on various points), are sufficient reasons for giving a detailed account of this affair.

No one who requires a Confession of Faith in order to enjoy Christian privileges can consistently object to a Church confessing the faith in its corporate capacity.

228

If one Society may lawfully do this, no reasonable objection can exist why any number of Societies, holding the same sentiments, may not exhibit their common belief. The public teaching and practice of a Church are constant declarations of its principles; and it surely cannot be wrong to do by the press, that which is constantly done by word and action in the place of worship. Independents have never held the unlawfulness of publishing declarations or *expositions of their existing sentiments and practice*. And if this is all that is meant by *Confessions of Faith*, then it is wrong to represent Independents as enemies of them. But these public formularies are generally viewed in a very different light. They are used as standards and tests by which the faith and orthodoxy of present and future generations are to be tried; and to which a solemn subscription or oath is required, binding the subscriber to abide all his life in the principles thus professed. ¹ When extending to a large book of human composition, when made a test of character, and a qualification for office, and an evidence of unity — *this* is what Independents object to — as what the law of Christ does *not* enjoin; and what has *never* promoted the peace, purity, or unity of the Church; and what has powerfully retarded the progress of truth.

The proper view of a Confession of Faith, and the distinction that is now noted, are very accurately stated in the Preface to the Savoy Declaration.

“The most genuine and material use of such Confessions is that under the same form of words, they express the substance of the same common salvation or unity of their faith; and accordingly, such a transaction is to be looked upon only as a means of expressing their common faith, and in no way is it to be made use of as an imposition upon anyone. Whatever is of force or constraint in matters of this nature, causes them to degenerate from the name and nature of Confessions, and turns them into *exactions* and *impositions* of Faith.”

229

¹ See Dunlop on the ends and uses of Creeds and Confessions; and the Confessional of Arch-deacon Blackburn, for the *pro* and *con* of this subject.

With these views, Independents have almost from the commencement of their existence, published declarations of their belief. In 1596 was published, “A true Confession of the Faith, and humble acknowledgement of the allegiance, which we, her Majesty’s subjects, falsely called Brownists, hold toward God, and yield to her Majesty and all others who are over us in the Lord.” In 1604, if not earlier, appeared an “apology or defence of such true Christians, as are commonly, but erroneously called Brownists,” etc. This work was published both in Latin and English, and was addressed to the Continental and British Universities. ¹ In 1611, “The English people remaining at Amsterdam” (Baptist Independents) published a declaration of their Faith. In 1620, King James’ “Loyal subjects, unjustly called Anabaptists, presented to him and to Parliament a Confession of their Faith.” A Confession of Faith of seven Baptist Churches in London was published in 1646; and another of several Congregations in the county of Somerset, in 1656. In all these documents, the most explicit avowal is made of all the doctrines of the Gospel, and of the leading points of Christian practice.

230

Nor are they less explicit on the subject of obedience to Government, than of faith in God. So false have always been the charges of disloyalty brought against this body.

In the year 1648, the Congregational Churches in New England held a meeting at Cambridge, where they agreed to the doctrinal part of the Westminster Confession, and formed a platform of Church discipline suited to their own principles. Various reasons might be assigned why the British Congregationalists had not sooner done the same. The profession had been long prosecuted — most of the Churches owed their origin to peculiar circumstances, were far scattered from each other, and had not enjoyed the opportunity of meeting together for any common object. They thus allude to these things in the Preface to the Savoy Declaration.

“We confess that from the very first, all, or at least most of our Churches have been in a way, like so many ships. Though flying the same general colours, they were launched singly, sailing apart and alone on the vast ocean of these tumultuous times. They were exposed to every wind of doctrine, under no other conduct than that of the word and spirit, and of their particular elders and principal brethren. They were without Associations among themselves, nor so much as holding out common lights to others by which to know where they were. Yet, while we thus confess to our shame this neglect, let all acknowledge that God has ordered it for his greater glory, in that his singular care and power should have so watched over each of these, that all should be found to have steered their course by the same chart, and to have been bound for one and the same port — and that upon the general search now made, the same holy and blessed truths of all sorts, which are current and warrantable among the other Churches of Christ in the world, should be found to be our lading.”

231

During the latter years of Cromwell’s government, they appear to have felt the necessity to publish their united belief on account of their great increase, exhibiting their union in the faith and obedience to Christ, and putting down the many calumnious misrepresentations which had been industriously disseminated to their disadvantage. For this purpose, they applied for liberty to meet to the Protector, without whose sanction they dared not to have assembled. Eachard represents Cromwell as granting permission with great reluctance. This was perhaps the case, though not for the reason which this Historian puts into his mouth — “that the request must be

¹ The designation of Independents is supposed to have been derived from the following sentence in this work. “Coetum quemlibet particularem, esse totam, integrum, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem, immediate et *independentem* (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo.” Cap. v. That the denomination *Independent* was not assumed, but given, is evident from the titles of many of the early defences of the body, and from their repeated protests against the misconstruction which this term occasioned. They claimed to be Independent of other churches merely in the exercise of discipline. In this sense, all other churches profess to be Independent, as no church allows the exercise of authority, or the right of interference, beyond its own body. The work from which I have quoted the above sentence is one of the many proofs that might be adduced, that the Brownists were neither destitute of learning, nor enemies to it.

complied with, or they would involve the nation in blood again.”¹ Oliver knew well that they were not the persons who had involved the country in its calamities; but his security consisted in the division of religious parties rather than their union — and as he had discouraged Presbyterian Associations, consistency required that he not appear friendly to Independent conventions.

His consent being obtained, however, a preparatory meeting was called at London, by the following letter addressed to the ministers in the city and its neighbourhood, by the Clerk of the Protector’s Council.

232

Sir,

The Meeting of the Elders of the Congregational Churches in and about London, is appointed at Mr. (George) Griffiths (preacher in the Charter House) on Monday next, at two o’clock in the afternoon, where you are desired to be present.

Yours to love, and serve you in the Lord.

HENRY SCOBELL.²

June 15, 1658.

This preliminary meeting accordingly took place. By its direction, circular letters were addressed by Mr. George Griffiths to all the Congregational Churches in England and Wales, inviting them to send Messengers to constitute a general meeting to be held at the Savoy, on September 29th following. From a number of the letters in answer to the circular, preserved in Peek’s *Desiderata*, it appears that the Churches were generally favourable to the measure. But some of them very prudently expressed their fears, lest anything of a political nature should be concealed under the cover of this proposed Assembly; and lest it was designed to promote some coalition with the state. The event showed that nothing of this nature was intended.

About two hundred Elders and Messengers, from over one hundred Churches, assembled at the Savoy on the day appointed, and continued together till the twelfth of the following month. They first observed a day of prayer and fasting, after which they considered whether they should adopt the Westminster Confession, or draw up an entirely original one of their own. They preferred the latter resolution, but agreed to keep as near the method of the other as possible. Mr. Griffiths was chosen clerk, and Doctors Owen and Goodwin, Messrs. Nye, Bridge, Caryl, and Greenhill were appointed as a Committee to prepare the heads of agreement. These were brought in every morning, discussed, and the statement to be adopted was unanimously agreed to.

233

The whole of it was afterwards published in 4to, under the title, “A declaration of the Faith and Order, owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England; agreed upon and consented to by their Elders and Messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658.” The Preface is long, and said to have been written by Owen, though subscribed by the whole Committee. The next year it was translated into Latin by Professor Hornbeck, and annexed to his letters to Dury, respecting Independency.³

The Savoy Declaration contains the same views of Christian doctrine as the Westminster Confession; but omits those parts which relate to the power of Synods, Church censures, Marriage and Divorce, and the authority of the civil magistrate in purely religious matters, *and which were*

¹ Neal, vol. iv. 188.

² Peek’s *Desiderata Curiosa*. ii. 591.

³ Neal, vol. iv. pp. 189, 190.

never ratified by Parliament. ¹ Instead of these, it has a chapter at the end, on the Institution of Churches, and the order appointed in them. It may be proper to extract some passages from this, which convey the views of the Churches at that time, and from which it will appear whether the Independents now hold the same leading principles.

On the constitution of churches instituted by Christ, it declares,

“*To each of these churches, he has given all that power and authority which is in any way needful for their carrying on that order in worship and discipline which he has instituted for them to observe, with commands and rules for the due and right exerting and executing of that power.*” Sect. 4.

234

“*Besides these particular churches,*” it maintains, “*Christ has not instituted any more extensive or catholic church, entrusted with power for the administration of his ordinances, or the execution of any authority in his name.*” Sect. 6.

“*The members of these churches,*” it declares, “*are saints by effectual calling, visibly manifested by their profession and walking.*” Sect. 8.

Of office-bearers, it affirms that,

“*The officers appointed by Christ are pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons.*” Sect. 9.

From the terms employed here, it might be supposed that four distinct offices were held by the framers, to be appointed for the church. But in the following sections, they speak of the office of pastor, elder, or teacher, only as distinct from that of deacon. Whatever distinction they might have contended for in the eldership or Presbytery of a congregation, in the exercise of gifts, they appear to have viewed the persons composing it as occupying the same office. While the Declaration speaks of laying on of hands, along with fasting and prayer, as the usual mode of appointment to the pastoral office; it also declares that,

“*Those who are chosen by the church, though not set apart by the imposition of hands, are rightly constituted Ministers of Christ.*” Sect. 13.

And that,

“*no ordination of others, by those who have been formerly ordained, by virtue of the power they have received by their ordination, constitutes them church-officers, without previous consent of a church.*” Sect. 15.

In the administration of the church, it declares that,

“*No person ought to be added to the church, except by its own consent; so that love, without dissimulation, may be preserved among all the members.*” Sect. 17.

On the subject of church censures, and combinations of churches by their messengers, its language is worthy of attention.

235

“*The power of censures being seated by Christ in a particular church, is to be exercised only towards particular members of each church respectively as such; and there is no power given by Him to any Synods or ecclesiastical assemblies to excommunicate, or by their public edicts, to threaten excommunication or other church censures, against churches, magistrates, or their people, on any account — no man being liable to that censure, except upon his personal miscarriage as a member of a particular church.*” Sect. 22.

¹ “We rather give this notice,” say the Prefacers to the Savoy Declaration, “because that copy of the Parliament’s, followed by us, is in few men’s hands; the other as it came from the Assembly, being approved of in Scotland, was printed and hastened into the world, before the Parliament had declared their resolutions about it; and yet it has been, and continues to be, the only copy ordinarily sold, printed, and reprinted for these eleven years.”

But,

“In cases of difficulties or differences either in point of doctrine or administrations — in which either the churches in general are concerned; or any one church in its peace, union, and edification; or any member or members of any church are injured by any proceeding in censures that are not agreeable to truth and order — it is according to the mind of Christ that many churches, holding communion together, by their messengers, meet in Synod or council, to consider *and give their advice* about that matter, to be reported to all the churches concerned. However, these Synods so assembled, *are not entrusted with any church power*, properly so-called, nor with any *jurisdiction over the churches themselves, to exercise any censures over any churches or persons, or to impose their determination on the churches or officers.*”

“Besides these occasional Synods or Councils, Christ has not instituted *any stated Synods in a fixed combination of churches, or their officers*, in lesser or greater assemblies; nor are there any Synods appointed by Christ in a way of *subordination to one another.*” Sect. 27.

236

This language is so very explicit, that it is scarcely possible to misunderstand it. If any are afraid of such meetings of messengers, they have only to consider that they are merely for counsel and advice, and are invested with no authority or power over the churches. They are entirely of a voluntary nature, resulting not from systematic organization, but from the love, union, and agreement existing among the churches. This is a very different thing from the authority claimed by the ecclesiastical assemblies, and the regular gradation of courts in the Presbyterian body. The Savoy Declaration pronounces its disbelief in the entire system of stated and organized subordination.

Independents have always recognised the propriety of meeting when there is any serious evil required to be investigated or removed, or when any general object called for combined exertion. To meet without sufficient business, would only produce evil, and lead to improper interference. A greater degree of union than prevails in some places, would perhaps be desirable. But if this can be obtained only by surrendering the rights of the churches, or by putting power into the hands of fallible men, no doubt can be entertained that it is better to be without it. The union of love and cordial esteem, and that which is the mere result of system or authority, are very different things.

The preface to the Savoy Declaration, from which some extracts have already been made, contains various important statements. It avows that the Independents had always maintained — though at the expense of much opposition —

“The great principle that, among all Christian states and churches, there should be allowed a forbearance and mutual indulgence to saints of all persuasions, who keep to and hold fast the necessary foundations of faith and holiness.” — “We are not ashamed to confess to the whole Christian world, that this has been our constant principle.”

237

They assert that,

“All professing Christians, with their errors which are purely spiritual, and do not entrench and overthrow civil society, are to be borne with, and permitted to enjoy all ordinances and privileges according to their light, as fully as any of their brethren who pretend to the greatest orthodoxy.”

And they solemnly declare that,

“If they had all the power which any of their brethren of different opinions had desired to have over them, or others, they would freely grant this liberty to them all.”

I apprehend that this is the first work of the kind in which these truly noble and Christian sentiments are announced. Happily, it is no longer necessary to defend their justness or advocate their importance.

Referring to the prognostications of future evil, which men who were no prophets had presumed to utter, respecting the tendencies of Independent principles, the Prefacers say this:

“From the beginning of the rearing of these churches, the words of the apostle ¹ have been applied to us, ‘That while we promised liberty to others, we ourselves would become servants of corruption, and be brought in bondage to all sorts of fancies and imaginations.’ ² Yet the whole world may now see, after the experience of many years, that the gracious God has not only kept us in that common unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God, which the whole community of saints have, but also in the same truths, both small and great, that are built on them — that any of the best reformed churches have arrived at in their best times, which were their first times.”

238

The short time they were together — with the business they had to execute, without any previous concert; and the unanimity and harmony which pervaded all their proceedings — they consider these things to be evidence of the presence and goodness of the Lord, and proof that they did not have to seek their faith when they assembled.

It would be foolish to expect that this meeting, or its proceedings, should escape criticism. But it is rather strange that so great a lover of peace as Richard Baxter, should have been its greatest enemy. His language respecting its leading members, particularly Dr. Owen, and respecting some of the expressions in its declaration of Faith, is altogether unworthy of Baxter’s piety and his understanding. ³ Instead of quoting his ill-natured reflections, which really carry their own confutation along with them, the reader would perhaps be better pleased with the testimony of the Rev. James Forbes of Gloucester (one of the members), who was called out by Baxter’s misrepresentations. Making every reasonable allowance for the influence of imagination and party feeling, this Gentleman’s account impresses us strongly in favour of the piety and solemn procedure of this meeting. He says,

“Generally, in the first place, I declare with all the solemn seriousness that the case requires, that though I have now turned seventy, through the goodness of God — and have had occasion in the days of my pilgrimage, to be present at several Synods and meetings of ministers and messengers of churches — there was the most eminent presence of the Lord with those who were then assembled, that I ever knew since I had a being.

239

I never saw the like before or since, and I question whether I shall see the like on this side of glory. It was a kind of heaven on earth, I think, to all who were present. Such rare elaborate speeches my ears never heard before, nor since. All along, there was a most sweet harmony of both hearts and judgments amongst them. Mr. Howe, then Chaplain to Richard the Protector, sat with them. We had some days of prayer and fasting, kept from morning till night; when one had prayed (I speak the truth and do not lie), I thought no one could outdo that person; and so too in preaching. Yet, ordinarily, those who followed, excelled those who went before.” ⁴

If I were disposed to state any particular objection against the Savoy Declaration, it would be one that is not more applicable to it than to most of the productions of the same nature: its excessive minuteness. There is too much of detail under the general heads, and too many explanations — as if it were not enough to believe the general doctrine, but also necessary to receive all the reasons which are assigned for it, and everything it is supposed to imply. This speciality has been the

¹ 2Pet 2.19.

² It is common for some who abuse modern Independents, to profess great respect for the early founders of the denomination. This, however, is a mere pretence — as the same afflictions were endured by them, which are accomplished in their brethren, who are now in the world. Time and juxtaposition produce many curious changes; but truth and piety are still the same, and invariably experience the same treatment.

³ Sylvester’s Baxter, part i. p. 164. Baxter’s Catholic Communion Defended, part v. p. 8.

⁴ Memoirs of Dr. Owen, pp.21-22.

occasion of innumerable contentions; and the multiplication of explanations to prevent them, has only made them more fertile sources of division. The confessions of faith, recorded in Scripture, are all extremely brief, but very comprehensive. And the truths necessary to be believed by all Christians, are often summed up in a single sentence. If all the compilers of Confessions had studied this Scriptural brevity, instead of systematic extension, it would have done well for the peace and unity of the people of God.

240

A copy of this Confession fell into the hands of Peter du Moulin, a French Protestant clergyman of some eminence, which it appears he intended to translate into French, I suppose. But having sent over to England some remarks on it, either addressed to Owen, or which fell into Owen's hands, the Doctor wrote him a letter, which I apprehend put a stop to his future criticisms. From this letter, it is evident that Moulin had either gotten a corrupted copy of the Savoy Declaration, or that he was disposed to corrupt it himself — in his remarks, he charges that it is filled with “palpable contradiction, nonsense, enthusiasm, and false doctrine.” The letter has no date, but from its repeated references to Owen's work on Justification, it must have been written near the end of the Doctor's life. ¹

The Savoy Declaration has never been much known, or generally used, even among Independents. As it was not intended to be a test or bond, and could not be enforced, it has never been regarded as authoritative. The principles of the body are adverse to all such views, or uses, of any merely human production. Being substantially the same as the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, which are more easily found, it seems to have gradually given way to them. ² The reason may, in part, also be found in the very moderate zeal of the Congregational body for the promotion of its distinctive principles.

241

Whether this circumstance is to its credit or its disgrace, is determined as men consider whether these principles are great, or little, or of no importance. It is surely desirable that the members of a Christian community should be able to give a reason for the faith and practice which they follow; and no man should feel indifferent to the progress of what he believes to be truth. Christianity teaches that the kingdom of God does not consist in mere external order or ordinances; but it also teaches that in everything which he observes in the worship of God, “every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind.” ^{Rom 14:5}

The preparatory measures for the meeting at the Savoy had taken place during the life of Oliver Cromwell; but the meeting itself was held after his death. This event occurred on the third of September; a day which the Protector customarily reckoned fortunate, because some of his most celebrated victories having been achieved on it. It is to be hoped it *was* so, even in the end, notwithstanding the language and opinions of his enemies respecting Cromwell. We have frequently spoken of this extraordinary man. It is not the object of this work to detail the deeds of his public life, nor the anecdotes of his private life; to defend his virtues, nor extenuate his faults. The services which he rendered to his country, and to religion, are not unknown; and whatever his motives were, those services were neither few nor small. To the last, his private morals remained untainted; his public regard for religion, and for religious persons, was maintained; and he died with a prayer becoming of a Christian, and not unworthy of the Protector of England.

242

¹ Memoirs, pp. 42-44, where Owen's letter to Du Moulin is inserted; but it is not now of enough importance to reprint.

² Besides the first edition, printed in 1659, I have met with the following editions of the Savoy Declaration. An edition in 18mo, 1688, one in 8vo. 1729; one in Ipswich, in 8vo. 1745, and one in 8vo. published at Oswestry, in 1812.

Baxter's characterisation of him, though he was never intimate with Cromwell, is perhaps just, on the whole; but too long to be inserted here. ¹ We have frequently quoted the opinion of Owen — an opinion formed from much personal intercourse with the Protector, both before and after he rose to that high situation — an opinion, uniformly favourable to Cromwell's character as a man, and as a Christian — and which, though it may have been moderated, was never retracted. I am not prepared to assert that he retained it, in its full extent, to the end. While Cromwell appeared humble, disinterested, and sought his country's good, Owen gloried in him, and viewed him in the light of a saint and a deliverer. When Cromwell's ambition got the better of his patriotism, and made him forget his former professions, Owen left him to defend himself, and their intercourse was interrupted. When afterwards accused of being one of those "who promised Cromwell his life, on his last sickness," ² Owen's reply was short, but satisfactory, "I did not see him in his sickness, nor for some long time before." ³ The reports of the fanatical prayers of Oliver's chaplains are, perhaps, little better founded than this charge.

It is difficult to form an accurate estimate of the true state of religion during the period of Cromwell's government. Judging from certain external appearances, and comparing them with the times which followed, the opinion must be highly favourable. Religion was the language and the garb of the court; prayer and fasting were fashionable exercises; a profession was the road to preferment. Not a play was acted in all England for many years.

243

And from the prince, to the peasant, to the common soldier, the features of Puritanism were universally exhibited. Judging again from the wildness and extravagance of various opinions and practices which then obtained — and from the fanatical slang and hypocritical grimace which were adopted by many, merely to answer a purpose — our opinion will necessarily be unfavourable. The truth, perhaps, lies between the extremes of unqualified censure, and undistinguishing approval. Making all due allowance for the infirmity and sin which were combined with the profession of religion — making every abatement for the inducements, which then encouraged the use of a religious vocabulary — admitting that there was even a large portion of pure fanaticism — we still apprehend that an immense mass of genuine religion would remain. There must have been a large quantity of sterling coin, when there was such a circulation of counterfeit. In the best of the men of that period, there was doubtless a tincture of unscriptural enthusiasm, and the use of a phraseology revolting to the taste of modern times. In many, there was perhaps nothing more. But to infer that, therefore, all was base and unnatural deceit would be unjust and unwise.

"A reformation," says Jortin, "is seldom carried on, without a heat and vehemence which borders on enthusiasm. As Cicero has observed, there never was a great man, *sine afflatu divino* [without divine inspiration]; so too in times of religious contests, there seldom was a man who was very zealous for liberty, both civil and evangelical — and who was a declared active enemy to insolent tyranny, blind superstition, political godliness, bigotry, and pious frauds — who did not have a fervency of zeal which led him, on some occasions, beyond the bounds of sober temperate reason." ⁴

244

The remark of another profound reasoner, far removed from enthusiasm himself, are also deserving of attention.

"Many errors in judgment, and some delusions of Satan intermixed with the work, are not any argument that the work, in general, is not the work of the Spirit of God. However great a pouring out of the Spirit there may be, it is not to be expected that it should be given now, as it was to the apostles, infallibly to

¹ Baxt. Life, part i. pp. 98-101.

² Letter to a friend, p. 9.

³ Sermons and Tracts, p. 617.

⁴ Jortin's Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. p. 270.

guide them in points of Christian doctrine. And if many delusions of Satan appear at the same time that a great religious concern prevails, it is not an argument that the work, in general, is not the work of the Spirit of God, any more than it was an argument in Egypt, that there were no true miracles worked there, because Jannes and Jambres worked false miracles at the same time, by the hand of the devil. Indeed, the same persons may be the subjects of much of the influences of the Spirit of God, and yet, in some things, be led away by the delusions of the devil; and this is no more of a paradox, than many other things that are true of real saints in the present state, where grace dwells with so much corruption, and the new man and the old man subsist together in the same person. If some of those who are thought to be worked upon, fall away into gross errors or scandalous practices, it is no argument that the work, in general, is not the work of the Spirit. Such things are always expected in a time of reformation. If we look into church history, we will find no instance of great revival of religion, that has not been attended with many such things. Thus it was with the Gnostics in the apostles' time; and thus it was with the several sects of Anabaptists in the time of the reformation. So too in England, when vital religion greatly prevailed in the days of Charles I and Oliver Cromwell, such things as these abounded.”¹

245

The application of these judicious remarks is obvious. It is freely admitted that no religion was necessary to make a man talk about “seeking God” — to lead him to hear many sermons, and even to make long prayers. All these things were done by many whose conduct revealed that their pretensions were more than questionable. But when we find along with these, fervent zeal for the fruits of righteousness, the glory of God, and the spiritual and temporal well-being of men; or find active labours in preaching the gospel, or patient suffering on account of it — the aspect of religious profession becomes very different. It is impossible to doubt the sincerity of such persons. Yet such were multitudes in the days of Cromwell, who are reckoned fanatical precisians,² or designing knaves. These very persons became, in the days of Charles II and James, confessors and martyrs for the truth. The two thousand ejected ministers, and the ten thousand people who suffered the loss of goods and of liberty — of country, and even life itself — were for the most part, the generation of the Commonwealth. Their conduct, perseverance, and sufferings show that they were not the sickly dreamers and visionary enthusiasts they have been reckoned, but men of elevated and scriptural piety.

246

During the Commonwealth no system of church government can be considered as having been properly or fully established. The Presbyterians, if any, enjoyed this distinction. But the ministers who occupied the parish churches were of very varied sentiments. Many of them were secret friends to the old Episcopacy and the liturgy. Many were for a reformed Episcopal government. Others thought no form of ecclesiastical polity was of Divine right, nor did they give themselves any concern about the matter. Some were Independents, and a few were Baptists.³ Cromwell's policy encouraged this diversity; as he dreaded the ascendancy of any one party. If the ministers attended to their own duty and did not interfere with his affairs, then whatever their sentiments were on church government, it did not prevent the enjoyment of his favour. This state of things may be considered anarchy and confusion by many; but it may be questioned whether the great ends of the gospel ministry were ever more effectually accomplished in this country, than during this period. No sacrifice of conscience was demanded — no encroachments on religious liberty were practised — no bounds were prescribed to zealous exertion for the good of the souls of men. Every man sat under his vine, and his fig-tree, without fear. — The word of the Lord had *free course*, and was glorified.

¹ *Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God*, by Jonathan Edwards, 1741. pp. 29, 31. The whole Tract is deserving of an attentive perusal.

² *Precisian: An over-precise person; one rigidly or ceremoniously exact in the observance of rules.*

³ Baxter's *Non-conformist's Plea for Peace*, p. 130.

The influence of the life and death of Cromwell on the profession of Independency, which he is supposed to have particularly favoured has, I apprehend, been greatly exaggerated. He has been represented as the chief instrument of promoting the increase and respectability of that party; and his death has been spoken of as the most disastrous event that could befall them.

247

In as much as Independents enjoyed full liberty and protection, and were considered capable of serving their country under the government of Cromwell, they were doubtless indebted to him. It would be exceedingly ungrateful to deny that they enjoyed these blessings in a much greater degree than, in common with others, than they have ever since. For all this, let Cromwell receive the praise to which he is entitled. It does not appear that they were indebted to Cromwell for anything more; and in some respects, his patronage was hurtful to them rather than useful. As a body, they had existed long before his name was known; and their increase and respectability arose from causes altogether independent of him. He might, indeed, be said to have raised *himself* in great measure, by *their* means. He took advantage of their reputation and influence, their love of liberty, and hostility to ecclesiastical domination, to shelter himself and gain his own ends. He climbed on their shoulders to the summit of ambition, and then he unceremoniously discarded or forgot them.

The enjoyment of his favour and patronage, to a certain extent, must have been injurious to the genuine profession of apostolical principles. It may appear strange that an Independent should declare that he has no wish that Independents, *as such*, should become the objects of political patronage. If indeed the glory of a Christian profession consists in mere numbers, or in the enjoyment of wealth, or in the possession of worldly honours, then these views must be extremely foolish. But if its glory consists in the spiritual character and disposition of its members, whether few or many, then the honours of a temporal kingdom have no tendency to promote it. An ingenious member of the Church of England says,

248

“Pure and genuine Christianity never was, nor ever can be, the national religion of any country on earth. It is a gold too refined to be worked up with any human institution, without a large portion of alloy. For no sooner is this small grain of mustard-seed watered with the fertile showers of civil emoluments, than it grows up into a large and spreading tree, under the shelter of whose branches the birds of prey and plunder will not fail to make comfortable habitations for themselves, and from there deface its beauty and destroy its fruit.”¹

When any party of Christians becomes exclusively the object of state favour, it immediately operates as a bounty on that profession. Every man who wishes or hopes to rise, has an inducement to enroll himself under its banners. There will be a visible increase of number and respectability, but a proportional decrease of piety and purity. The Independents never were the objects of this exclusive patronage; but in so far as that profession was considered, during the Commonwealth, to be more acceptable to the ruling powers than any other, I conceive it must have derived *injury* rather than *benefit* from the circumstance. It would induce some of those volatile and unprincipled spirits, which always float in the current of state favour, to hoist the colours of Independency. But they would be pulled down the first change of wind that occurred. Such adventurers, whatever their rank, add no real strength to the effective force of a Christian community; and their dispersion is a blessing rather than a punishment.

249

In another point of view, also, the patronage of Cromwell and his party has been injurious to the character of Independency. In the opinion of many, it has confounded it with revolution and

¹ Disquisitions on several subjects, by Soame Jenyns p. 164.

republicanism. To this day, it is the occasion to represent its adherents as enemies to established government, or at least to monarchical government. I feel no concern to deny that there were Independents then who preferred a republic to a monarchy, especially an unlimited monarchy — as many of the greatest men of the age, though not Independents, did the same. But I feel concerned to maintain that there is no link or connexion between the religious sentiments of Independents, and their views of any form of civil government. And if the favour of Cromwell has led men to believe that Independents are naturally, or necessarily, republicans, it has done them a material injury. In consequence of this mistake, everything of a revolutionary and sanguinary nature during the above period, has, been fearlessly charged by some, against this body. To vindicate it is now unnecessary. It has flourished, in the Scriptural sense of the word, more under a monarchy than ever it did under a Protector. And the body of British Independents has always been reckoned among the friends of the Hanoverian succession, and the steady, uniform, and conscientious supporters of that illustrious house.

“Tillotson told me,” says Bishop Burnet, ¹ “that a week after Cromwell’s death, being at Whitehall by accident, and hearing that there was to be a fast that day in the household, he went out of curiosity into the presence chamber where it was held. Richard was placed on one side of a table, with the rest of Cromwell’s family, and six of the preachers were on the other side — Thomas Goodwin, Owen, Caryl, and Sterry, were of their number.

250

There he heard a great deal of strange stuff, enough to disgust a man forever of that enthusiastic boldness. God was, as it were, reproached with Cromwell’s services, and challenged for taking him away so soon. Goodwin, who had pretended to assure them in a prayer, that he was not to die, which was but a very few minutes before he expired, now had the impudence to say, “You have deceived us, and we were deceived.”

Sterry, praying for Richard, used those indecent words, “Make him the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of his person.” The same story is repeated on the authority of Burnet, in Birch’s life of Tillotson. ²

Without impeaching the veracity either of Tillotson or Burnet, there are circumstances which induce a strong suspicion of the accuracy of the anecdote. The gossiping disposition of Burnet led him to commit many mistakes, and writing down conversations about others long after they were held, was no great security for fidelity. ³ That such a meeting took place is highly probable; but it looks somewhat suspicious that Tillotson, who was then only a divinity stripling without a name, should, from mere curiosity, presume to go into the presence chamber of the Protector on such an occasion. Burnet does not seem to have adverted to the fact that Goodwin’s words, with which Tillotson was offended, are the very words of the prophet Jeremiah, chap. 20.7; and they were used, in all probability, in the very sense in which the prophet employs them — not as denoting what God had done, but only what he had permitted men to do. “You have allowed us to deceive ourselves, and we have been deceived.”

251

Nothing is put into the mouth of Owen; and I am quite satisfied that he was not there. We know from himself, that he had not been with Cromwell on his death-bed, nor long before. He was not one of the household chaplains, and this was a private household fast. He was not a favourite of

¹ Hist. of his own Time, vol. i. p. 116.

² p. 17.

³ “The Bishop’s hearsays,” says Lord Lansdowne, “are, in most cases, very doubtful. His history is little else but ‘such a one told such a one,’ and ‘such a one told me.’ This sort of testimony is allowed in no case; nor can the least certainty be built upon stories handed about from one to another, which must necessarily alter in the several repetitions by different persons.” Lord Lansdowne’s Works, vol. ii. p. 179. — “I have never,” says Sir John Dalrymple, “tried Burnet’s facts by the test of dates and original papers, without finding them wrong.” — Memoirs of Great Britain, p. 34.

Richard's, and therefore not likely to be asked on such an occasion; and still less likely to be a volunteer. The entire story seems a compound of imperfect recollections, exaggerated in the repetition, with a view to get a hit at the fanaticism of Cromwell's chaplains. The denial, on the part of Owen, of assertions as positively made as those above, leads us to receive the testimony of the opposite party with great caution; and where the characters of others are involved, the testimony of bishops and archbishops ought to be subject to the same laws of evidence which regulate that of other men. ¹

252

Besides the works which Dr. Owen published during his Vice-chancellorship, and already noted, he had been engaged in preparing another elaborate performance, which appeared soon after he had relinquished that office: "Of communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each person distinctly, in love, grace, and consolation, etc." 4to. Oxford, 1657. It appears, from a short preface, that he had preached on the subject, and then extended it into a considerable treatise. He first shows that the saints have communion with God in his manifestations of love and grace toward them, and in their returns of holy gratitude, confidence, and joy. He then endeavours to establish from Scripture, that this fellowship is with each of the Divine persons distinctly, as the title of his work imports; and it proceeds at great length to illustrate the nature of this fellowship with the Father in love, with the Son in grace, and with the Holy Spirit in consolation.

There is much delightful and important instruction in this work. Though the subject arises from the first principles of the economy of salvation, it embraces matter which is only adapted to the higher form of the Christian profession. For the full understanding of it, it requires the possession and vigorous exercise of that spiritual faculty which the natural man does not enjoy; and which constitutes the vital principle of the new creature. There is nothing in Christianity corresponding to the *Μυστηριον* (*silence*) of ancient paganism — no esoteric ² doctrines, which are concealed from the common believer. But there are things which those who only stand in the outer court of the temple, do not know; and which are the singular privilege of those who occupy the *penetralia*.³ There is an initiation which must take place, which is the work, not of man, but of God; and without this, the visible apparatus of the gospel appears only like pantomimic exhibition,⁴ unintelligible and unimpressive.

253

The eyes of a natural, sinful creature, cannot look at the invisible things of God. They must undergo an operation similar to unsealing the organs of vision, as though their eyes were covered by a film which shuts out the light of heaven. In plain terms, the mind of man must undergo an

¹ Those who amuse themselves with the prayers and fasting of the Protector, may contrast with the picture drawn by Tillotson, the following scene on the Lord's day evening in the court of his royal successor. It is described by Evelyne, a respectable and religious man, but no fanatic, as he was a devoted friend of the Church and of the royal family. "I can never forget the inexpressible luxury and profaneness, gaming and all dissoluteness, and as it were, total forgetfulness of God, it being Sunday, which I was witness of this day se'nnight. The King sitting and toying with his concubines; Portsmouth, Cleaveland, and Mazarine, etc. A French boy singing love songs in that glorious gallery, while about seventy of the great courtiers and other dissolute persons were at Basset [a card game resembling faro] round a large table, a bank of at least £2000 in gold before them; upon which the gentlemen who were with me made reflections with astonishment." — *Memoirs* vol. i. p. 585. This single scene speaks volumes on the dissoluteness and impiety of the court of Charles, and the awful effects which it must have produced on the country. Looking back but a few years, well might the people exclaim, *O tempora! O mores! [What times! What conduct!]*

² *Esoteric*: confined to and understandable by only an enlightened inner circle (gnostic).

³ *Penetralia*: the innermost parts; *i.e.*, the deep things of God (1Cor 2.10).

⁴ *Pantomime*: gestures and body movements without words; here it means *form without substance*, as though "going through the motions" without understanding.

entire moral revolution — a renewal¹ — in order to understand, relish, and approve the revelations and felicities of the kingdom of God. The grand object of this dispensation is not to restore the doctrines of natural religion; nor to exhibit a perfect code of moral legislation; nor to establish the certainty of a future state. It does embrace all these; and most men considered learned in Christendom rest in these — but its sublime designs reach far beyond these narrow views. They comprehend the communication of a Divine nature to a sinful creature, and the bestowment of all things necessary for its support. This progresses till, ^{Phi 1.6} being completely delivered from the corruptions of this world, the creature receives an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of the Lord and Saviour. ^{2Pet 1.11} Sin destroyed or defaced the work of God. It is the design of the system of mediation to remake it, to create a new world, consisting of one vast renewed family. At the head of this family is placed, not an *earthly man*, frail and mutable, but the only begotten Son — “the Lord from heaven.” ^{1Cor 15.47} Man’s rebellion occasioned disorder in the universe, and interrupted the intercourse between the Creator and the creature. By Christ, all things are again reconciled and re-united. Harmony is again restored, and God once more pronounces His work to be very good. ^{Gen 1.31}

254

Only those who are perfect, ^{1Cor 2.1} that is, divinely taught, ^{1Th 4.9} will enter into these views; and only those are likely to understand the work of Owen on Communion. For what does fellowship with God consist in, but God’s enjoyment of us, and our enjoyment of God, according to the established principles of the ministry of reconciliation? Someone who is destitute of this, knows nothing of the gospel or its great design. He may discuss its *evidences*, speculate about its *doctrines*, and observe its *institutions*, but while he is without its immortalising principle, he is only amusing himself with the leaves, instead of feeding on the fruits of the tree of life.

As evidence of how little understood these sentiments are, even by those who think they are (almost) the only true Christians, I may quote the account which Wood gives of this work.

“In this book he strangely affects, in ambiguous and uncouth words — canting, mystical, and unintelligible phrases — to obscure, sometimes, the plainest and most obvious truths. And at other times he endeavours, by such a mist and cloud of senseless terms, to draw a kind of veil over the most erroneous doctrines.”²

I do not know that there are half-a-dozen words in the whole book, which are not perfectly intelligible to any person who understands English. Nor is there any peculiarity of phraseology, except what distinguishes the author’s style in all his writings. The darkness which Anthony complains of, is in the subject, or rather, it was in himself in relation to that subject. It is not surprising that a blind man does not understand a dissertation on the nature of colours, or that a deaf man imperfectly comprehends the doctrine of acoustics — the lack of the faculty sufficiently explains the reason.

255

It is in no degree more surprising that a man who is a Christian merely by hereditary descent, or by a nominal profession, does not understand the essential glory or excellence of the gospel. “The natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God; nor *can* he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” ^{1Cor 2.14} The deficiency in the one case is physical, and in the other it is moral — which equally affect the perceptions of their subjects. But these are materially different in the responsibility which they involve, as the one is a *misfortune*, and the other is a *crime*.

The strongest objection to the work on Communion is that it is too rigidly systematic. Few, perhaps, will follow out the Doctor’s views to the extent to which he carries them, of *distinct*

¹ More properly, *regeneration* by the Holy Spirit. They must be *reborn* to see the kingdom of God (Joh 3.3). They were dead in their trespasses and sins; but in Christ, they are made alive by God (Eph 2.1-9; Col 2.9-14).

² Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 560.

fellowship with the Father, Son, and Spirit. The groundwork of his illustrations is indeed in Scripture; but the same sort of superstructure does not seem to be reared on it. Too many, or fine distinctions, injure the unity and Divine harmony which pervade the system of revealed grace; and they ill correspond with that lovely freedom and unfettered phraseology, which distinguish the inspired writings. To be indifferent to the importance of correctly expressing ourselves on all the doctrines of revelation, and to affect greater accuracy in treating them than the apostles employ, are extremes which are equally improper and pernicious. If the latter was the fault of Owen and the theological writers of that period, the former is the great evil of the present. It was then impossible to misapprehend the sentiments of the leading writers on every topic of importance connected with Christianity.

256

In regard to many of our most popular theological writers now, it is extremely difficult to ascertain what is their belief on various subjects, and those not of trifling importance — yet they glory in this very circumstance! Whether this arises from imperfect knowledge, from undervaluing some parts of the Christian system, from fear of losing their popularity by boldly avowing objectionable truths, or from all these combined, it is deeply to be regretted. When the writings of such persons have a powerful influence in directing the tone of the public mind, the evil alluded to is of serious magnitude.

This production of Owen's pen is particularly gratifying, considering the situation of the author while it was composed, and as a specimen of the discourses he was in the habit of delivering at Oxford. However much he must have been involved in the dry details of secular business, or secular learning, it shows how his mind was chiefly affected. No man could more boldly contend for the cause of liberty, or more warmly advocate the interests of learning. He was equally an enemy to despotism and Vandalism. But the salvation of Christ, and the spiritual interests of his people, were still the grand objects of his attachment and pursuit. His heart was in his Master's work, and he was alive to all the glory of his undertaking. No subordinate object was allowed to occupy that place in his mind, which spiritual things alone ought to enjoy. And in none of the extended controversies in which he engaged, does he write with such zeal, as on communion with God. This invaluable privilege must have been his solace amidst the distracting labours in which, contrary to his inclinations, he had become involved.

257

He could probably say of the exercise itself, and the labour of writing it, what the amiable Bishop Horne does of his work on the Psalms:

“The employment detached him from the bustle and hurry of life, the din of politics, and the noise of folly. Vanity and vexation flew away for a season; care and disquietude did not come near his dwelling. He arose fresh as the morning to his task; the silence of the night invited him to pursue it; and he can truly say that food and rest were not preferred above it. Every part infinitely improved upon his acquaintance with it, and none gave him uneasiness but the last; for then he grieved that his work was done.”¹

After nearly twenty years had passed, this work on Communion was still unmercifully assailed, and became the subject of a protracted controversy which will afterwards be examined.

Another work, which he produced this year, is of a very different nature. And it immediately occasioned a controversy to which it will now be necessary to attend. This was: “Of Schism, the true nature of it revealed and considered, with reference to the present differences in religion.” 12mo. pp. 280. Ox. 1657. This subject — which somebody justly observes occasioned a schism about the meaning of the word — Owen endeavours to illustrate entirely by the light of revelation. He notes the primary import of the term (a rent or separation of parts in a united substance); and

¹ Horne's Preface to his commentary on Psalms (1812).

its moral or analogical meaning (a division of sentiment or affection, in a religious or political body). He then proceeds to show that the apostles use the term *schism*, merely to describe “causeless differences and contentions among the members of a particular church, contrary to that love, prudence, and forbearance, which ought to be exercised towards one another.”

258

That anyone may be guilty of the sin of Schism,

“he must be a member of some one church, constituted by Jesus Christ; and in it, he raises causeless differences with others, to the interruption of Christian love, and the disturbance of the due performance of the duties required of the church in the worship of God.”¹

Hence, it follows that the separation of one church (or many churches) from other churches, is never described as schism in Scripture — especially if the body that is seceded from is not of Divine appointment in its constitution. And it also follows that the separation of an individual from any church, on account of what affects his conscience, is not the sin of schism. Hence, all the abusive language of Romanists against Protestants, and Episcopalians against Presbyterians, and Presbyterians against Independents — as being *schismatics* — is utterly misplaced. Whether any are guilty of this evil, does not depend on the circumstance of separation, but on the merits of the case, and other parts of conduct. Owen’s view of the subject is precisely the same as Dr. Campbell’s in his valuable dissertation on this word *schism*; the reader is referred to it for further satisfaction as to its scriptural import and use.²

What a fruitful source of theological altercation would be dried up, if this were the interpretation of the term that is adhered to! But this would not suit the purpose of those who most delight in hurling the *brutum fulmen*³ against others. It is a fine thing to make an adversary odious, to fix on him the character of a schismatic — though it may more justly belong to the one whose unchristian conduct probably occasioned the separation.

259

“Schism,” says the celebrated Hales of Eaton, “has long been one of those theological scarecrows with which those who wish to uphold a party in religion, use to frighten those who, making any inquiry, are ready to relinquish or oppose it, if it appears either erroneous or suspicious.”⁴ It is worthy of remark that the hideous nature of it is seldom urged, except toward those who leave a community. Let as many schismatics as they please, come from *other* bodies *into* their own community; it is never hinted that they have been guilty of this crime. This is a strong proof that the sin of schism is deplored chiefly when it is an offence against men’s interests, feelings, or authority. Such persons should think of the witty Vincent Alsop’s remark: —

“Schism is an ecclesiastical cannon which, being overcharged and ill managed, recoils and hurts the cannoneer. He that undertakes to play this great gun needs to be very careful, and sponge it well, lest it fire at home.”⁵

Owen’s work had little connexion with any party sentiments, as its principle was equally available to all parties of Protestants. Yet, all of them being *schismatics* in the ordinary sense of the term (in their relation to others), it soon met with several opponents. The first of these was Dr. Hammond, who subjoined to his continuation of the Defence of Grotius, “A reply to some passages

¹ pp. 43, 44.

² Diss. ix, part iii.

³ *Brutum fulmen: an empty (baseless) threat.*

⁴ Works, vol. i, p. 114. *That is, they use it to silence any questions or challenges, voiced by the timid.*

⁵ Mellus Inquirend, p. 209.

of the Reviewer in his late book about Schism.” his reply relates chiefly to the state of Episcopacy in the times succeeding the apostles; and on this account, Owen took little notice of it.

260

Another answer was from the pen of Mr., Giles Firmin, who wrote “Of Schism, Parochial Congregations, and Ordination by imposition of hands, in which Dr. Owen’s revealing of the true nature of Schism is briefly and friendly examined.” 8vo. pp. 157. 1658. The book corresponds with the title, and is written in a very Christian spirit. The object of it is to show that Schism may be a more extensive evil than Dr. Owen’s definition admits. He therefore defines it, “The dissolution of that unity which Christ, our Lord, requires in his church” — which may extend to the whole visible profession of Christianity. This of course depends on the extension of the analogical meaning of the term. But on the whole, there is no very material difference between Owen and Firmin. Alluding to him, the Doctor said, rather severely, that Firmin neither understood him, nor the things which he wrote about. ¹ Mr. Firmin had been in New England several years; but when he wrote this treatise, he was pastor of the church at Shalford, in Essex. He was a very respectable man; an eminent scholar, especially in the Oriental languages — well read in the Fathers, Church history, and religious controversies. ² If he was a Presbyterian, he was so moderate a one, as to be mistaken by Edwards (of Gangrene celebrity) for an Independent.

But the most violent adversary of the Doctor on this occasion, was Mr. Daniel Cawdry, “Preacher of the word at Billingmagn, Northamptonshire” — a high-flying Presbyterian. He produced, in the same year in which the Doctor’s work appeared, a pamphlet, the title of which at once begs the question, and forestalls the proof; “Independency a great schism.” 12mo. pp. 200. Lond. 1657.

261

The first sentence of this work corresponds with what we said about the use made of the charge of Schism, and with the dogmatic title of the book. “The crime of Schism is so heinous in itself, and so dangerous and noxious to the cause of God, that no invectives against the evils of it can well be too great or high.” So all parties have exclaimed (who arrogate to themselves the exclusive character of the true church) against those who have had the temerity to call into question their claims, and to dissent from their fellowship.

When it is stated that this fiery zealot speaks of “reaping with lamentation the cursed fruits of toleration and forbearance in religion;” that he represents toleration as “doing more towards rooting religion out of the hearts of men in seven years, than enforcing uniformity did in seventy;” and that he generally terms it “a cursed, intolerable toleration;” — the reader will easily guess at his spirit, and perhaps have little inclination to examine his arguments. The design of the pamphlet is to prove that Independents had been guilty of a great schism in gathering churches out of Presbyterian congregations. This was the unpardonable sin of which they were considered guilty at this period. In many instances, it was not true. For in reply to this very charge, the Prefacers to the Savoy Declaration say: —

“Let it be further considered that we have not broken from them, or their order, by these differences — rather, they broke from us. And in that respect, we less deserve their censure, our practice being no other than what it was in our breaking from Episcopacy — and long before Presbytery, or any such form as they are now in, was taken up by them. And we will not say how probable it is that the yoke of Episcopacy would have been upon our neck to this day, if some such way, as formerly and is now termed *Schism*, had not been practised with much suffering, and since continued in.”

262

¹ Pref. to Div. Origin. of the Scriptures.

² Nonconf. Mem. vol. ii. pp. 214-216.

But Cawdry had more objects than one to accomplish by his work. It contained an Appendix, "Showing the inconstancy of the Doctor; and the inconsistency of his former and present opinions." The proof of Owen's inconstancy and inconsistency amounts to this: in 1643, being then connected with the Presbyterians, he published a Treatise in which he speaks on some points *as a Presbyterian*. In 1657, having been an Independent for at least ten years — as all the world knew — he published a book which contains sentiments bearing upon Independency. Ergo, Owen is inconsistent and unstable! Alas! for the logic of poor Daniel Cawdry. Men sometimes endeavour to bring an opponent into disgrace by such pitiful means.

Owen was not hesitant to reply. In the course of a few weeks he produced, "A Review of the true nature of Schism, with a Vindication of the Congregational Churches in England, from the imputation thereof, unjustly charged on them by Mr. Daniel Cawdry. Ox. 1657." 12mo. pp. 181. He assures us in the Preface, that it was the work of only four or five days, which was all the time he could devote to it, and all he thought it deserved. He meets and repels the charges of his adversary with much firmness, and strengthens his original position. He informs us, "That such was his unhappiness, or rather happiness, in the constant intercourse he had with Presbyterians, both Scotch and English, which was utterly of another frame of spirit — that, till he saw this treatise, he did not believe there remained one godly person in England of such dispositions, in reference to present differences."

263

He successfully shows that Cawdry had completely failed in making out his charge of Schism and of inconsistency, against his brethren and Owen. He concludes the defence of his changes, which we have fully narrated, by simply remarking, "Whoever can glory that in fourteen years he has not altered his conceptions of some things, shall not have me for his rival." ¹

The controversy did not terminate here. The next year Cawdry returned to the charge, in "Independency further proved to be a Schism, etc." 12mo. 1658. pp. 158. This production abounds with personalities, though the author feels that he had already committed himself. Indeed, Cawdry seems to have been a contradiction hunter, for this is not his first attack of the same kind on Independency, and on the personal characters of those who professed it. He had published, in 1645, a 4to. volume, "*Vindiciae Clavium*," against "Cotton's Keys of the kingdom of Heaven." — And in 1651, another 4to. in vindication of it — "The inconsistency of the Independent way with Scripture and itself;" in which he reveals the same rancorous spirit against Cotton and Hooker, which he does in his attack on Owen; and the same zealous desire to find contradictions, with little more success. The manuscript of Cotton's reply to the personal charges of Cawdry, had come into Dr. Owen's hands, just as his own answer had gone through the press. Therefore, immediately after the second attack of Cawdry appeared, Owen published — "A Defence of Mr. John Cotton from the imputation of self-contradiction, charged on him by Mr. Daniel Cawdry: written by himself, not long before his death: To which is prefixed, an Answer to a late Treatise of the said Mr., Cawdry, about the nature of Schism." 12mo. Ox. 1658.

264

This small treatise is nearly equally divided between Cotton and Owen. The Doctor shows that Cawdry and his brethren were as loudly, and with more apparent justice, charged with being Schismatics by the Episcopalians, as the Independents were by the Presbyterians.

"For we deny," he says, "that since the gospel came into England, the Presbyterian government, as stated by them, was ever set up except by the *wishes* of a party of men. So that here still, unless as it lies in particular congregations, where our right is as good as theirs, none have separated from it that I know of,

¹ p. 15.

though many cannot consent to it. *The first ages we plead are ours*; the following were unquestionably Episcopal.” p. 79. ¹

Cotton, whose defence the Doctor published, was a person for whom Owen had very high respect. He was a man of extensive learning, solid piety, and laborious exertion in the cause of Christ. Owen had been, in part, indebted to his writings for his own sentiments as an Independent. He was one of the first of the New England Congregationalists who wrote on the subject of church government. His writings had a very extensive influence, both in that country, and in England. His work on “The Keys of the kingdom of Heaven,” contains the substance of the argument for the Independent polity. Though he occasionally uses language in it which few Independents would now be disposed to employ; and he speaks of the power of councils in a way that is not consistent with his leading principles.

265

On the subject of the Magistrate’s interference in religion, also, both his writings and his conduct prove that, in some respects, he was far from perfection. This was not the first attack he had to sustain on his Work on the Keys. It had been taken up by Baillie in his “Dissuasive from the errors of the times;” in which Cotton and his brethren were loaded with calumnies and defamation; — and by Samuel Rutherford, with more argument and moderation, in his “Due right of Presbyteries;” — and by Cawdry, as I already noted, in his “*Vindiciae Clavium*.” Cotton replied to all these with much Christian temper, in his “Way of the Congregational Churches cleared” from the aspersions of Baillie, the contradictions of Cawdry, and the misconstructions of Rutherford. These works, which were mostly considerable volumes, show how deeply the controversy about Church Government then occupied the minds of men; and how keenly some of the leading writers of the period engaged in it. Those who wish to know all that is possible to be said for Presbytery and Independency, have only to consult them. They contain much extraneous matter, and a great lack of moderation on both sides. But they literally exhaust the subject, and I suppose they must have exhausted the writers themselves, nearly as much as they now exhaust the reader. It is matter of wonder and regret, that the subject could not be disposed of with less labour, and less acrimony. The last defence of Cotton, and Owen’s vindictory preface, put an end to his collisions with Cawdry, and to the Schism controversy. And here terminates our account of it. “*Gaudete omnes arenam video.*” [*Rejoice all in the arena, who see it.*]

266

Owen’s next work, which was produced partly in 1658, and partly in the following year, is a thick 12mo volume. The nature and objects of it are fully explained in the extended title page.

“Of the Divine origin, authority, self-evidencing light, and power of the Scriptures. With an Answer to that Enquiry, How we know the Scriptures are the word of God. Also, a Vindication of the purity and integrity of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testament; in some considerations on the *Prolegomena*, and Appendix to the recent *Biblia Polyglotta*. To which are subjoined some exercises ² about the nature and perfection of the Scripture, the right of interpretation, internal light, revelation, etc.”

This is rather a curious miscellany. Prefixed to the whole contents is a dedication to, “His reverend and worthy friends, the Prebends of Christ Church College, with all the Students in Divinity in that Society.” In the first tract are some very excellent observations on what is generally understood by the *internal evidence* of the Bible; or that which satisfies the mind of a Christian,

¹ The wording is a bit obtuse. Owen is saying that the church of England was not originally Presbyterian – as that party readily admits. If anything, it was a group of independent churches. When it changed to an Episcopacy, none claimed to be separating from Independency in order to create that Episcopacy. Essentially, Owen asks why it is now an issue to *remain* Independent, as the English church was originally? That’s not “schism;” it’s standing firm. That corresponds with the Savoy Preface (p. 261 above) saying *they* didn’t break away; the *others* did. See also p. 299 below. – WHG

² Orig. “*exercitations*” - a discourse performed as a display of skill, or to unravel the intricacies of some subject.

that in trusting to the revealed method of salvation, he is not following a cunningly devised fable. The Doctor rests his reasonings chiefly on two things: the *light* and the *efficacy* of the truth. As it is the nature of light not only to make other things manifest, but to bring the evidence of its own existence along with it; so the beamings of the majesty, truth, holiness, and authority of God in the Bible, distinguish it from all counterfeits, and commend it to the conscience — which it illuminates, sanctifies, and judges. The effects it produces in subjugating human antipathies to itself, and the cure of moral disease, are also strong proofs of its heaven-derived power. It is the force of this internal evidence — the perception of the excellence, suitableness, and glory of the Divine revelation of mercy in the gospel — that induces the great body of Christians to receive it.

267

Being made, “the wisdom and the power of God” to their salvation, they have the strongest possible evidence of its Divine nature and origin. However complete and satisfactory the external testimony is, it does comparatively little for the conversion of men; as in most instances the gospel is rejected, not from lack of evidence, but from hatred or indifference to its subject. The argument of Owen has been largely addressed by others, though by few more fully or satisfactorily than by himself. The same views are brought forward by Professor Halyburton in a *Treatise on the Reason of Faith* (appended to his work on natural and revealed religion), and by President Jonathan Edwards in his *Treatise on Religious Affections*.

While this tract was in the press, the *Prolegomena* and *Appendix* to the London Polyglot, were put into Owen’s hands. In consequence of that, he delayed the publication of his tract till he examined that volume; and his examination produced the second tract in this work. The object of the former treatise was to evince, “That as the Scriptures were immediately given by God himself, His mind being represented to us in them; so by His providential dispensation, his whole word is preserved entire in the original languages.” He now contended that if any corruption were allowed to creep into the text of Scripture, all his reasonings would be subverted, the foundation of faith weakened, and the providence of God would appear to have been careless concerning the preservation of the Divine word. He was sadly afraid that if some of Walton’s principles were admitted, that *Popery* would obtain advantage on the one hand, and *infidelity* on the other.

268

The “*Biblia Polyglotta Waltoni*,” is by far the most valuable and important biblical work that ever issued from the British press.¹ It has rendered immense service to the criticism and interpretation of the Scriptures, and conferred immortal honour on its projectors and editor. Several works of the same nature had been previously published abroad: such as the Complutensian Polyglot of Cardinal Ximenes, in 1517; the Antwerp Polyglot, published at the expense of Philip the Second of Spain, in 1572; and the Paris Polyglot of Le Jay, in 1645. These works had all been edited in the most sumptuous manner, and at great expense. And what is very extraordinary, the world had been entirely indebted for them to the zeal and liberality of Catholic princes, prelates, or private individuals.² None of the Protestant princes or patrons of learning, had yet attempted any work of this nature. It was reserved for England to wipe away this reproach; and that was not done during the reign of her royal “Defenders of the Faith,” nor under the auspices of her richly beneficed Bishops; but during the reign of fanaticism, and under the patronage of the Prince of fanatics — OLIVER CROMWELL — though his name was afterwards ungraciously blotted out!

¹ Edited by Anglican Bishop Brian Walton. Among his collaborators were James Ussher, John Lightfoot and Edward Pococke, Edmund Castell, Abraham Wheelocke and Patrick Young, Thomas Hyde and Thomas Greaves. The proposals for the Polyglot appeared in 1652. The book itself came out in six great folios. The first in 1654 and the last in 1657. Nine languages are used: Hebrew, Chaldee, Samaritan, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, Ethiopic, Greek, and Latin.

² Le Long Bib. Sacra, tom. i. pp. 13, 20, 27-33. Ed. 1709.

Brian Walton, D.D., afterwards Bishop of Chester, was the principal projector and editor of the work; but he was assisted by a number of the learned members of Cambridge and Oxford, in conducting it through the press. It was the first British work published by subscription [£50 each]. The Protector allowed five thousand reams of paper to be imported for it, free of duty; and he otherwise assisted in defraying its expense.

269

It was finished in 1657. By its fulness, accuracy, and convenience for consultation, it far surpassed all former works of the kind, and it remains to this day [1820] the most complete collection of the sacred writings ever published.

It appears, at first, somewhat surprising that Dr. Owen would have viewed this work with jealousy or disapproval. But this surprise ceases when we reflect on the school of sacred learning in which he had been bred; and to which, from principle, he was still attached; and to which the great body of Hebrew scholars then belonged. Upon the revival of learning, Hebrew literature was almost entirely in the hands of the Jews. The few Christians who acquired from them any acquaintance with it, received implicitly the dogmas of the Rabbins, who were supposed to be profoundly versed in the criticism of their sacred books. Two of these dogmas were inculcated as matters of faith, as well as questions of fact and criticism: — the immaculate purity of the Hebrew text, and the Divine origin of the points and accents. Little knowledge of the state of the Hebrew manuscripts then existed (the science of criticism was in its infancy). There was no knowledge whatever of some of the ancient versions; and knowledge about all of them was exceedingly limited and imperfect. The Controversies between the Catholics and the Reformed affected *this* as well as *other* subjects. The former unduly extolled the merits of the Vulgate, and depreciated the value of the original Scriptures. The latter went to the other extreme, and treated with unmerited disrespect, the Latin version, the Septuagint, and all the other early translations. It was looked on as a point of the Protestant faith to maintain these views; and it was dangerous to an individual's character to deviate far from them.

270

As general knowledge increased, the true principles of criticism came to be better understood; the importance of the ancient versions was more justly estimated; and doubts began to be entertained respecting the two positions which, till then, had been most surely believed. Several learned men had hinted their suspicion of the Divine origin of the Hebrew points; but the first who assailed it at any length was Lewis Capel, Professor of Hebrew in the Protestant college of Saumur. His “*Arcanum punctuationis Revelatum*,” published in 1624; and his “*Critica Sacra*,” in 1650, may be said to have begun and finished the controversy. The latter work — the labour of thirty-six years, brought such a mass of learning and evidence to bear upon the contested subjects, that it left comparatively little to be done by others. Yet, such was the state of the literary republic at the time, that the work was refused admission to the press by the prohibitory principles of foreign Protestants. After ten years of fruitless application for an *imprimatur*,¹ it was at last printed at Paris by his son, who was a Catholic.²

The cause of the points, and of the Hebrew verity, was warmly maintained by the Buxtorfs, by the celebrated Glassius, and many others. The doctrines of Capellus were adopted and defended by Morinus, Vossius, Grotius, and other names of great celebrity. It is therefore no impeachment of Dr. Owen's learning, that he was of the ancient, rather than of the modern opinion on this question. It was that which was supposed to be most advantageous to the Protestant interest

¹ *Imprimatur*: formal and explicit approval.

² Walchii Bib. Theol. iv. pp. 268-270. Kennicott's Hist, of the Heb. Text, vol. ii. of his Dissertations.

which the lovers of the word of God were considered bound to maintain, and which many of the greatest scholars and theologians then in Europe, most hotly supported.

271

The question of the various readings has long since been set to rest by the immense collections of Mill and Kennicott, of De Rossi and Griesbach. On the subject of the points, different opinions are still entertained; but on all sides, less importance is attached to them than when the controversy was first agitated. The progress of Hebrew literature has revealed that the fears entertained by Owen respecting the doctrines of the Polyglot, were wholly groundless; and his language — that those who asserted that the Scriptures had suffered in the same manner as other books, bordered on atheism — was rash and improper, as the event has proved. He disclaims all personal motives in the considerations he was led to throw out on the Polyglot; he professes not to have been acquainted with Walton, and little acquainted with his chief co-adjutors; and he pretends to no profound acquaintance with the class of literature to which the Prolegomena and Appendix of the Polyglot properly belong. It is unnecessary now to canvass his objections. His fears magnified his expectations of danger, and multiplied his difficulties. Neither the cause of sacred learning, nor his own fame, would have suffered if he had never written a sentence on the subject.

He was not allowed to pass unanswered. Walton immediately published an able, but ill-tempered reply. “The Considerator considered, and the Biblia Polyglotta Vindicated,” etc. 12mo. 1659, pp. 293. It cannot be concealed, and should not be denied, that Walton had the better of his antagonist in this controversy. He possessed eminent learning, great critical acumen, and all that patient industry which was necessary for the successful prosecution of his very arduous undertaking.

272

These qualifications, combined with abundance of leisure, the assistance of learned associates, and enthusiastic devotedness to the cause which he espoused, enabled Walton to bring his original work to a perfection that left all its predecessors far behind — and to meet any antagonist, with advantages of whose importance he was sufficiently aware. The time and talents of Owen had been chiefly devoted to very different pursuits. In doctrinal, exegetical, and controversial theology, he then had but few equals, and no superior. In these departments, he shone with distinguished lustre; he consecrated all the faculties and ardour of no ordinary mind, to their cultivation. His public labours and numerous writings must have left him but little time or inclination for the dry pursuits of verbal criticism. On this account, it would have been better if he left the subject to others. But while I freely concede the palm of victory in this contest to Walton, it is impossible to compliment the spirit with which he fought for and achieved it. He never condescends so much as to name Owen, although the work which he answers was not anonymous. He breathes a tone of defiance and contempt, both uncalled for and unsuitable. But it was probably dictated as much by the political changes in prospect, as by a personal dislike of Owen. The ex-Vice-chancellor of Oxford, though not then “A son of the Church of England,” — a title to which Walton attached no ordinary importance — was not unworthy to be named with the most learned of her progeny. Even the Editor of the Polyglot was not entitled to school him like a dunce. His remarks on the motives and designs of Owen are bitter and unchristian, and only reflect dishonour on himself.

273

And surely the man who, after enjoying the favour of CROMWELL, had the ingratitude to erase his acknowledgment of it, and to insert the name of CHARLES, from whom his work had derived no benefit (though afterwards it procured its author a bishopric) does not have the highest claims to credit for Christian simplicity and sincerity. ¹ Let it only be remarked, in conclusion, that if John

¹ In the latter part of the Preface to the Polyglot, when it was first published, the following passage occurs: — “Primo autem commemorandi, quorum favore chartam a vectigalibus immunem hoboimus, quod quiique ab hinc annis a Concilio secretiori primo concessum, postea a *Serenissimo Protectore*, ejusque concilio operis promovendi causa,

Owen could not have produced the Polyglot, still less could Bishop Walton have written the Commentary on the Hebrews.

“The Restoration which soon followed,” says Bishop Marsh, “put an end to the controversy; and within a few months after Charles the Second’s return, Dr. Walton was promoted to the See of Chester. The prejudices excited by Owen’s pamphlet, and the false conclusions which he drew from that variety of readings, unavoidably resulting from a multitude of copies, did not indeed immediately subside. But those prejudices and apprehensions were at least mitigated by the endeavours of Dr. Fell, who published (as he relates in his Preface) an edition of the Greek Testament for that purpose.”¹

274

The third Tract in this volume of Owen’s, is in Latin, and is chiefly designed for the Quakers. It is rather singular that he should have criticised the Polyglot in English, and the Friends in Latin; and that he should have joined as the object of the same attack, the greatest learning and the greatest fanaticism in the country. Walton took care to notice this, and not to the advantage of the Doctor. His “*Exercitationes adversus Fanaticos*,” roused an adversary among the Quakers, who was not less fiery (though less learned) than the Editor of the Polyglot. This was Samuel Fisher, originally a Minister of the church, afterwards a Baptist, and finally a Quaker. He was a man said to have been of eminent virtue, piety, and learning.² The reply to Owen is part of a 4to. volume of 600 pages, the title of which I quote for the amusement of the reader.

“The Rustics alarm to the Rabbis: or, the Country correcting the University and Clergy, and not without good cause, contesting for the truth against nursing mothers and their children; in four apologetical exercises in which is contained, as well, a general account to all inquirers, as a general answer to all opposers of the most truly Catholic, and most truly Christ-like Christians, called *Quakers*, and of the true Divinity of their doctrine. By way of entire intercourse held in special with four of the Clergies’ chieftains, viz John Owen, D.D., recent Dean of Christ church; Thomas Danson, M. A., once Fellow of Magdalen College, since one of the Seers for the town of Sandwich; John Tombes, B. D., once of Bewdly, since of Lemster; Richard Baxter, Minister at Kidderminster, another eminent master in this English Israel — which four *fore-men* hold the sense and senseless faith of the whole Fry, and write out the sum of what is, or is to be said, by the whole fraternity of fiery fighters against the true light of Christ, and its true children. By Samuel Fisher, who sometimes went astray, as a lost sheep among the many shepherds, but has now returned to the Great Shepherd, and Overseer of the soul.” 1660.

275

The confidence, abusive language, and absurdities of this production, are beyond all description. Had Samuel Fisher designed to show how wise and righteous he was in his own estimation, and how entirely he despised others, he could not have taken a more effectual method of doing it, than by writing this book. Yet, this strange man was a distinguished leader among the Quakers; he endeavoured to deliver the burden of the word of the Lord to Parliament, and actually attempted a mission to Rome to convert the Pope!³ It is extraordinary that a body so measured in its phrases, and meek in its manners, as the Quakers appear to be, should have produced such fiery spirits as Fisher, whose intemperate language certainly affords strong proof that he did not speak by the Spirit of Jesus.

benigne confirmatum et continuatum crat.” When the Bible was prescribed to Charles II in 1669, the two last leaves of the Preface were cancelled, and three others substituted in their place, in which the passage runs thus: “Inter hos effusioe bonitate labores nostros prosecuti sunt (praeter eos quorum favore chartam a vectigalibus immunem habuimus); *Serenissimus Princeps D. Carolus* [i.e., Charles],” etc. Few of the copies with the original Preface were published, as Walton probably foresaw the approaching change; but a republican copy, being a greater rarity, now brings a better price than a royal one.

¹ Marsh’s Theol. Lect. vii.

² Crosby’s Baptists vol. i. pp. 359-363.

³ Sewel’s History of the Quakers, pp. 133-257.

Richard Cromwell succeeded in peace to the chair of his father. But not possessing the talents or the courage necessary to occupy it he soon deserted it for the quieter and more comfortable repose of private life. To follow the ever-shifting scenes of the political stage, between the death of Cromwell and the restoration of the monarchy, would lead me too far away from the immediate design of this work. I shall therefore confine myself entirely to the conduct of Owen during this busy and perplexing period, as far as it can be ascertained.

276

Among the first acts of Richard's government was the summoning of a Parliament, which met on the 27th of January, 1659. On the 4th of February following, we find Dr. Owen preaching before it at a private fast. The subject is, "The glory and interest of nations professing the Gospel." From the dedication to the House, it appears that some false reports had been circulated about the sentiments of the discourse, respecting forms of civil government. Nothing of a political nature, however, occurs in the sermon — and Owen declares that no sentiments of his would interfere with any form of civil government on earth, righteously administered. The minds of men were then in a state of great agitation; and in such circumstances, it is scarcely possible to speak publicly without occasioning suspicion or misconception.

The army was divided into two factions: the Wallingford-house party which was for a Commonwealth; and the Presbyterian party which, along with the majority of the Parliament, was for the Protector. The former party, of which Fleetwood and Desborough were the heads, invited Dr. Owen and Dr. Manton to their consultations. Dr. Owen went to prayer before they entered on business; but Manton, being late before he came, heard a loud voice from within, saying, "*He must down, and he shall down.*" Manton knew the voice to be Owen's, and understood him to mean the deposing of Richard; and therefore he would not go in. ¹

277

Such is Neal's account of a very singular affair. If Manton heard no more than the words printed in italics, it is strange that he should have put such a construction on them. They might allude to the Pope, or the Grand Turk, as much as to Richard Cromwell. It is not like Owen's usual prudence to vociferate sedition at a private meeting, so loudly as to be heard outside the door; and do that before the Council had deliberated. ²

In Baxter's own life, the most positive charges are preferred against Owen, as the grand instrument in pulling down Richard.

"He gathered a church at Lieut.-General Fleetwood's quarters, consisting of the active officers of the army. In this assembly, it was determined that Richard's Parliament must be dissolved; and then he quickly fell himself. — Dr. Owen was the chief that headed the Independents in the army; and afterwards he had been the great persuader of Fleetwood, Desborough, and the rest of the officers of the army (who were his gathered church), to compel Richard to dissolve his Parliament." ³

In attending to these statements, it must be remembered that they proceed from a man who, though honest in his intentions, entertained very violent prejudices against the Independents, and Dr. Owen in particular. They were not made public till after Owen's death, when Owen could not defend himself. And though Sylvester, the Editor of Baxter's life, applied to the Doctor's Widow

¹ Neal.vol. iv.p. 209.

² The absurdity of the construction put on the words of Owen's prayer is more evident when it is acknowledged that Dr. Manton did not so understand them till *after* Richard's deposition. Non-con. Mem. vol. i. p. 201. Mr. Palmer mentions in the Non-con. Mem. vol. iii. p. 401, that he had met with a manuscript defence of Mr. Baxter's conduct, in charging the deposition of Richard upon Dr. Owen, which he meant to deposit in the Red Cross-street Library; but no such manuscript was ever lodged there.

³ Baxter's Life, part 1. p. 101. part iii. p. 42.

to explain these passages if she could, probably thinking it an invidious task for anyone to rake up the ashes of her husband, she left him to do what he pleased.

278

But the internal evidence is by no means in favour of the correctness of these statements. It would appear from them, that Owen had *collected* the Wallingford-house party, instead of being called in to *pray* at its deliberations. According to Neal, this party was Owen's church, and among the other deliberations of this body, the propriety of deposing the Protector was introduced! *Credat Judaeus Apella!* Owen had no church at Wallingford-house; his stated residence was in Oxford. Some of the officers of the party were Independents, and probably looked up to him for occasional advice. This, I believe, was the extent of his connexion with their proceedings.

But we do not need to rest the defence of Owen on these general reasonings. We can adduce evidence of the most conclusive nature, in reply to these charges of political interference. He was accused in *Fiat Lux* (a book we will speak about later), of being part of that dismal tempest which overbore not only church and state, but reason, right, honesty, all true religion, and even good nature. To this sweeping charge, the Doctor replies:

“Let me inform you, that the author of the criticisms, (on *Fiat Lux*) is a person, who never had a hand in, nor gave consent to the raising of any war in these nations; nor to any political alterations in them, *no — not to anyone who was among us during our revolutions*. But he acknowledges that he lived and acted under them, the things in which he thought his duty consisted; and challenges all men to charge him with doing the least personal injury to any, professing himself ready to give satisfaction to anyone that can justly claim it.”¹

279

In Vernon's letter to a Friend, the charge of pulling down Richard is directly preferred against him. To which he answers:

“Of the same nature is what he affirms — of my being the instrument in the ruin of Richard Cromwell, *with whose setting up and pulling down I had no more to do than himself*; and the same answer must be returned again, as to the Friar, *Mentitur impudentissime*.”²

Knowing these solemn asseverations³ — as Baxter must or might have known; and as his Editor, Sylvester, probably knew — there is something very unchristian in still maintaining charges of so serious a nature, on the authority of reports.

“To all these,” says the writer of Owen's Memoirs, “we may add the testimony of the Rev. James Forbes of Gloucester, in a letter to a minister now living in London. “There is still a worthy minister alive who can bear witness that Dr. Owen was against the pulling down of Richard Cromwell; for a message came to him: You must preach for Dr. Owen such a day at Whitehall, for he is sick, and the cause of his present illness is his dissatisfaction at what they are doing at Wallingfordhouse.”⁴

Notwithstanding the strength and fulness of the above evidence, in Calamy's continuation of Baxter's Life, there is another laboured attempt to fix the above charge on Dr. Owen.⁵ All the circumstances we have noted are brought forward; with another — an acknowledgment said to have been made by Owen to Baxter, that he was an agent in pulling down Richard's Parliament, and Baxter. But can it be conceived that Owen should have made such an acknowledgment in private, and publicly declare what Baxter must have known to be false?

¹ Vind. of Animad. on *Fiat Lux*, pp. 10-12.

² Sermons and Tracts, p. 617. [The Latin means, “It's a shameless lie.”](#)

³ [Asseveration: an emphatic declaration.](#)

⁴ p. 19.

⁵ Vol. ii. pp. 917-922.

To say nothing of his character, there would be a degree of folly in such conduct, of which we cannot suppose him to be guilty. From what he knew of Baxter's itch for scribbling, he could not doubt that he would embrace the first opportunity to proclaim from the house-top what had been told in his ear. And accordingly, the Doctor was scarcely in his grave when this ungenerous attack was made on his memory. ¹ Baxter was a rash man, and his repetition of a conversation many years after it had been held, is not to be compared with the public and solemn testimony of a man of Owen's established reputation for religion and uprightness. Dr. Calamy's attempt to prove that Owen had told a public lie, is by no means honourable to him, and it savours strongly of that party prejudice which is marked in several parts of his otherwise valuable work.

In the memoirs of Ludlow, we have some account of the part which Owen took in the restoration of the Long Parliament, an event which occurred after the deposition of Richard. And if Owen favoured it, then it is a strong proof of his disinterestedness, because he and his party could hope for little favour from the Long Parliament. From Ludlow's account, which we have every reason to believe is correct, the fall of Richard was occasioned by various concurring circumstances: the indecision of the Protector himself; divisions in the army, and offence given by him to some of the leading officers; his taking part with the Presbyterians, and thereby exciting fears among the Independents for the safety of religion and of religious liberty.

After he was brought down, and his Parliament dissolved, the republican party was strongly pressed to restore the Long Parliament. It was alleged that there was not a sufficient number of members left to make up a Parliament. "Upon this, Dr. John Owen," says Ludlow, "having desired me to give him a list of their names, I delivered him one, in which I had marked those who had sat in the house since the year 1648, and were yet alive, amounting to the number of about 160. The Doctor having perused it, carried it to those at Wallingford-house." ² In the end, the Long Parliament was restored; it rewarded its restorers with restrictive laws and deprivation of places.

We need not wonder at the misrepresentations to which Owen, and others similarly placed, were exposed. The period between the death of Oliver and the restoration of Charles was exceedingly unsettled. Owen must have been filled with various fears and anxieties. The return of a civil war, or the establishment of Presbyterian uniformity, or the restoration of monarchical despotism, must have been equally frightful to contemplate; and yet one or another of these events seemed unavoidable. It was the duty of every man who wished well to his country, and who loved religion, to prevent, if possible, the effusion of blood, the reorganization of civil tyranny, or the exercise of ecclesiastical oppression. To err in such circumstances by giving well-meant advice, though it might eventually prove injudicious, is more honourable both to the patriot and the Christian, than cold neutrality, which looks with indifference on the tempest, and afterwards smiles at the calm.

Owen preached before Parliament for the last time on the 8th of May, 1659; the second day after it had met. ³ In the month of August following, the Congregational Churches in London desired leave to raise three regiments for the Parliament, and obtained its consent to do so. ⁴ They had become exceedingly alarmed for their liberty, and not without cause. Monk ⁵ had for some time

¹ Baxter's answer to Owen's twelve arguments, p. 27.

² Ludlow's Mem. vol. ii. p. 181. — Ed. 1751.

³ Whitlocke's Memoirs, p. 679.

⁴ Ibid. p. 683.

⁵ [George Monck \(1608-1670\) – 1st Duke of Albemarle; English soldier and politician, and a key figure in the Restoration of the monarchy to Charles II in 1660.](#)

been playing a part. Formerly he acted with the Independents; now he was seemingly disposed to support the Presbyterians. Apprehensions were entertained about the march of his army into England. To ascertain his real sentiments and intentions, Caryl and Barker were dispatched to Scotland with a letter to him from Dr. Owen, in name of the Independent Churches, to which it was thought Monk belonged. Colonel Whally and Major-General Gough were associated with the ministers, and both were members of the same communion. At Newcastle they were joined by Mr. Hammond, and in Scotland by Mr. Collins — both very respectable and useful Independent ministers. ¹ They had an interview with Monk and some other officers of the army at Holyroodhouse. Caryl told him they did not come to deliver their sense of the General's proceedings, but the sense of the churches which had given them no commission to enter into the merits of the cause, nor to debate whether Lambert's action in turning out the Parliament were justifiable or not. They were only to present to his Lordship their opinion that he did not have a call to appear against it in that manner — that his Lordship only had charge to keep Scotland quiet — and that he was not bound to take notice of any differences that happened in England. Caryl proceeded to assign reasons why the General should go on no farther. At finally, he assured him that whatever happened, it would be laid at his door, as he would be considered the originator of the war. ²

283

The reasonings of the Commissioners with Monk proceed entirely on the ground of the connexion subsisting between the churches and him. From this they considered themselves bound to expostulate with him on the impropriety of involving the nation in war, occasioning much evil to his brethren, and perhaps being instrumental in bringing back a state of things that would be ruinous both to civil and religious freedom. They could make nothing of Monk, however. He sent them back with a letter addressed to Dr. Owen, Mr. Greenhill, and Mr. Hook, full of meaningless compliments, hypocritical professions, and promises that he never intended to fulfill. ³ It must have satisfied them that they had everything to fear, and nothing to hope, from his march into England. His character was a compound of selfishness and hypocrisy. He swallowed oaths without ceremony, and broke them without remorse. He deceived all parties, but stood true to his own interest to the end. ⁴ The Independents offered to stand by their friends in Parliament, and to force Monk back into Scotland. Owen and Nye had frequent consultations with Whitelocke and St. John. And at a private treaty with the officers at Wallingford-house, they offered to raise one hundred thousand pounds for the use of the army, provided it would protect them in their religious liberties — apprehensive that Monk and the Presbyterians designed to subvert them.

284

But those officers had lost their credit; their measures were broken and disconcerted. One party was for a treaty; and another for the sword. Their old veteran regiments were dislodged from the city, and Monk was in possession. ⁵

The anxiety of the Independents is easily accounted for. Their very existence was at stake; for they had nearly as much to fear from the power of the Presbyterians, as from the return of the king. They only wanted protection and liberty. But they knew neither party would agree to these moderate demands, once they obtained power. It does them honour that they were willing to make any sacrifices, rather than part with privileges more valuable than life itself. The Presbyterians, however, completely predominated. Everything was in a train for the restoration of the king, to

¹ Skinner's Life of Monk, p. 103.

² Baker's Chron. p. 587. Ed. 1733.

³ Neal, vol. iv. pp. 238-240.

⁴ Burnet, vol. i. p. 188.

⁵ Neal, vol. iv, p. 242.

whom they looked forward with all the fondness and confidence of a promised saviour. Among other preparations for this event, on the 3d of March 1660, the question between Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Owen, about the Deanery of Christ Church, was referred by the House of Commons to a Committee. On the 13th of the same month, by a vote of the House, Owen was discharged and Reynolds restored to his place. ¹ Previous to this, Wood says he and Goodwin had been removed from preaching at St. Mary's, by the endeavours of the Presbyterians. If this was so, it was a most ungrateful return for the kindness and liberality with which Owen had uniformly treated that party. The Doctor did not take his ejection very meekly, according to Vernon, who represents him as saying: "I have built seats at Mary's, but let the Doctors find auditors, for I will preach at Peter's in the east." ²

285

Thus terminated Dr. Owen's connexions with the Commonwealth, and with the public politics of his time. I am unable to affirm that they never proved a snare to him, nor involved him in conduct and discussions foreign to the business of the Christian ministry. We have his own authority for believing that many of the scenes through which he passed were not to his liking; and his writings sufficiently prove that his mind sustained little injury from his circumstances. The very reports and misrepresentations to which his conduct gave rise, however, show how dangerous a thing it is for a Minister of the Gospel to be connected with political parties, or concerned in their proceedings. In ordinary circumstances, this can be easily avoided; but Owen must have been often so situated as not to have the power to act entirely in his own hands. When this is the case, it becomes us to judge charitably, even when we cannot fully approve. With his talents, and the degree of popularity which he obtained, in the providence of God, he probably could seldom have acted differently from what he did. And wherever our information is sufficient, his conduct allows for a defence, rather than an apology. It is beyond doubt that his motives were pure, and his aims disinterested; that he had at heart the interests of religion, and the welfare of his country. If he could not keep himself entirely unspotted from the world, or at all times justly avoid its censure, we have only to remember what he himself would have been the first to confess — that he was a sinful, fallible creature, who made no claim to perfection. But how comparatively few have acted such a part, on such a theatre, and borne away so large a portion of fair and solid reputation. If our knowledge of his history were more perfect, I am satisfied that it would be increased, rather than diminished.

286

From here, we must follow his steps through other scenes. They are less splendid in the estimation of the world, but more important in themselves, and more glorious in the eye of God:

- defending the faith from the press
- illustrating it in the conventicle ³
- and exemplifying its influence in the tribulation and patience of Jesus Christ.

¹ Whitelocke, p. 699.

² Letter to a Friend, p. 28.

³ *Conventicle*: a building for religious assembly (especially Nonconformists).

CHAPTER X.

Owen retires to Stadham — Effects of the Restoration — Venner's insurrection — The fifth monarchy men — Difference between Owen and Clarendon — The Act of Uniformity — Owen writes on the Magistrates' power in Religion — His Primer for children — His *Theologoumena*—His Criticisms on Fiat Lux — Cane's Reply — Owen's Vindication — Difficulty of finding a license for it — Interview with Lord Clarendon — Invitation to New England — Sufferings of the Dissenters — Relieved for a time by the plague and fire of London — Owen writes various Tracts — Preaches more regularly in London — Publishes a Catechism on the Worship and Discipline of the Church — Answered by Camfield — Discussions between Baxter and Owen, respecting a union of Presbyterians and Independents — Failure of the attempt — Owen receives a Legacy — Publishes on Indwelling Sin — On the 130th Psalm — The first volume of his Exposition of the Hebrews — Review of the whole work.

After the Doctor was deprived of the Deanery of Christ Church, he retired to Stadham, the place of his birth, where he had purchased an estate, and where he had collected a small congregation during his residence in Oxford. He continued to preach to this society for some time, and was resorted to by many from Oxford, to whom perhaps he had formerly been useful, and who now followed him to be comforted and instructed by his labours. The congregation, however, was in a short time broken up by the Oxford Militia, and the persecution became so violent that the Doctor had to move from place to place for security. ¹

The Restoration of Charles II brought many woes to Britain. He was totally destitute of religion, without sincerity, and indifferent to everything but pleasure and sensual gratification. The despotic spirit of the Stuarts had suffered no depression by their misfortunes and sufferings.

288

He returned like a conqueror rather than an exile, to take possession of a hereditary throne and an unlimited sceptre, instead of accepting the conditional and defined sovereignty of a free and independent people. The mania of royalty was now as wild as the phrensy of republicanism had ever been; and under its excitement the people forgot that they had rights to maintain and conditions to prescribe, as well as gifts to bestow. What was thus generously surrendered, Charles had neither the honour nor the generosity to respect. He made a large importation of French politics, licentiousness, and irreligion; so that in a very short time the appearance of the court, and the aspect of the country were entirely changed. The decidedly religious characters of the former period no doubt held fast their integrity; but the lukewarm, or those who had only adopted the profession of the day, either laid it quietly aside or turned out bitter enemies to their former friends. But just as all was not genuine religion which had assumed its appearance during the Commonwealth, so more of it remained afterwards than might have been supposed from the open profaneness which abounded. A numerous body of enlightened and conscientious men patiently endured the trial of cruel mockings, and bonds and imprisonments, and many of them the loss of all things for Christ's sake. They steadily resisted the torrent of infidelity and corruption, and ultimately obtained an important triumph.

Shortly after the Restoration, the insurrection of Venner and the Fifth monarchy men ² brought much reproach on the Dissenters, and afforded the court a favourable and wished-for opportunity to interfere with their privileges.

289

Baptists and Quakers, as well as the monarchy men, were forbidden to assemble publicly; and Independents, though not named, were considered as involved in the same condemnation. The respective bodies of Dissenters published declarations expressing their detestation of the

¹ Memoirs, p. xxxii.

² [Thomas Venner became the last leader of the Fifth Monarchy Men, who tried unsuccessfully to overthrow Oliver Cromwell in 1657; they then led a coup against the newly restored king Charles II. This was known as "Venner's Rising." It lasted four days before the rebels were captured. They were executed 19 January 1661.](#)

principles and practices of these wild fanatics. The document issued by the Independents, disowns the personal reign of Jesus on the earth, ¹ as dishonourable to him, and prejudicial to his church; and it abhors the propagation of this or any other principle by force or blood. It refers to the Savoy Declaration for the sentiments of Independents respecting civil magistracy, and the obligation to obey it. And it declares that they do not cease to pray for all sorts of blessings to the king and his government. This paper is signed by twenty-five of their ministers, among whom the name of Owen does not occur. It is probable that he was in the country when the insurrection took place, and might not have an opportunity of being present at the meeting in which the declaration was drawn up. His sentiments, however, were quite in unison with it. ²

In justice to the Fifth Monarchy men, it ought to be stated that all the patrons of this sentiment cannot be considered friendly to the measures of Venner, Harrison, and the other fierce republicans and visionaries by whom this uproar had been made. The religious sentiment is as old as some of the Fathers of the church. It is only a modification of the doctrine of the MILLENNIUM, which has been held by highly respectable individuals of various communions both before and since the Commonwealth. The learned and celebrated Joseph Mede, and his contemporary Dr. Henry More, held sentiments nearly allied to those of the persons who contended for the personal reign of Jesus on earth.

290

I have now before me a folio volume by Nathaniel Homes, a fifth monarchy man: "The Resurrection revealed, or the dawning of the day-star," etc. It is a book full of curious learning, in which the sentiments of Mede are advocated — but without any of that grossness and carnality which are supposed to have distinguished this class of persons. Others also deserved respect both for learning and piety. It is only when religious sentiment induces those practices which are incompatible with public peace or good morals, that the restraints of authority are called for. Among the German Anabaptists, and English Fanatics — whose sentiments were the same on various points— there were probably many whose private characters, another day, would have been very different from that which the judgment of man has pronounced, and which the proceedings of the general body would seem to warrant.

Wood expresses his astonishment that Owen was not excepted from the benefit of the Act of Oblivion passed after the king's return.³ But this I suppose was never contemplated. The royal party knew too well the character and conduct of the Doctor, to involve themselves unnecessarily in the odium of such a measure. The same writer tells us that Sir Edward Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, then Chancellor, treated Owen with great kindness and respect, and wished him, if he would not conform, to employ his time in writing against the Roman Catholics, and not to disturb the public peace by keeping conventicles. Owen promised to do this. But afterwards, being found preaching to thirty or forty persons at Stadham, he was complained of to the Chancellor.

291

When Owen understood this, he wrote to Dr. Barlow, whom he had obliged in the same manner in Cromwell's time, to endeavour to make his peace with Hyde. In consequence of which, Barlow

¹ Referring to eschatology and the restoration of Israel prior to Christ's return, called Chiliasm, the Golden Age, or the Jewish Dream. The second Helvetic Confession (1566) states, "We further condemn Jewish dreams that there will be a golden age on earth before the Day of Judgment, and that the pious, having subdued all their godless enemies, will possess all the kingdoms of the earth." The amillennial view is that the millennium is the Church Age, during which the church is more or less persecuted until Christ returns, which is Judgment Day. — WHG

² Neal, iv. p 311, 312.

³ The Indemnity and Oblivion Act of 1660 was a general pardon for everyone who committed crimes during the Civil War and Interregnum, with the exception of certain crimes such as murder, piracy, and rape; and with the exception of people named in the act, who were involved in the regicide of Charles I.

went from Oxford to Cornbury for the purpose. But the Chancellor told him that Dr. Owen was a perfidious (treacherous) person who had violated his engagements, and therefore he would let him suffer the penalty of the laws which he had broken. ¹

Independent of any positive evidence, we might be fully assured from Owen's well-known principles, that he would never have promised to abstain from preaching when he had an opportunity. But he meets the charge directly himself. Wood's account is borrowed chiefly from Vernon, in reply to whom the Doctor says,

“There is nothing in substance or circumstance that can lay the least pretence to truth in what he reports to have happened between the then Lord Chancellor and me. As I have good witness to prove that the mistake which fell out between us was not occasioned by me, I much question whether this author was informed of the untruths he reports by Dr. Barlow; or whether he ever gave his consent to use his name publicly to countenance such a defamatory libel.” ²

As Owen held no living in the Church, he was not involved in the consequences of the Act of Uniformity. All that he and those with whom he acted sought, was toleration or liberty of conscience. A comprehension within the pale of the establishment was incompatible with their principles, and unsuited to their wishes. It does not fall within the design of this work to note the discussions between the Court and the Presbyterians, about the Act of Uniformity, as the subject of these memoirs had no connexion with them.

292

But the discussions themselves, and the treatment which followed, suggest some important reflections. They show the folly of attempting to reconcile the principles and practice of the kingdom of Christ, with those of a worldly government. The Court was determined to yield nothing; the Non-conformists were disposed to yield everything they could in good conscience, in order to retain the patronage of the state. Expediency rather than Scripture was the rule by which both parties proceeded. They did not perceive, or were unwilling to acknowledge, that the church is a society altogether different in its principles and constitution from the state; and therefore it ought to be independent of its interference. The Ministers wished too much to get the earth to help the woman, while the court was determined to make the woman help the earth. Hence the disputes between them were interminable; for the further they proceeded, the more widely they diverged.

The Bartholomew ejection was a strong measure, but naturally expected from the spirit of the court. Except for the individual suffering which it occasioned, it should not be deplored. The Church of England was unworthy of the men whom she cast out. Their ejection taught them better views of the Christian dispensation. And in the enjoyment of a pure conscience, and in the liberty of Christ, they possessed a happiness which the benefices of the church without them could not confer. They originated many of those societies which have preserved the light of Evangelical truth in the country, and which would not, in all probability, have existed without that event. Their conduct was a noble testimony to the power of religion, to which, as might have been expected, the seal of Divine approval was attached.

293

Soon after the Doctor had left Oxford, he wrote a paper containing “Resolutions of certain questions concerning the power of the supreme Magistrate about religion and the worship of God, with one about tithes.” Lond. 4to. 1659. It was answered shortly after by a Quaker in a “Winding sheet for England's ministry, which has a name to live, but is dead.” The following year he produced “a Primer for Children.” It was written, according to Wood, though he confesses he had

¹ Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 557.

² Sermons and Tracts, p. 617.

not seen it, for the purpose of training up children in Independency; a very heinous crime in the opinion of some people — as if it were more unlawful to educate children in Independency than in any other system. Owen was fully convinced that if children were not trained up in the fear of the Lord, whatever else they were instructed in, would signify little.

His next work was one of his most learned and laboured performances, and shows the transitions of which he was capable, from writing Tracts and Primers, to Latin systems of Theology.

“Theologoumena Pantodapa, etc. Or six Books on the nature, rise, progress, and study of true Theology. In which also the origin and growth of true and false religious worship, and the more remarkable declensions and restorations of the Church are traced from their first sources. To which are added digressions concerning Universal grace — the origin of the sciences — notes of the Roman Church — the origin of letters — the ancient Hebrew letters — Hebrew Punctuation — Versions of the Scriptures — Jewish rites, etc. Oxford, 1661, 4to. pp. 534.”

294

It was reprinted at Bremen in 1684, and at Franeker in 1700. It has no dedication; but there is a long Preface and a Latin Poem at the end of it, eulogizing the work, and giving a kind of analysis of it, by T. G., whom he calls *“Clarissimus Symmystes,”* and whom I suppose to be Thomas Goodwin. The title page of this work, which I have translated at length, explains the nature and variety of its contents. It is in fact a critical History of Religion, somewhat of the same nature as Jurieu’s Critical History of Religious worship, with some of the discussions of Gale’s court of the Gentiles.

In the first book, Owen treats Theology in general: the natural theology of the first man, and the corruption and loss of it by the entrance of sin. In the second book, he discusses Adamic or Antediluvian Theology. The third Book treats Noahic or Postdiluvian Theology, and the progress of Idolatry till the time of Abraham. The fourth Book is on Abrahamic and Mosaic Theology. In the next book he examines the corruption, reformation, and abolition of the Mosaic system. The last book treats Evangelical Theology and the proper method of studying it. The work reveals a vast extent of reading and a profound acquaintance with the whole compass of profane and sacred learning. On doctrinal subjects, it contains the same sentiments as his English works; in the digressions are some curious speculative discussions; his *notes* of the Roman Church accurately mark her character and corruption; and his views of the study of Theology deserve the attention of every student. What his sentiments were at this time, respecting the constitution of the New Testament Church, the learned reader will perceive from the following paragraph:

295

“Christ nowhere taught that one family, city, town, district, nation, people, or kingdom, made one Church. But the grand principle of the constitution of every Gospel Church is the voluntary obedience of his faithful disciples. Resting on his sole authority, they form themselves into a society, such as he himself has prescribed. For he expressly taught, as we have already mentioned, that all believers in every part of the earth should form societies of this kind; in which they should attend to that Gospel worship which is of his own appointment; exercise the discipline instituted by himself; carefully promote the preservation and comfort of the whole church, together with the increase of believers; submit to those who preside over them by his appointment, according to the rules laid down in his word; help one another by all the duties of their sacred fellowship, such as counsels, prayers, and alms; declare the truth in the most public manner; diffuse the sweet odour of the Gospel; and finally convince and judge the world by the sanctity of their lives, by their attention to good works, and by the most careful observance of peace and love among themselves. Adhering to this rule, believers formerly erected societies of this description in every part of the world; and thus they ought to be constituted to the end of time.”¹

¹ Lib. vi. c. 7.

This work is very incorrectly printed. In an advertisement to three pages of Errata at the end, the Doctor blames the printer for great carelessness; at the same time he mentions that he was absent during the printing of it, "*a capite ad calcem.*" There are mistakes or blunders on almost every page; on this account, the continental Editions are preferable to the author's own, as they are free from the numerous errors which deform it.

296

Unless my memory misleads me, a minister in Scotland is said to have prepared a translation of this work some time ago. But unless a good deal of freedom was used with the original, I question whether it would be a readable book in English; and the information which it contains has long been superseded by numerous valuable works in every department of Theology of which it treats.

Following the advice of Lord Clarendon, his next publication was on the Popish controversy. In 1661, a 12mo. volume appeared, entitled "Fiat Lux, or a general conduct to a right understanding between Papist and Protestant, Presbyterian and Independent, by J. V. C. a friend to men of all religions." The author of this work was John Vincent Cane, a Franciscan Friar, who wrote several things before on the Catholic controversy. *Fiat Lux* contains a great display of moderation, and a large portion of craft. It proposes to show that there is no reason for men quarrelling about religion; — that everything is so obscure, no one should set himself up as a guide to another; — that the various sects of Protestants have no advantage over one another, and none of them any advantage over Popery, which is innocent in its principles and unblameable in its conduct toward them all. The inference to be drawn from its miscellaneous discussions is that the only remedy for all existing evils and differences, is returning to the bosom of an infallible church. Rome alone is *Terra firma*, and all is sea beside.

297

The state of the country rendered any production of this nature, however feeble and contemptible in itself, an object of attention. The well-known leanings of the court, the incessant vigilance and craft of the emissaries of Popery, and the tendency of human nature to embrace its most unscriptural and dangerous sentiments, justified an immediate reply to this pretended friend of light. It was put into Owen's hands by a person of honour (probably Clarendon), with a request that he answer it. Accordingly in 1662, appeared "Criticisms on Fiat Lux by a Protestant, 12mo. pp. 440." In an address to the reader, he says, "the author of Fiat seems at first to be a Naphtali giving goodly words; but though the voice we hear is sometimes that of Jacob, the hands are the hands of Esau." He extracts out of the mass of confusion of which it is composed, all the leading principles or statements, and replies to them with great spirit and pertinency. He does not pretend to defend the particular sentiments of any party, but joins issue on the grand principles of Protestantism. It contains a larger portion of irony than is usually found in the Doctor's writings, which renders it tolerably pleasant to read (though on a now stale, but still important subject).

Cane published a short reply to Owen's criticisms, in an epistle to the author. He seemed less anxious to defend his former treatise than to discover who the critic was, and to excite popular odium against him as one of the demagogues of the commonwealth. This led Owen to meet him again in a larger work, with his name prefixed to it.

"A vindication of the Criticisms on Fiat Lux, in which the principles of the Roman Church, as to Moderation, Unity, and Truth are examined; and sundry important controversies concerning the Rule of Faith, Papal Supremacy, the Mass, Images, etc. are examined. Lond. 1664, 8vo. pp. 564."

298

We have already extracted some passages from this work in reply to the personal charges of the Friar; it is therefore unnecessary to refer to them again. The work itself is not limited to replying to Cane; it embraces the substance of the Popish controversy. It is divided into twenty-four

chapters, in each of which he treats some important fact or principle in dispute. It abounds with learning and strong reasoning, and shows how much the author was at home on the minutest parts of that widely extended controversy. He had cultivated every department of theology with diligence, and had only to bend his mind for a little to any one subject, in order to make the rich stores of his varied learning bear upon it with the happiest effect.

For this work, strange as it may appear, the Doctor found it difficult to procure an *imprimatur*. The Bishops, who were privately enemies to Owen's reputation, and some of them secret friends to Popery, had little inclination to promote the one, or to assist in injuring the other. They alleged that he did not give the title of SAINT to the apostles and evangelists, and that he attempted to prove there was no evidence of Peter's having been at Rome! To the first objection the Doctor replied that the designation of Apostle was more distinguished than that of Saint, in which all the people of God were included. But to please them, he yielded to make that addition. He would, however, consent to make no alteration on the other point, unless they could prove that he was mistaken; and he would rather that his work never see the light, than expunge what he had written. Such was the temper of the Episcopal Inquisition at this time, that in all probability his book would have been suppressed, had not Sir Edward Nicholas written to the Bishop of London to license it — he was one of the principal secretaries of state, a man of unblemished character, and highly esteemed for his public and private virtues. The work accordingly appeared with the *imprimatur* of Thos. Greig, domestic chaplain to his Lordship. ¹

299

These works appear to have gained Owen the favour of Lord Clarendon, who employed Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, to procure an interview with him. His Lordship expressed his approval of the service done by the Doctor's Anti-popish writings, and intimated that he had more merit than any English Protestant of the period. At the same time, he offered Owen preferment in the church if he would conform. Had Owen complied, the highest honours of the hierarchy would doubtless have been open to him. However, the Doctor declined for obvious reasons. He was too much an *Independent* in every sense to barter his freedom for office, honour, or wealth. His Lordship expressed his surprise that a person of his learning would have embraced the *novel* opinion of Independency. To which the Doctor replied that he had indeed spent some part of his time in acquiring an acquaintance with the history of the Church; and he would engage to prove against any Bishop that his Lordship would appoint to meet him, that the Independent form of Church Government prevailed for several hundred years after Christ. They also conversed on the subject of religious toleration. The Chancellor asked Owen what he would require. He answered, "Liberty to those who agreed in doctrine with the Church of England." This was all, probably, which he then thought it prudent or necessary to mention — with the exception of the Papists, there were very few in the country who held doctrines different from those of the Church of England.

300

How Clarendon understood or repeated this remark is uncertain; but it seems to have occasioned a report that the Doctor was unfriendly to the toleration of any but those who held the doctrinal sentiments of the Church. This, however, is so contrary to his avowed sentiments and general conduct, as to require no refutation. He was perhaps unfriendly to the toleration of Catholics, for reasons in which many of the warmest friends of liberty are united with him. Popery has been the invariable and universal enemy of civil and religious freedom, and the strongest supporter of oppression and arbitrary power. It is a deadly night-shade, under whose baneful influence all the moral and social virtues of man are either stunted in their growth, or entirely destroyed. The very love of liberty must induce aversion to the encouragement of a sect which, if consistent, must wage

¹ Mr. Samuel Mather also replied to *Fiat Lux*, in "A Defence of the Protestant religion." Dublin, 1671, 4to.

eternal war with freedom. And it can only flourish by prostrating the understanding, enslaving the conscience, and extinguishing the moral feelings of men.

In the end of the year 1663, the Doctor received an invitation from the first Congregational Church of Boston, in New England, of which Mr. Cotton, and afterwards Mr. John Norton, had been Pastor. The latter having died in the month of April preceding, the church desired to fill his place with Dr. Owen. Their application was seconded by the following, very respectful letter from the General Court of Massachusetts. In it, Owen is urged to accept the call, both from the important field of usefulness it presented, and from the similarity of their sentiments and circumstances to his own: —

301

“Reverend Sir,

It has pleased the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth, who gives no account of his matters, to take to himself, that pious and eminent minister of the gospel, Mr. John Norton, late teacher of the Church of Christ in Boston, whose praise is in all the Churches. The suitable and happy repair of this breach is of great concern, not only to that Church, but to the whole country. Now, although most of us are strangers to you, yet having seen your labours and heard of the grace and wisdom communicated to you from the Father of lights, we thought fit to write these, to second the call and invitation of that church to yourself, to come over and help us. We assure you it will be very acceptable to this Court, and we hope to the whole country, if the Lord directs your way here, and makes your journey prosperous to us. We confess the condition of this wilderness presents little that is attractive as to outward things; nor are we unmindful that the undertaking is great, and that many trials accompany it. The persons who call you are unworthy sinful men, of much infirmity, and may possibly fall short of your expectation (considering the long and liberal day of grace afforded us). Yet, as Abraham and Moses, being called of God, by faith forsook their country and its pleasures and followed the Lord — the one not knowing where he went, the other to suffer affliction with, and bear the manners of, the people of God in the wilderness; and God was with them and honoured them — so we desire that the Lord would clarify your call, and give you his presence. You may please to consider those who give you this call as your brethren and companions in tribulation. We are in this wilderness for the faith and testimony of Jesus, and we yet enjoy, through the distinguishing favour of God, the pleasant things of Zion in peace and liberty.

302

And while the Lord sees fit to entrust us with this mercy, we hope no due care will be found lacking in the Government established here, to encourage and cherish the churches of Christ, and the Lord’s faithful labourers in his vineyard. Thus praying to the God of the spirits of all flesh, to set a man over this congregation of the Lord; that He may go in and out before them, and make your call clear, and the voyage successful to us; and that if the Lord grants us such a favour, you may come to us in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ. With our very kind love and respect,

We remain, your very loving friends,
John Endicott,

in the name, and by appointment of the General Cort,
sitting at Boston, in New England, the 20th October, 1663.”¹

I am unable to say what answer the Doctor returned immediately to this affectionate invitation. It would seem from a letter of Captain Gookins, one of the Assistant Governors of Massachusetts,

¹ This letter was extracted from the Public Records of Massachusetts by Dr. Gordon, and transmitted by him to the late Mr. Palmer, of Hackney; who inserted it in the Protestant Dissenter’s Magazine, vol. iii. p. 447. Mr. Endicott, was Governor of the Colony, and a very excellent and much respected man. He went to Salem in the year 1628, and had chief command of those who first settled there, in whose difficulties and sufferings he largely participated. He continued there till the jurisdiction of Massachusetts desired his removal to Boston for the more convenient administration of justice, as Governor of the Colony; to which office he was elected for many years with little intermission. He served God and his country till, old age and infirmities coming upon him, he fell asleep in the Lord, in 1665, in the 77th year of his age. — Morton’s New England Mem. pp. 176, 177.

dated July 1666, that after some time, he had been inclined to comply with the request; but certain circumstances deterred him. He says,

303

“Dr. Owen, and some choice ones who intended to come with me, are diverted. And that is not from hopes of better times in England, but from fears of worse in America — which some new counsels gave them occasion for — so that in all probability a new cloud is gathering, and a storm is preparing for us.”¹

2

It is said he was stopped by orders from Court, after some of his property was actually embarked. The sufferings to which conscientious Dissenters were exposed, were increasing in severity every day. It was not deemed sufficient to drive them out of the church; it was thought necessary to make them miserable afterwards. Dr. Owen had his own share of these sufferings. He preached at Stadham as long as he was able, and then removed to London where he lived mostly in private, and preached as often as he conveniently could. The Act of 1664, for suppressing Conventicles, was designed (according to Rapin) to drive the Non-conformists to despair, or to commit real crimes against the state. Many were led by it to adopt a species of conformity to which Independents and Baptists objected as unscriptural — as countenancing the measures of Government, and approving of a persecuting church. To evade the laws and enjoy the privilege of worshipping God, many and ingenious measures were resorted to. However, the Oxford Act (or Five Mile Act) was intended to cut off all these resources. All who refused to swear to passive obedience in the most absolute sense, were prohibited from coming within five miles of any incorporated town or borough. The iniquity of the Act was all the greater, because it was passed during the plague of London, where many of the Non-conformist ministers had courageously ventured to preach to the living, and administer consolation to the dying.

304

The plague was followed by the terrible fire of London, in which the greater part of the city was destroyed, and most of the Churches laid in ruins. This disastrous event was placed, perhaps unjustly, to the charge of the Papists, and it raised a terrible storm against them — while it occasioned a partial mitigation of the laws against the Dissenters. Temporary places of worship, called *tabernacles*, were fitted up, in which many of the Non-conformists preached to crowded and attentive audiences. Owen, Goodwin, Nye, Griffiths, Brooks, Caryl, Barker, and other Independents, fitted up rooms or other places for public service; and for a short time, they were permitted to meet unmolested. Baxter says Owen had kept off before this — as if he had been more ashamed or afraid of suffering than his brethren. But I apprehend this is only one of the many instances of Baxter’s private feeling towards Owen.³

The fall of Lord Clarendon in the following year, who had been the chief adviser of the unconstitutional and rigorous measures pursued by the Court, together with the temporary disgrace of Archbishop Sheldon, and Bishop Morley, who were guilty actors in the same proceedings, contributed to relax the exertions made to ruin the Dissenters. Clarendon is said to have remarked that his affairs never prospered after the Oxford Act. The king began, or pretended, to see the selfish and unjust policy of some of the late proceedings, and professed a willingness to give relief to his persecuted subjects.

305

¹ Hutchinson’s Hist. of Massachusetts. vol. i. p. 226.

² Non-con. Mem. vol. i. p. 202.

³ Baxter’s own Life, part iii. p. 19.

About this time (I cannot ascertain the exact dates of all of them), Dr. Owen wrote several tracts which tended to enlighten the public mind, and to soften the hearts of adversaries: — “An Account of the Grounds and Reasons on which the Protestant Dissenters desire their liberty.” — “A Letter concerning the present Excommunications.” — “The present Distresses on Non-conformists examined.” These are printed in the folio volume of his sermons and tracts; but without dates. In 1667, he published “Indulgence and Toleration Considered, in a Letter to a person of honour,” 4to. pp. 31. And “A Peace Offering, in an Apology and humble plea for Indulgence and Liberty of Conscience.” 4to. pp. 37. The general design of all these tracts is,

- to promote peaceable obedience to the civil enactments of Government;
- to show the injustice and impolicy of subjecting conscientious and useful men to suffering on account of their religious sentiments;
- to expose the unconstitutional nature of the proceedings against them, by informers and secret emissaries;
- to give a view of the nature and benefits of toleration in former ages, and in other places;
- to vindicate it from various charges, and
- to point out the folly of attempting to settle the peace of the country on the basis of religious uniformity.

They contain some of those enlightened principles and reasonings on the subject of religious liberty, which are to be found in his former writings; and notice what the event has proven to be true: that there is no nation where religious liberty would be more conducive to tranquillity, trade, and wealth, than England. All the tracts were anonymous, for very obvious reasons.

306

About this time he appears to have been preaching pretty regularly to a congregation of his own forming. It consisted, among other persons, of many officers of the army, with whom he had formerly been connected. He also set up a lecture to which many resorted — persons of quality, and eminent citizens; some account will afterwards be given of several of them. Any ease which was enjoyed, however, was but of a very temporary nature. No legal protection had been obtained, and the most valuable rights and privileges of the community were at the mercy of interested informers, and of ignorant and intolerant magistrates. The Doctor himself made a very narrow escape from being apprehended when on a visit to his old friends in the neighbourhood of Oxford. He endeavoured to keep as private as possible; but he was observed, and information was given about the house in which he lodged. Some troopers came and knocked at the door for admittance. On the landlady opening it, and demanding what they wanted, they told her they sought Dr. Owen. She told them he was not there, supposing he had gone off early in the morning, as he intended — upon which, instead of examining the house, they rode off. The Doctor, learning what had taken place, immediately got his horse and returned to London. ¹ How dreadful the state of the country must have been, when such a man was under the necessity of sculking and moving from place to place for security!

307

In 1667, he published “A Brief Instruction in the Worship of God, and Discipline of the Churches of the New Testament, by way of Question and Answer.” 12mo. pp. 228. It has neither his name nor that of the printer, nor the place of printing, — evidences of the danger of being known as the author or publisher of a work on such a subject, at that time. The style, however, betrays the writer in every page. It contains only fifty-three questions, the answers to which (with their explications) are of course abundantly long, and are frequently divided into several sections. His sentiments as an Independent, as might be expected, are plainly stated — but more in the way of practical

¹ Memoirs, p. 25.

explanation, than of controversy or theoretical defence. I think it right to quote his answers to several questions, because the work is now scarcely known, and because they state very explicitly the Doctor's views on some disputed points.

“Quest. 19. What is an instituted Church of the gospel?

Ans. — A society of persons, called out of the world, or their natural worldly state, by the administration of the word and Spirit to the obedience of the faith, or the knowledge and worship of God in Christ, joined together in a holy bond, or by special agreement, for the exercise of the communion of saints in the due observation of all the ordinances of the Gospel.

“Quest. 23. Who are the ordinary officers or ministers of Christ in the Church, always to be continued therein?

Ans. — Those whom the Scripture calls Pastors and Teachers, Bishops, Elders, and Guides.

Explication By all these names, and sundry others, the same sort, order, and degree of persons is intended. Nor is any one of these names applied or accommodated to anyone unless all the rest are also applied in like manner; so that he who is a *Pastor* or *Teacher*, is also a *Bishop* or *Overseer*, a *Presbyter* or *Elder*, a *Guide* or *Ruler*, a *Minister* or servant of the Church for the Lord's sake.

308

“Quest. 30. Are there any differences in the office, or offices of the Guides, Rulers, Elders, or Ministers of the Church?

Ans. — The office of those who are Teachers, is one and the same among them all; but where there are many in the same Church, it is the will of Christ that they should be particularly assigned to such special work in the discharge of their office-power, as their gifts received from him particularly fit them for, and the necessities of the Church require.

Explication. — They are all alike Elders, alike Bishops, alike Guides, *have the one office in common among them, and each one the whole entire to himself.*

“Quest. 40. How often is the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper to be administered?

Ans. — -Every first day of the week, or at least as often as opportunity and convenience may be obtained, 1Cor 11.26; Act 20.7.

“Quest 52. In what does the duty of any Church of Christ consist towards other Churches?

Ans. — 1. In walking circumspectly, so as to give them no offence. 2. In prayer for their peace and prosperity. 3. In communicating supplies to their wants according to ability. 4. In receiving with love and readiness the members of them into fellowship, as there is occasion. 5. In desiring and making use of their counsel and advice in such cases of doubt and difficulty as may arise among them. 6. In joining with them to express their communion in the same doctrine of faith.”

It surely cannot be matter of doubt, which denomination of Christians the person belonged to, who could express himself in this manner. The Catechism altogether contains an excellent view of the constitution, ordinances, and officers of a Christian Church.

309

And its re-publication might serve to convince some, that the sentiments of certain modern Independents are not so remote from those of their more “learned and celebrated” predecessors, as has been ignorantly alleged.

The publication of this Catechism, Baxter tells us, “was *offensive to many.*” This seems to have been the lot of all Independent Catechisms. Among the rest, it gave great offence to Benjamin Camfield, Rector of Whitby in Derbyshire, who published an octavo volume of 347 pages in reply to it. “A serious examination of the Independents' Catechism, and of the chief principles of Non-conformity to, and separation from, the Church of England. 1669.” By this gentleman's account, “the book examined is the sink of all Non-conforming and separating principles from the

Protestant religion established in the kingdom!” He is exceedingly angry with the Catechist throughout. He declares he neither knows nor cares to know him, and labours hard to convict him of error or inconsistency in maintaining the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures! But the body of the Doctor’s work remained untouched. Nothing is more amusing than to see a high churchman in a rage, when we know he can only storm and revile, not having the power to banish or imprison.

The publication of the Catechism led Mr. Baxter to propose to Dr. Owen a union between the Presbyterians and the Independents. That singular man was forever contriving schemes of union, but very seldom employed the means which were most likely to accomplish them. He seems invariably to have forgotten that union will never be effected by disputing for it, and that chiding (which he called ‘plain dealing’) was very unlikely to bring it about.

310

His present attempt was no more successful than many others.

“I told Dr. Owen,” he says, “that I must deal freely with him, and that when I thought of what he had done formerly, I was much afraid, lest one who had been so great a breaker, would not be made an instrument in healing.”

This was certainly no great encouragement.

“But in other respects, I thought him the fittest person in England for the work; partly because he could understand it; and partly because his experience of the temperament of men, and of the mischiefs of dividing principles and practices had been so very great, that if experience were to make any man wise and fit for a healing work, it would be him.”

This must have been vastly flattering to the Doctor.

“And that a Catechism for Independency, which he had recently written, was my chief motive — because there he had given up two of the worst principles of popularity” — acknowledging — “that the people do not have the power of the Keys, and they do not give this power to the pastor.”

He does not inform us that Owen admitted he had given up anything, or retracted any sentiment for which he had formerly contended. Nor had Owen in fact done so. Owen maintains, in the Catechism,

“That whatever the Pastors do in the Church according to rule, they do it not in the name or by authority of the church, by which their power is derived to them; nor only as members of the church, by their own consent; but they do it in the name and authority of Jesus Christ, from whom, by virtue of his law and ordinance, their ministerial office or power is received.”

311

This is a sentiment, which I believe Owen held from the beginning, to the end of his career. Stripped of the superfluous language in which his ideas are all clothed, it amounts merely to what I apprehend all Independents hold: that the Pastor of a church in leading it to obey the laws of Christ, does not act from a power communicated by the church; but by virtue of a special appointment of Christ, whose authority is interposed.

Mr. Baxter soon drew up an “abundance of theses, as the matter of common concord,” and left them with Owen, who objected to their number. On this he produced another draft of the things in which Presbyterians and Independents were agreed, and to which he requested the Doctor’s exceptions. Owen wrote him at some length, pointing out several things which would require reconsideration — and at the same time expressing his cordial approval of the object and of the general plan proposed. This produced a long letter from Baxter, in reply to his doubts and exceptions. He still insinuates suspicions of Owen’s sincerity, which must have rendered the correspondence very unpleasant to him. This, and the difficulty of accomplishing the object, perhaps together with doubts of the good likely to result from its attainment (as circumstances

then stood), seem to have discouraged the Doctor. After more than a year's delay, Baxter says Owen returned the papers with these words: "I am still a well-wisher to these mathematics." A reply sufficiently brief, expressive of his general approval of the scheme, but of his doubts about the calculating process of his ingenious correspondent. "This was the result," says Baxter, "of my third attempt for union with the Independents."¹

312

Mr. Baxter's first attempt at union with the Independents, seems to have been made with Mr. Philip Nye about 1655. We have a full account of the correspondence between them in his Life.² The second, I suppose, was made with Mr. George Griffith, some time after the former.³ Neither of those individuals could enter into Baxter's proposals. It would be very unfair, however, to attach the blame of being hostile to union, to Owen, Nye, or Griffith, or to the Independents at large, just because they could not go into these measures. Mr. Baxter's schemes often looked fair and plausible on paper; but their practicability in the present state of human nature is a very different thing. The Independents were the smaller body, and were naturally afraid of being borne down by numbers, if they formed a union by conceding any of their leading principles. They attached less importance to external uniformity than Baxter and most of his brethren did. Whatever evils occasionally result from disunion, is likely to cure them only by inflicting a greater evil in their place. This was a scheme which would comprehend in one body Episcopalians and Baptists, Presbyterians and Independents. The sentiments of the Independents on the subject of union (expressed in the two last articles of the Savoy Declaration), embrace everything for which it is of importance to contend. And I believe they are the sentiments held and acted on by that body to this day.

"Those reforming Churches which consist of persons sound in the faith, and of conduct that becomes the Gospel, should not refuse the communion of each other, so far it as it may be consistent with their own principles respectively, even though they do not walk in all things according to the same rules of church order. Churches gathered and walking according to the mind of Christ, judging other churches to be true churches, though less pure, may receive into occasional communion with them, such members of those churches as are credibly testified to be godly, and to live without offence."

313

What these eminent persons could not effect by disputation, was brought about shortly after their death in 1696. That was when the Presbyterian and Independent churches in London and the environs, united on certain general principles.⁴ This illustrates the justness of a remark of Owen's, in a Sermon preached on the occasion of two Churches uniting.

"I would be very sorry that any man living would outdo me in desires that all who fear God throughout the world, especially in *these* nations, were of one way, as well as of one heart. I know I desire it sincerely. But I truly believe that when God accomplishes it, it will be the *effect* of love, not the *cause* of love. It will proceed from love, before it brings forth love. There is not a greater vanity in the world, than to drive men into a particular profession, and then suppose that love will be the necessary consequence of it — to think that if they can but drive men into such and such practices by sharp rebukes, by cutting and bitter expressions, then love will certainly ensue."⁵

It is very probable that this language alludes to the failure of this very attempt between Baxter and himself; and it seems to explain the true cause of it. Baxter also refers to these failures in his *Cure of Church Divisions*, published in 1670. In that text, he fights the Established Church with the one

¹ Baxter's own Life, part iii. pp.61-69.

² Part ii. pp. 188-192

³ Ibid. part ii. p. 193.

⁴ See Heads of Agreement.

⁵ Sermons, p. 178.

hand, and the Independents with the other. He confesses that for twenty years he had been writing, preaching, and praying for the Churches' peace, but to no purpose.

314

"I have but made a wedge of my bare hand," he says, "by putting it into the cleft; and both sides closing upon it to my pain, I have turned both parties — which I endeavoured to part in the fray — against myself. While each side had but one adversary, I had two."¹

Bagshaw replied to the "Cure;" and "Dr. Owen," Baxter says, "spoke very bitterly against it in private, and divulged his dissent from my proposals of concord, though he never said more to myself than was before expressed."² Baxter, though a most devoted servant of Christ, put too much keenness of temper into all his peaceable proposals; and this, no doubt, was one of the main reasons for their frequent failure. In promoting love — while he always acted from pure and upright motives — he did not sufficiently study the principal means of accomplishing it:

"Ut ameris amabilis esto." [To be loved, be lovable.]

In 1668, Owen succeeded to a legacy of five hundred pounds by the death of Martyn Owen, a rich Brewer in London, and a relation of the Doctor's.³ This, together with his landed property and the proceeds of his numerous writings, enabled him to live, while enjoying probably little emolument from his labours in the Gospel. As these must have been very irregular and frequently interrupted, more time was left for private application, which he appears to have employed with the most conscientious diligence. Some of his most important publications which had been long in preparation, made their appearance during this year. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted and to an account of them.

315

The first of these is, "The nature, power, deceit, and prevalency of the remainders of Indwelling-sin in believers, etc." 8vo. This work is the substance of a series of Sermons (as most of his practical writings were). The text is Rom. 7.21. It assumes the innate and universal nature of human depravity, and confines itself entirely to the experience believers have of the conflict between sin and grace, to which they are perpetually subject. It reveals a deep acquaintance with the malignity of sin, and the deceitfulness and desperate wickedness of the human heart. It is closely connected in its nature with his treatise on Mortification — to which he refers the reader, and of which we have already given some account. There are many fine and important passages in this work, attention to which would lead to much self-examination, watchfulness, and humility on the part of believers. The remains of inbred corruption sufficiently account for the little progress which is too generally made in the Christian profession — for the fearful misconduct and falls to which men who have named the name of Christ are frequently left — for the lack of that solid peace and enjoyment of which believers often complain — and for that conformity to the world, in its pleasures and vanities, which distinguish many who would be offended if their Christian character were called into question. These things were matters of complaint and lamentation in the days of Owen, and are no less so now. It is true that we now have a larger portion of public zeal, and bustling activity, in promoting the interests of religion. This is good; it ought to be encouraged; and it must be a matter of thankfulness to every sincere Christian. But the deceitfulness of sin may operate as effectually (though less obviously) in many whose "zeal for the Lord of Hosts" may appear very prominent, as it operates in times when such exertions were not made.

316

¹ Cure, p. 144.

² Baxter's own Life, part iii. p. 73.

³ Peck's Desiderata, vol. ii. p. 547.

It is much easier to donate money to religious societies, to make speeches at public meetings, to unite in plans of associated usefulness, than it is to sit in judgment over our hearts, or to correct the aberrations of conduct, spirit, and disposition. There may be much public professional warmth, and yet great inward, private decay. In short, there may be a merging of individual, secret religion, in the bustle and crowd of general profession and public life. These things are not suggested for the purpose of discouraging public exertion and association for the diffusion of truth; but for the purpose of leading men to consider that, in our current circumstances, genuine Christianity is not necessary to do many things which are now the objects of general approval; and to consider that such things, however excellent in themselves, are but poor substitutes for a life of holy obedience, and converse with ourselves and with heaven. Those who engage in these objects would do well to read Owen on Indwelling-sin.

This same year he published, “A Practical Exposition of the 130th Psalm, in which the nature of the forgiveness of sin is declared, the truth and reality of it asserted, and the case of a soul distressed with the guilt of sin, and relieved by a discovery of forgiveness with God, is discoursed at large,” 4to. This work largely partakes of both the faults and the excellencies of its author. It partakes of his prolixity, verbosity, and diffusion; but it also possesses a large share of his knowledge of God and of man, and of the Divine ways of working with sinful creatures. Considering the topics which it embraces, it might have been one of the most valuable and useful of his writings — had he limited himself to a short illustration of the great leading points.

317

But his disposition to weave an entire system into every work, extends his reasonings and illustrations so much, that the minds of most of his readers become fatigued and perplexed long before they arrive at the conclusion. The prevailing disposition of the present age is to reduce everything to *Tracts*. This mode of treating Divine subjects suits the superficiality and indolence of writers, and the trifling habits of readers; while at the same time, it is attended with very considerable advantages. In the age of Owen, the opposite tendency prevailed: the writers of that period seldom knew when to stop. They never supposed they could exhaust a subject. They were dissatisfied till they had produced a folio or a quarto, and had said everything that could be said on the point in hand. This did not require all the labour and genius that some may suppose. In fact, the bulk of the work was often a *saving* of labour to them. They never thought of dressing or revising their thoughts. A whole chapter might often have been condensed into a paragraph, and have retained all its sentiment and a greater portion of spirit. Without meaning to detract from the merits of Dr. Owen, I am convinced that it would have been much more difficult for him to abridge than to expand. And I am convinced that he would have been more exhausted by the attempt to reconsider and condense his reasonings, and to polish his style, than by the first production of any of his works.

A judicious Christian who has much leisure and some taste for Theological reading, will derive benefit from such a treatise as this one the 130th Psalm. But it may be of importance to note that there are some evils which the very extent and mode of treating the subject are calculated to produce on others. As the points which it treats embrace the leading subjects of salvation, an inquirer may be impressed with the feeling that they are involved in great obscurity, when they require so extended an explanation; — he may be led to doubt whether he will ever arrive at a satisfactory knowledge of them.

318

We consider this a very hurtful mistake, which too many of the older works of Divinity have tended to promote, and in no small degree. They are unfavourable, we conceive, to those clear and simple views of salvation which the Bible itself contains, and which it ought to be the great object of

writing and preaching to point out. In this view, we have long thought the words of our Christian bard to be as theologically and practically just, as they are poetically beautiful:

O how unlike the complex works of man,
Heaven's easy, artless, unencumber'd plan *
No meretricious graces to beguile,
No clustering ornaments to clog the pile;
From ostentation as from weakness free.
It stands like the cerulean arch we see.
Majestic in its own simplicity.
Inscrib'd above the portal, from afar
Conspicuous as the brightness of a star,
Legible only by the light they give.
Stand — the soul quick'ning words — “Believe and live!”

— COWPER.

We apprehend that a work which describes a minute and extensive process of God's manner of dealing with a sinner, or of keeping a believer in the truth, is likely to operate injuriously upon both sinners and believers. On the former, it is in danger of producing the belief that conversion is a *work* which the sinner has to effect, either in the way of beginning it, or of carrying it on. The author may perhaps guard against this abuse of his performance. But while he describes a lengthened train of fears that must be entertained — of convictions that must be felt — of difficulties that must be subdued — of means that must be used — of duties that must be performed — there are a thousand chances that a partially enlightened mind will suppose that all these must be done, or gone through, in order to find repose.

319

And so it will be ready either to sink into despair from their magnitude, or else take comfort from brooding over its own feelings and duties — instead of looking for enjoyment from an Almighty Saviour, and a finished redemption. Such an individual, and even one who has obtained peace through faith in the blood of Christ, will be in danger of being exceedingly discouraged at not finding in himself those feelings or marks which are attributed to the children of God. And if his experience does not correspond with the description given, he may be ready to conclude that something must be materially wrong. A person of cultivated talents who has been in the habit of paying close attention to the workings of his own mind, may describe all his own feelings at great length, and with much accuracy — and these may perhaps be tolerably suited to individuals of the same description, placed in similar circumstances. But if this is made the *rule* of determining God's method of dealing with others, it would be far from just, or generally applicable.

We have no doubt that such books as Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*, Alleine's *Alarm*, Baxter's *Call*, and Owen's *130th Psalm*, have been eminently useful to many. They have roused attention, and produced conviction in multitudes. But we put it to any enlightened Christian, whether the attempt to follow all the directions in these books, and the application of all the principles they record, to the characters and experience of men in general — whether that would not have the most injurious consequences. God's methods of “convincing of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment,” are exceedingly diversified.

320

There is a disposition in men to make their personal and individual experience the rule and the test of that of others. The revelation of mercy is beautifully simple and plain. Yet, the process by which we may have arrived at the understanding of it, may have been very circuitous and complicated. Instead of directing the attention of men to the revelation itself, in the full blaze of its splendour, and the unadorned simplicity of its statements — inviting them to follow the windings of our path while tracing it out, and the harassing perplexities of our minds while seeking

for rest — there can be little doubt that we would *injure* rather than *benefit*. Christians have too generally fallen into the mistake of recommending theological treatises to inquirers, and the experience of eminent individuals, *instead of pointing them to the Cross of Christ itself*, or directing them to the record of inspiration. Much good has certainly been done by the former method. But it can scarcely remain doubtful whether equal good, without any portion of evil, might not have been done by the simpler method of the apostles.

We can make great allowance for enlargement on doctrinal or exegetical theology; but conciseness is of vast importance in an experiential or practical treatise, such as the one on the 130th Psalm. To offer any analysis of a book which scarcely allows for it, and which is so generally known, would be rendering no service to the reader. Its praise, the writer of that memoir says, has been in all the churches; and to those who exercise the patience which a careful perusal of it requires, and whose “senses are exercised to discern between good and evil” — perusing it will be rewarded with profit. In all the language which occurs in it, it would be wrong for us to profess what we do not feel, which is entire acquiescence.

321

At the same time, our difference is not so much about the substance of the sentiments, as about the mode of communicating them, and some of the expressions employed. We cannot, for instance, see the propriety of the “distinction between faith and spiritual sense,” for which the Doctor contends. Faith is opposed to sense, just as it is opposed to sight and hearing. And it is only in opposition to them that the apostle says, “We walk by faith, not by sight.” There can be no spiritual exercise or enjoyment, except through the medium of faith. And the stronger faith is, the higher our enjoyment of spiritual blessings will rise. We indeed question whether the Doctor’s views on the subject of faith are always consistent with themselves. He sometimes speaks very simply about it, and at other times more mysteriously. This was probably occasioned by his propensity to enlarge and to refine — where, in many cases, a simpler adherence to the written record, and to the dictates of a common understanding, would have been at once a shorter and more effectual method.

In this important and busy year, he also appeared the first volume of his great and long projected work on the Epistle to the Hebrews. As this is the most valuable as well as the most extensive of all his writings, it will merit (as well as require) particular notice here. It is designated,

“An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, — in which the original text is opened and clarified, ancient and modern translations are compared and examined — the design of the apostle with his reasonings, arguments and testimonies is unfolded, — the faith, customs, sacrifices, and other usages of the Judaical Church, are opened and declared, — the true sense of the text is vindicated from the twistings of it by Socinians and others, — and lastly, practical observations are deduced and improved. With preliminary Exercitations:” folio.

322

The second volume appeared in 1674, the third in 1680, and the last (which he left fit for the press) in 1684, after his death. For the sake of unity, and to prevent repetitions, we will consider the whole at present. ¹

The Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the most important and difficult portions of the New Covenant Scriptures. Its subjects are of particular interest, and the manner in which they are treated by the inspired author, renders no ordinary degree of scriptural information and critical acumen necessary for its interpretation. It is devoted to the illustration, not of the elements or first principles of Christianity, but of its *higher* departments — what the apostle calls “the perfection” of the Christian system. The proofs which it adduces from the Old Testament,

¹ I use, for the sake of convenience, the 8vo. Edition, by the Rev. George Wright, in 7 vols. Edin. 1813.

- of the Supreme Divinity of the Son of God;
- of his infinite superiority as a Prophet or Lawgiver to Moses;
- as a Priest to Aaron and all his successors;
- the views which it affords of the mystical design of the ancient dispensation;
- of the nature and services of the earthly Tabernacle;
- its reasonings respecting the Sacrifice of Christ;
- his Mediation in heaven; and
- and the superior privileges of New Testament believers;

exhibit the depth of his knowledge in the mystery of Christ. These are calculated to exercise the minds of the most intelligent Christians, and are eminently fitted to enlarge our conceptions of the grandeur of that heavenly economy which was established by the blood and perpetuated by the ministry of Jesus in the sanctuary of God. An intimate acquaintance with it will do more to establish the faith and comfort the mind of an enquirer, than all that has been written on Divine truth since the days of the apostles.

323

It must be acknowledged that the interpretation of this epistle is attended with difficulties of considerable magnitude. It abounds in peculiarities of style and sentiment; it treats subjects which are little noticed in other parts of the New Testament; and it contains profound and singular views of many parts of the Old Testament, and of its services. There is also a particular closeness in the reasoning, which requires the most fixed attention in tracing it, to avoid mistakes. While these things have deterred many from attempting to explain it, they have operated as inducements to others to endeavour to unfold its beauties and unveil its obscurities. Thus, though much of it has been misunderstood, few books of Scripture have had more labour bestowed on them by learned and ingenious men.

It employed the pens of a number of the ancient writers. Prior to the time of Owen, many of the foreign Divines, both Catholic and Reformed, had bestowed much attention on it. In our own country, too, it had not been neglected. In 1635, David Dickson, a Scotch minister, and the author of several exegetical works, published at Aberdeen an octavo volume of explanations of this epistle. William Jones, D.D., is the author of a commentary on it, along with one on the epistle to Philemon, and on the second and third epistles of John, which appeared in one volume folio in 1636. Thomas Lushington, D.D., published in 1640, a folio commentary on the Hebrews. George Downham, Bishop of Derry, and author of several other theological works, also published a commentary on it that year. William Gouge, D.D., a learned Puritan and a member of the Westminster Assembly, was the author of another which appeared in 1655. And in 1662, another folio exposition of the epistle appeared from the pen of Mr. George Lawson.

324

All of these elaborate (and some of them valuable) works were prior to the attempt of Owen, and were doubtless known to him. In his preface, he speaks of some of them as “composed with good judgment, and to very good purpose.” Referring to the entire body of preceding commentators on the epistle, he says:

“Some I found had critically examined many of the words, phrases, and expressions of the writer. Some compared his quotations with the places in the Old Testament from which they are taken. Some had endeavoured an analysis of the several discourses of the author, with the nature and force of the arguments insisted on by him. The labours of some were to apply the truths contained in the epistle to practice; others have collected the difficulties which they observed in it, and scanned them with objections and solutions in the Scholastic manner. Others had a special regard to the passages whose sense is controverted among the several parties who are at variance in the Christian religion. All, in their way and manner, endeavoured to give light to the intention of the Holy Ghost, either in particular passages, or in the whole epistle.”

He was encouraged by the help to be derived from all these quarters, for the interpretation of the epistle. On the other hand, for a time he was discouraged from the attempt, by the idea that after so much had been done, any further labour was unnecessary. But after he had perused all the works he could obtain, he says,

“I found the excellence of the writing to be such; the depth of the mysteries contained in it to be so great; the compass of the truth asserted, unfolded, and explained to be so extensive, and so diffused through the whole body of the Christian religion;

325

the usefulness of the things contained in it, to be so important and indispensably necessary; that I was quickly satisfied that the wisdom, grace, and truth treasured in this sacred storehouse, are far from being exhausted by the endeavours of all who had gone before us. So far did all these truths then seem from being perfectly brought to light by them, that I was assured there was sufficient ground left for a renewed search after rich ore in this mine — not only for the present generation, but for all those that will succeed, to the consummation of all things.”

The Doctor brought no ordinary qualifications to this important and interesting work. To eminent piety was now added a mind enriched with all the various stores of theological learning — matured by years and experience, and enlarged by the most correct and extensive views of the whole scheme of Divine revelation. He possessed an understanding that was naturally acute, and sharpened by constant and extended intercourse with enlightened and cultivated society; a habit of application and perseverance of unspeakable importance to such an undertaking; and a *copia verborum*¹ which supplied an inexhaustible facility to convey his sentiments on every subject. Even a slight acquaintance with the work, must show how well these advantages were employed.

The exercises which accompany this work, and which make up the two first volumes of Wright’s 8vo. edition, are particularly valuable. They contain a vast treasure of solid learning and laborious research.

326

Independent of the Commentary, they may be of much service to the elucidation of other parts of the Sacred record:

- they examine and establish the Canonical authority of the Epistle;
- they inquire into its writer, and show him to have been Paul;
- they investigate the time in which it was written, and show it to have been shortly after Paul’s deliverance from his first imprisonment
- they consider the language in which it was written, and prove it was Greek.

The citations made from the Old Testament in it are the subject of particular attention. They are the subjects of extended and accurate illustration, through the first volume:

- the oneness of the Church;
- the Jewish distribution of the Old Testament, and their oral law and tradition;
- the Messiah, and the promises of the Old Testament concerning him;
- his appearances under the former dispensation;
- the faith of the ancient Church respecting him;
- the evidence that he has long since come;
- the consideration and vindication of Daniel’s prophecy of the 70 weeks;
- Jewish traditions about the Messiah;
- proof that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah;
- Objections of Jews against Christianity;

¹ *Copia verborum*: an abundance of words; a rich or full vocabulary.

- the state and ordinances of the Church, before, and during the time of the law;
- the law itself, its precepts, promises, and threatenings;
- the Tabernacle, the priesthood, and its sacrifices;

The second volume is entirely occupied with the consideration of the Priesthood of Christ, and the day of sacred rest. Respecting the former of these subjects, he remarks in his preface:

“It is wholly outside the compass of my knowledge, if the reader can find any other work in which the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ has been so handled in its proper order and method, as to its origin, causes, nature, and effects.”

Without professing to be entirely of Dr. Owen’s views in every part of these prolix dissertations, it must be admitted that it is but a small and comparatively unimportant part to which any Christian can take exception; and the richness and scriptural piety which run through the whole, render them particularly interesting.

327

The subjects are in themselves highly delightful; and few human writings exist, in which they are so ably treated. They abound in Rabbinical learning, particularly the first part of them. This was, perhaps, necessary, as they involve so minute a discussion of the Jewish controversy. But I am not aware that this branch of learning is of so much importance to the elucidation of Scripture, as was then supposed. Owen, if any man, was qualified to bring it to bear upon the New Testament. And yet I do not perceive that much information can be derived from his use of it. Let any man examine the writings of Lightfoot, and Pococke, and Schoetgen, the great masters of Rabbinical lore, and he will perhaps be astonished at the little advantage that accrues to Biblical interpretation from their labours. Indeed, it is scarcely reasonable to expect anything but disappointment from them. The ancient Jewish writers or critics, with the exception of the earlier Talmuds, are all lost. And the more modern Rabbins were such a race of drivellers, that their writings contain the largest portion of trash and nonsense to be found in the world. A little acquaintance with them will gratify curiosity, and at times perhaps supply a hint or an argument — but to expect anything like enlightened criticism in them, is about as reasonable as to look for it from children.

The Exposition itself may be considered in a three-fold light: (1) as an explanation of a portion of Scripture; (2) as a body of controversy, and (3) as a practical application of Divine truth. As an explanation, or exegetical illustration of an important epistle, it is distinguished by the general accuracy of its interpretations, and the conscientious manner in which the author endeavoured to trace out the meaning of the Divine writer.

328

There are works of this nature, and on this very book, which reveal a greater parade of learning; and in which the meaning of particular texts is more accurately defined. For example, Pierce and Hallet’s work on the Hebrews contains more critical learning; and the work of Mr. Archibald M’Lean of Edinburgh frequently corrects the minor mistakes of Owen. But neither of them, on the whole, compares with his. The leaven of Arianism in the former, and the dryness of the latter, render them less useful, and also less interesting. The following passage of Owen’s preface deserves the attention of all his readers, and especially of all who attempt to expound the word of God. It gives an admirable view of his state of mind, and of the principles on which he proceeded in his interpretation,

“For the exposition of the epistle itself, I confess, as was said before, that I have had thoughts of it for many years, and I have not been without regard towards it, in the whole course of my studies. Yet I must now say that, after all my searching and reading, prayer and assiduous meditation have been my only resort — and by far the most useful means of light and assistance. By these, my thoughts have been freed from many entanglements into which the writings of others had thrown me, or from which they could not deliver me. I have been as careful as I am of life and soul — to bring no prejudicial sense to the words; to

impose no meaning of my own nor other men's upon them; nor to be imposed on by the reasonings, pretences, or curiosities of any — but always went nakedly to the word itself, to humbly learn the mind of God in it, and to express it as He enabled me. To this end, I always considered in the first place, the sense, meaning, and import of the words of the text — their original derivation, their use in other authors — but especially in the LXX of the Old Testament, in the books of the New Testament, and particularly the writings of the same author.

329

Oft-times the words expressed out of the Hebrew, or the things alluded to among that people, I found to give much light to the words of the apostle. To the general rule of attending to the design and scope of the passage, the subject treated, mediums fixed on for arguments and methods of reasoning, I still kept in my eye the time and season of writing this epistle, the state and condition of those to whom it was written, their persuasions, prejudices, customs, light, and traditions; I also kept in my view, the covenant and worship of the church of old; the translation of covenant privileges and worship to the Gentiles on a new account; the course of providential dispensations that the Jews were under; the near expiration of their church and state; the speedy approach of their utter abolition and destruction, with the temptations that befell them on all these various accounts — without which it is impossible for anyone to justly follow the apostle so as to keep close to his design, or to fully understand his meaning.”

Such views, under the Divine blessing, and directed by the judicious perseverance of Owen, could not fail to be attended with the most important result: they embrace everything that could be necessary or useful to the interpretation of Scripture.

The Exposition also contains a large portion of controversy, chiefly on two subjects, or embracing two classes: Jews and Socinians. It is obvious how the former came to occupy so much of his attention; but the reason for his introducing the latter may require some explanation. The Polish Socinians had directed all their strength and ingenuity against the Scripture doctrine of the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ.

330

They endeavoured to make out that the language of Scripture on that subject, was not to be understood literally, but metaphorically — and of course, that there is no such thing as a real sacrifice or priesthood belonging to Christianity. Owen considered these things to be at the foundation of all Christian faith and hope, and to constitute the grand subjects of the Epistle. He could not allow so fair an opportunity to escape, of vindicating from such Socinian glosses, the important statements and doctrines of revelation. If his zeal for what he believed to be truth sometimes carried him rather far, and led him to occasionally find fault with some sentiments that were not very remote from truth, and to express himself strongly against them because they were held by persons infected with heresy — it is only what we might expect from a mind so ardently attached to evangelical doctrine. Without adopting all of Dr. Owen's sentiments, the Christian who wishes to be established in the truths that were controverted by the Socinians, will find in this work such a body of evidence and argument in support of them, that it must remove any reasonable ground for scepticism and unbelief. We do not hesitate to affirm that the proper understanding of the Epistle to the Hebrews alone, is amply sufficient to put to flight all the sophistry and declamation of the adversaries of the Deity, sacrifice, and priesthood of Christ — from Faustus Socinus to Thomas Belsham. On the Jewish controversy, there is almost everything that is of importance. In fact, it will be found that on a number of subjects, a satisfactory reply to a Jew, is also a sufficient answer to a Socinian.

The practical tendency and application of the whole, are not the least important features of this work. The eminent godliness, as well as the author's learning, conspicuously appear on every page.

331

“His reasonings always terminate in some holy result. After reading the criticisms of an accurate scholar, the arguments of a sound logician, and the illustrations of a fertile mind, we are furnished with directions

for self-examination; or we are sent away to our closets with a warm exhortation to abound in prayer if we hope to understand the mind of the Spirit.”¹

This is just as it ought to be. The theory of Christianity without the practice, is like a body without the spirit; and the practice without the theory is not a *reasonable* service. To treat the Bible like an ancient classic, is using an unholy freedom with its sacred contents; while indifference to the precise meaning of the Holy Spirit, manifests ignorance of the important connexion that subsists between right sentiments and suitable practice in religion — as well as a lack of regard for the authority of God speaking in his word.

Notwithstanding this threefold division of the work, and the intimate connexion of its several parts with each other, it is so constructed that any of the departments may be read separately.

“The method of the whole,” says the author, “is so disposed, that anyone, by the sole guidance of his eye, may carry on his reading of any one part of the whole without interruption, or mixing any other discourses with it. Thus he may, in the first place, go over our consideration of the original text, with the examination of ancient and modern translations, and the grammatical construction and signification of the words, without diverting to anything else that is discoursed on the text. In like manner, if any desire to peruse the exposition of the text and context, with the declaration and vindication of the meaning of the Holy Ghost in them, without the least intermixture of any practical discourses deduced from them, he may — under the same guidance, and with the same labour — confine himself to this from the beginning to the end of the work.

332

And because the practical observations, with their improvements, virtually contain in them the sense and exposition of the words, and give light to the intention of the apostle in his whole design, for all I know some may desire to exercise themselves principally in those discourses. They may do this by following the series and distinct continuation of them, from first to last.”

Thus, the Critic, the Expositor, and the plain Christian, may all find something to their taste, and to exercise their minds.

It would be superfluous labour to enlarge on the execution of the work, after what has been already said, and the high rank it has long held among the standard books of exegetical theology. This is more especially so, because the improved and more portable edition of Dr. Wright, has now brought it within reach of many who otherwise must have judged its merits entirely from reports. However, it may not be unnecessary to state that it is the fruit of more than twenty years’ labour of the industrious author. It was a long and chequered period, during which Owen complains of “straits and exclusion from the use of books” which occasioned “uncertainties, failings, and mistakes” — which he prays “the reader may never experience.” Without any exaggeration, we may apply to this undertaking, the elegant and sorrowful language of our great English lexicographer,

“The exposition of the Hebrews was written with little assistance from the learned, and without any patronage of the great; not in the soft obscurities of retirement, or under the shelter of academic bowers, but amidst inconvenience and distraction, in sickness and in sorrow.”

333

Such was the importance -which the author himself attached to it, that he said when it was finished — “Now my work is done, it is time for me to die.”² On the Continent, the work has been long highly valued. Walch says of it, “Egregium est opus hoc, locuples testis de auctoris singulari eruditione, atque industria, quam ad illud conficiendum adhibuit.”

¹ Dr. Wright’s Preface, pp. iii, iv.

² Clarkson’s Fun. Ser.

It was translated into Dutch and published in quarto at Rotterdam in 1733. Le Long also mentions the proposal of a Latin translation of it at Amsterdam in 1700; but whether it ever appeared I am unable to say. ¹ The late Dr. Williams, of Rotherham, published an abridgement of it in 4-vols. 8vo. in the year 1790. This was rendering a service to the cause of sacred literature, when the folio edition was so scarce and so expensive. Some also may be disposed to read the abridgement rather than the extended original. While it merits the praise of fidelity, so far as I have observed, those who wish to ascertain the sentiments and enter into the feelings of Dr. Owen, will find it necessary to consult the original work.

I know no ancient or modern work of an expository nature, that will bear a fair comparison on the whole, with the Exposition of the Hebrews. Caryl on Job, is fully equal to it in magnitude; but he falls far short in the interest which it excites, and the ability which it displays. Its author, though a learned and pious man, was far from being equal to Owen. And the subject on which he chose to exercise his own patience and that of his readers, cannot be considered so valuable to the church as that of his friend and successor.

334

The celebrated work of Vitringa on Isaiah, has deservedly obtained an equal reputation with that of Owen on the Hebrews. It contains a larger portion of critical learning, and displays no less of acuteness and talent. But it is still more systematic than Owen's work — often fanciful — and sometimes erroneous. It is, however, *instar omnium* on Isaiah. The work of Professor Lampe on the Gospel of John, with its valuable dissertations, is somewhat similar to Owen's. Belonging to the same school, possessed of varied learning — and of patient industry — he is strictly orthodox, and exhausts almost every topic of importance in the Evangelist. But he does not always interest the mind sufficiently in his discussions, and is occasionally rather fond of mystical interpretations.

The chief objection to the Exposition of the Hebrews is its vast extent — four folio, or seven large 8vo. volumes on one epistle — and that not the longest in the New Testament. It appears to be a rather cumbrous apparatus of explanation. Much of the work, it must be acknowledged, is not necessary to the interpretation of the apostle's language. Yet, in general, the connexion between the text and the commentary is neither forced nor unnatural; it is surprising how little occurs that we wish had been omitted. Like several other larger productions of the author, it contains a very entire and valuable system of Divinity. There are few points of Divine truth on which the reader will not find important information. On this account, the index belonging to the octavo edition will be found of particular service. If the fame of Walton rests on the *Polyglot*, and that of Poole on the *Synopsis*,² then the *Exposition of the Hebrews* — even if Owen had written nothing else — forms a pedestal on which he will appear an object of admiration to all future generations.

¹ Walch. Bib. Selecta, iv. p. 788.

² Matthew Poole, *Synopsis Criticorum* (Synopsis of Interpreters). This text is a verse-by-verse summary of the history of interpretation. He includes the old Jewish doctors, the early Church Fathers, Medieval Rabbis, Reformation-era Romanists, Lutherans, and the Reformed.

CHAPTER XI.

Persecuting conduct of the Congregationalists in New England — Remonstrances of Owen and his brethren on the subject — Owen publishes on the Trinity — His controversy with Parker — His Truth and Innocence vindicated — Publications of others on the same side — Marvel and Parker — Conduct of Parliament toward the Dissenters — Vernon's attack on Owen — Owen's defence — Alsop — Owen invited to the Presidency of Harvard College — Publishes on the Sabbath—Correspondence on this subject with Eliot — Charles publishes a Declaration of Indulgence — Address from the Dissenters on this account presented by Owen — Owen's attention to the measures of the Court — Becomes one of the preachers of the Morning Exercise — Publishes on Evangelical Love — Death of Caryl — Union of Caryl's and Owen's Church under the Doctor — Notices of persons of distinction who were members of the Church — The Parliament offended with the King's Indulgence — Notices of distinguished Noblemen whose friendship Owen enjoyed — His interviews with the King and Duke of York — Work on Communion attacked by Sherlock — Owen's vindication — Controversy occasioned by Sherlock's book — Owen publishes on the Holy Spirit — Review of all his writings on that subject — Attacked by Clagett — Publishes on Apostasy — Marries his second wife.

For several years, the New England Congregationalists had been employing very oppressive measures to suppress the Baptists and Quakers. Their highly improper and Antichristian conduct has often been alleged as evidence of the persecuting dispositions of Independents (as well as others) when they are possessed of power. It would be foolish to deny that men calling themselves Independents may be persecutors; but all who understand the principles and the spirit of Independency, must ever maintain that such conduct is inconsistent with it. A little acquaintance with the proceedings in New England, against which Dr. Owen and his brethren protested, will satisfy us that Independency had almost nothing to do with them.

The Brownists, who colonized New England, understood most thoroughly the principles of religious liberty. But they had moved from Holland to America, *as a church*, and were little conversant in the science of legislation and political economy.

336

They therefore formed state laws on the principles of the New Testament, and the discipline of the church of Christ. They did not perceive (which should scarcely surprise us) the impossibility of managing a growing population by such means, in a new country, without sacrificing the liberty of the subject, or the purity of the church. At first, the body of the people were Christians, and of one mind. A considerable time elapsed before the erroneous principles on which their legislative code was founded, made their appearance. It was still longer before they understood the proper remedy. The subsequent emigrations from Britain consisted of many persons who greatly differed from the original settlers on various subjects — even though they fell into their general measures and views. Most of the Puritans who went over to New England were attached to a species of Presbyterianism, rather than to Independency. From this arose the peculiar complexion which the churches there exhibited after a time. They had their regular meetings of synods and councils, in which the civil magistrate occupied a place; and the laws or regulations of these groups were enforced by his authority. It is an obvious misapplication of the term “Independency,” to apply it to such a procedure, and it is unjust to make it accountable for the consequences. ¹ It is not the name, but the spirit and conduct, which reveal the system to which we belong. ²

337

Their behaviour was considered so contrary to the word of God, that on hearing of it, a letter was written by the Independent ministers in London. At their head was Dr. Owen, remonstrating with

¹ Consistent Independency can never be accountable for anything except what is done by the Churches and their office bearers, separately assembled. The proceedings of delegated bodies or representatives, in conjunction with civil authority, are obviously at variance with its first principles. It was entirely by meetings of the latter [civil] description that all the persecuting measures in New England were adopted. A full view of their injurious nature, as well as of the length of time during which they continued to operate, will be found in Backus' Church Hist. of New England, 2 vols. 1777-1784.

² Neal's New England, vol. i. passim.

their brethren, and entreating them to desist from such proceedings. Without entering into the merits of the differences between them, and the persons who were suffering, they urge a variety of suitable and important considerations to convince them of the necessity of altering their measures. And thus they conclude:

“You have the advantage of truth and order; you have the gifts and learning of an able ministry to manage and defend them; you have the care and vigilance of a very worthy magistracy to countenance and protect them, and to preserve the peace; and above all, you have a blessed Lord and Master who has the keys of David, who opens and no man shuts, living forever to take care of his own concerns among his saints. And assuredly, you need not be disquieted, though a few persons, through their own infirmity and weakness — or through their ignorance, darkness, and prejudices — should to their disadvantage turn out of the way, in some lesser matters, into byways of their own. We only make it our hearty request that you trust God with his truth and ways, so far as to suspend all rigorous proceedings imposing corporal restraints or punishments on persons who dissent from you, and who practise the principles of their dissent without danger or disturbance to the civil peace of the place.”¹

Dr. Mather acknowledges that this letter, dated the 25th of March, 1669, was not attended at the time with all the effects it should have produced. But at length, it and other means contributed to give the New England churches better views.

338

It shows, however, what the sentiments of Dr. Owen and his brethren were, respecting coercive measures; and it completely exculpates them from all participation in conduct which cannot be too severely reprobated.²

In 1669, Owen published “A Brief Declaration and Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, as also, of the Person and Satisfaction of Christ.” 18mo. pp. 252. It was occasioned, he tells us in the preface, “by no particular provocation he had received, nor by any particular work in opposition to the doctrine contended for; but entirely by his desire to promote the edification and establishment of the plain Christian.” After what has been said on the Trinity in our account of the controversy with Biddle, and because we must resume it again in reviewing a larger subsequent performance of the Doctor’s, it is unnecessary to enter upon it now. This contains the same sentiments, stripped of their controversial dress, and illustrated simply from the Scriptures themselves. It has been frequently reprinted, and was also translated into the Dutch language.³

The next year, Owen was engaged in a very ill-tempered controversy on the subject of Non-conformity. The High Church party was constantly increasing their malignant hostility to the poor suffering Dissenters, and resorted to every mode of aggression that was likely to make them miserable. It was impossible, however, to ruin them entirely, till every principle of liberty was rooted out of the country.

339

To consummate this execrable project, Samuel Parker (whom we have spoken of before), published “A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politic, in which the authority of the Civil Magistrate over the Consciences of Subjects in matters of external religion, is asserted; the mischiefs and inconveniences of Toleration are represented, and all pretences pleaded in behalf of Liberty of Conscience are fully answered.” 8vo. pp. 326, 1670. In this vile production, the Non-conformists are grossly slandered,⁴ and their sentiments represented as incompatible with the peace and

¹ Magnalia Americana, book vii. p. 28.

² [That is, condemned.](#)

³ Vitringa, Doct. Christ. Pars vi. p. 6. Edit. 1776.

⁴ [Orig. caluminate: to falsely charge or with malicious intent; attack the good name and reputation of someone.](#)

security of government. The most extravagant powers are ascribed to the magistrate in all things civil and religious, and the blindest and most abject submission to his authority is enjoined.

It was imperiously necessary to meet this attack. Dr. Owen applied to Baxter to undertake the defence of Non-conformity. But he declined the task, considering himself excepted from the reproaches which had been thrown out; and he felt that if he were to answer Parker, they would soon make him as odious as the rest. ¹ The Doctor therefore took him up on it, and acquitted himself with great credit in his “Truth and Innocence Vindicated; in a Survey of a Discourse on Ecclesiastical Polity,” etc. 8vo, pp. 410, 1670. Owen ludicrously sums up the substance of Parker’s work in the following Royal decree: —

“We have a universal and absolute power over the consciences of all our subjects in things pertaining-to the worship of God — so that, if we please, we can introduce new duties never yet heard of, in the most important parts of religion. And we may impose on them in the practice of religion and divine worship, whatever we please; so that in our judgment, it does not countenance vice, nor disgrace the Deity. This power is naturally inherent in us; it was not given or granted to us by Jesus Christ, but belonged to us or our predecessors before he was ever born.

340

And this is such that we ourselves, if we would, might exercise the special offices or duties of religion in our own person — especially that of the Priesthood — though we are pleased to transfer the exercise of it to others. All our prescriptions, impositions, and injunctions on these things, immediately affect and bind the consciences of our subjects, because they are ours. Whether they are right or wrong, true or false, we enact and ordain as follows: — [Here insert, if you please, the author’s scheme of religion, given in the second chapter.] That every man may, and does think and judge whatever he pleases concerning the things enjoined and enacted by us. For what have we to do with their thoughts and judgments? They are under the empire and dominion of conscience, which we cannot invade, even if we would. They may, if they please, judge them inconvenient, foolish, absurd — indeed, contrary to the mind, will, and law of God. Our only intention, will, and pleasure is to bind them to the constant observation and practice of them, and that is under the penalties of hanging and damnation.” ²

Extravagant as this statute may appear, it is composed chiefly of Parker’s own words and phrases, and in the sense too in which he used them. It is scarcely necessary to say that Owen’s Vindication is a triumphant exposure of the folly and iniquity of such sentiments. Indeed they cannot bear examination; and the chief difficulty in replying to them is their intrinsic absurdity and madness.

341

Yet such was the confidence or vanity of Parker, that after the publication of his Polity, he said to the Earl of Anglesea, “Let us see, my Lord, whether any of your chaplains can answer it.” Parker looked upwards for support, and did not care at what expense he wrote himself into a Bishopric. The substance of his Polity was preached at *Lambeth*; and it was printed by the orders of *Sheldon*, a man of similar sentiments and spirit. The Doctor’s work greatly tended to promote his celebrity among the Dissenters; and did great credit to his talents and spirit, as well as good to the cause. Besides, by Dr. Owen’s “Truth and Innocence,” Parker was very roughly handled by several anonymous antagonists. “Insolence and Impudence triumphant: Envy and Fury enthroned: the Mirror of Malice and Madness, in a late Treatise entitled,” etc. 1670. “Toleration Discussed in two Dialogues.” 1670. “Criticisms on a new book, entitled Ecclesiastical Polity.” 1670. “A Free Inquiry into the Causes of that very great esteem the Non-conformist ministers are in with their followers.” 1673. These are only some of the productions which appeared on the side of the Non-conformists.

¹ Sylvest. iii. p. 42.

² pp. 113-115.

Next year, Parker published “A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Polity,” against Dr. Owen; and in the following year, a still further attack on him in a preface which he wrote to a posthumous work of Bishop Bramhall.¹ These works abounded in the lowest abuse of Owen. He calls him the “Great Bell-weather of disturbance and sedition.” — “The viper,” he says, “is so swelled with venom that it must either burst, or spit its poison.” — “The dunghill is his only magazine, and calumny his only weapon.”

342

He openly avows that,

“If Dr. Owen had been treated as ill or worse than is alleged, yet it can never be pretended that he was treated worse than he deserved. For he was a person of so pernicious a temper, of so much insolence, of such a restless implacable spirit, of such a sworn and inveterate hatred toward the government of the church and state, that without ceremony or fear of incivility, he ought to have been pursued as the greatest pest and most dangerous enemy of the church and commonwealth; and whoever wishes well to his country, can never do it greater service than by beating down the interest and reputation of such sons of Belial.”

This was speaking out with a vengeance, and silence was the only reply to such shocking language., All this is prefixed by Bramhall’s defence of himself and his brethren against the charge of Popery. He was the fast friend of Laud and the other *Ultras* of that period. He was one of those ardent and secular spirits who mainly assisted in stretching the bow of Ecclesiastical prerogative, until it finally broke in their hands. Parker imitated his “Patron Lord,” and produced the same glorious effect.

Although Owen appeared no more in this controversy, it by no means terminated here. The vainglorious Churchman was doomed to receive a scourging from the hands of a Layman, which must have made him writhe in every sinew. Charles and his court were passionately devoted to wit and raillery. They gloried in a Butler, whose burlesque poetry exposed the Puritans to contempt, and broke the edge of public censure against themselves. The other party, however, could boast a Marvel² — who was a wit and a poet too, — the most patriotic senator of his time, whose ironic muse often lashed the follies and the vices of the court. This witty writer took up the conceited clergyman, and in his “Rehearsal Transposed.” It turned all the laughers against him, and it was read with delight from the king down to the tradesman.³

343

There are times and subjects which require the use of ridicule; and it will sometimes succeed, if judiciously managed, when graver argument fails.

— “Ridiculum acri
Fortius, et melius magnas plerumque secat res.”⁴

Parker and his party were now driven to the necessity of a defence against this unexpected mode of repelling them. Victory was no longer thought of, if a decent retreat could only be effected. They assailed Marvel with all manner of weapons. In a twinkling there appeared, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transposed; Rosemary and Bayes; The Transproser Rehearsed; Gregory Father*

¹ John Bramhall (1594-1663) — Bishop of Derry, and Archbishop of Armagh (with Ussher and Bedell). He defended the English Church from both Puritan and Roman Catholic accusations, and against Hobbes’ views of materialism and liberty (free will). He was heavily involved in the reconstruction of the Church of Ireland, imposing Archbishop Laud’s reforms during the reign of Charles I. Thus he was a key figure in the persecution of the Puritans.

² Andrew Marvell (1621-1678) —English poet, satirist and politician, sometime member of the House of Commons. During the Commonwealth period, he was a colleague and friend of John Milton.

³ Burnet’s own times, vol. i. p. 382.

⁴ “Jesting oft cuts hard knots more forcefully and effectively than gravity.” — Horace

Greybeard, with his vizor off; A Common-place Book, out of the Rehearsal Transposed; Stoo him Bayes; etc.

Marvel, undismayed by such a shower of missiles, returned to the charge. In a second part of the Rehearsal, he again overwhelmed his adversaries, and effectually silenced their battery. It was generally admitted that the odds and victory were on his side. And it had this effect on Parker, says Wood: that he judged it more prudent to lay down the cudgels than to enter the lists again with an untowardly combatant, so hugely well-versed in the then but newly refined art of sporting and jeering buffoonery. ¹ Although Parker retreated from any further attack after the second part of the Rehearsal appeared, in truth he only suppressed those passions to which he was giving vent in secrecy and silence. Indeed, that was not discovered till a posthumous work of his was published, in which one of the most striking parts is a disgusting caricature of his old antagonist.

344

Marvel was indeed a republican, the pupil of Milton, and he adored his master. But his morals and his manners were Roman — he lived on the turnip of Curtius, and he would have bled at Philippi. We do not sympathise with the fierce spirit of those unhappy times, that scalped the head feebly protected by a mitre or a crown. But the private virtues and the rich genius of such a man are purely from the spirit of party. ²

The Parliament which met in 1670, fell upon the Non-conformists more furiously than ever. They revived the Act against Conventicles, and made it severer than before. After it had passed the commons, Dr. Owen was requested to draw up some reasons against it, which were laid before the house of lords by several persons of distinction. He pointed out in plain and strong language, its unjust and impolitic nature. ³ But it was all in vain — the bill passed the lords, the whole bench of Bishops voting for it, except Wilkins, Bishop of Chester, and Rainbow, Bishop of Carlisle. By this iniquitous Act, the persons who attended any meetings for religious worship, other than those of the Church of England, were made liable to heavy fines: the preacher twenty pounds for the first offence, and forty for the second. To encourage informers, they were entitled to one-third of that; and it was provided that all the clauses in the Act should be construed most largely and beneficially to suppress Conventicles, and to justify and encourage all persons to be employed in its execution. ⁴

345

Neal justly remarks on this Act, that the wit of man could hardly invent anything short of capital punishment, that was more cruel and inhuman. Nothing less than the extermination of Dissenters seemed to be determined; and only He who restrains the wrath of man could have prevented its having that effect. It is scarcely conceivable how men possessing the least particle of Christian principle or feeling, could take part in such a measure. Yet such is the blinding influence of power, and the deceitfulness of the heart, that professed Christians have supposed such enactments are a service to the cause of God. ^{Joh 16.2} These and similar deeds of oppression in support of Ecclesiastical establishments, by men connected with them, independent of other considerations, are enough to blast their reputation, and to induce a conviction that the cause which requires such support cannot be the cause of God.

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis...⁵

¹ Athen, Ox. vol. ii. p. 619.

² D'Israeli's quarrels of Authors, vol. ii. p. 204.

³ Sermons and Tracts, p. 588.

⁴ Neal, vol. iv. p. 350, Edit. 1755.

⁵ "Not such aid nor such defenders [do the times require]." — Virgil.

Attempts to ruin their fortunes, and injure their usefulness, were combined with the cruelest machinations to blacken their private character. So long as the Dissenting ministers stood high in public estimation, it was found impossible to accomplish by state edicts, the destruction of their cause. In abuse and detraction, auxiliaries were sought to aid the common object. Parker, as we have already seen, was a leader in this species of glorious warfare. He was joined that year by an able and hearty co-adjutor, to whose pages I have often been indebted, the Rev. George Vernon, a Gloucestershire Rector, who was educated at Oxford while Owen presided in the university. ¹ He produced, “A Letter to a Friend, concerning some of Dr. Owen’s principles and practices.” 4to. pp. 78. Owen is here described as “the Prince, the Oracle, the Metropolitan ² of Independency.”

346

He is denounced as “the Ahithophel of Oliver Cromwell — a blasphemous and perjured person, and a libeller of authority after the restoration of Charles II.” He is accused of having “praised God for shedding the blood of Christian kings and their loyal subjects — and of being guilty of reiterated perjuries against that God, whom he confidently affirmed to be the inspirer of all his prayers.” In short, the state is invoked to take vengeance on a miscreant whose crimes deserved the highest punishment the laws could inflict.

We are accustomed now to hear the name of John Owen pronounced only with respect. But these things show that he partook largely of the common treatment of all the disciples of Christ. His name was cast out as evil, and all manner of reproach was poured out on him falsely for the Son of Man’s sake. The verdict of posterity is often more favourable, and always more impartial, than that of the present generation. The memory of the just is blessed, while that of the wicked is left to rot. The violence of this attack was such that the Doctor found it necessary to meet it in a short letter to Sir Thomas Overbury, from which we have frequently quoted. ³ Vernon had studied attentively the old wicked maxim,

Calumniare audacter, aliquid haerebit. ⁴

And Owen had learned from Father Valerian the use of another phrase, which he very decidedly applies to his clerical opponent. To some impudent slanders which were propagated against him, that Father simply replied, “*Mentiris impudentissime;*” ⁵ so said the amiable and witty Blaise Pascal, in answer to the calumnies of the Jesuits; ⁶ and so said Owen, *sans ceremonie*, to the libel of the Rev. George Vernon.

347

The situation of the poor Dissenters was truly pitiable. They were baited by all sorts of antagonists, from the royal mastiff, ready to devour, to the contemptible church cur who could only bark or snarl. Whatever line of conduct they pursued, they were sure to be abused. In the true spirit of Procrustes,⁷ their enemies were determined to stretch them, or lop them.

“They challenge us,” said Alsop, “to a paper duel in the most provoking language, such as would set an edge on the most obtuse coward. If modesty, an ambition for peace, or love of retirement, tempt us to decline the combat, we are then posted up for cowardice; but if we awaken so much spirit as to take up the gauntlet, and return the mildest answer, then trusty R. gets it in the wind, and immediately summons

¹ Athen. Ox. Bliss. iv.—605

² Metropolitan — an archbishop presiding over other bishops within his jurisdiction; here used sarcastically.

³ Sermons and Tracts, p 615.

⁴ Slander boldly, something always sticks.

⁵ Bayle’s Dict., Valerian. — meaning, “You lie shamelessly.”

⁶ Provincial Letters.

⁷ Greek mythology — a mythical giant who was a thief and murderer; he would capture people and tie them to an iron bed, stretching them or hacking off their legs to make them fit; Procrustes was killed by Theseus.

his hamlets, raises the whole *posse ecclesiae* and spiritual militia upon us, and strangles the helpless infant in the cradle. If it escapes, and is written with becoming seriousness, they have one reply, 'this is nothing but whining or raving!' If the style is brisk, they have one word ready to confute it, 'this is drollery, burlesque, buffoonery.' Against all of this I see no other remedy but silent complaints; or it may be this short rejoinder: — *Tolle Legem, et fiat disputatio.*"¹

The learned Mr. Charles Chauncey, President of Harvard College, died in February, 1671. It must have been about this time that Owen was invited to become his successor— unless, because of his advanced age (Mr. Chauncey was eighty-two at his death), Owen had been invited to the office during his lifetime.²

348

Dr. Owen was particularly qualified for such an office. His learning, talents, and experience, together with the knowledge he must have possessed of academic affairs from his situation in Oxford, all pointed him out to his brethren in New England, as a most suitable person to fill the important trust. Harvard College was founded about 1630, and derived its name from Mr. John Harvard, a worthy minister, who left a considerable sum of money to lay the foundation of a fund for its support. Many persons in England contributed both money and books to the infant institution. Among them were Mr. Baxter, Sir Kenelm Digby, Sir John Maynard, Archbishop Usher, Mr. Joseph Hill, and the celebrated Theophilus Gale, who left the greater part of his valuable library to enrich it. The first President was Mr. Nathaniel Eaton, who was succeeded in 1640, by Mr. Henry Dunstar; he continued in office till he became Baptist in 1654. He was succeeded by Mr. Chauncey, who remained till his death. From this college many of the most valuable ministers in America have come forth; and it continues to enjoy considerable reputation.³

I have discovered no document ascertaining the fact of Owen's invitation to fill the Presidency. Yet, as the Memoirs prefixed to his Sermons and Tracts assert it, as well as asserting that he had an invitation of a similar nature from some of the Dutch universities, little doubt can be entertained of its truth.

349

In the month of August 1671, the Magistrates and Ministers of Massachusetts Bay, addressed a letter to their brethren in England, imploring assistance for the support of Harvard college — the supply of a President, and that young men might be sent over to be educated. A reply to this letter was written and subscribed by Dr. Owen and twelve of the London Independent Ministers. It is dated February 5th, 1672. They deplore their great inability to afford all the relief that was needed, but intimate that they were doing something for their assistance, which would be sent afterwards. They regret the difficulty of finding a President, and recommend Dr. Hoar — a member of Mr. Collins' church, who was then proceeding to New England. It is an exceedingly Christian and affectionate letter, and shows how cordially the churches on both sides of the Atlantic were disposed to support and countenance each other. Dr. Hoar was accordingly chosen President.⁴ But in consequence of some misunderstanding between him and the students, he resigned early in 1675, and died soon after. He had been originally educated in Harvard college himself, but came over to England in 1653, where he took his degree of M. D., and married a lady of rank of the name of Lisle.⁵

¹ Epist. ded. to Melius Inquirendum. "Take the law, and let it speak."

² "It does not satisfactorily appear that he was invited to the Presidency of Harvard College." Holmes' American Annals, vol. i. p. 321.

³ Magnalia Americana, book iv.

⁴ Hutchison's Coll. of Original Papers, pp. 429-431.

⁵ Mass. Coll. for 1799, p. 108.

This same year, 1653, the Doctor published his work on the Sabbath, which he had originally designed to form part of his Exercises on the Epistle to the Hebrews; but for particular reasons he now issued it by itself. His great object in it, is to establish the authority, and illustrate the duties and privileges of the day of sacred rest. The fanatics of the Commonwealth, among their other extravagances, had disputed its Divine obligation, and contended that it was a part of the ceremonial Law abrogated by Christ. From maintaining that every day alike was *holy*, they had proceeded to make every day alike *profane*.^{Rom 14.5}

350

The publications and conversation of such persons had stumbled and shaken many; but they were not the chief causes of the relaxed observation of the Lord's day, which was then prevailing. The spirit of the *Book of Sports*¹ still influenced the British court; and Episcopal writers had done much to shake the faith of the country in the privilege and sacred obligation of the Christian rest. The design and tendency of Peter Heylin's *History of the Sabbath* were to destroy its sanctification, and to root up the principles generally entertained by Christians on that subject. All decent regard for the Sabbath was completely thrown off by the king and his ministers. Their private conduct on that day, as it appears from a note in a former part of this work, was execrably immoral. And when they attended the worship of God, it seemed to be their chief design to afford a public exhibition of the highest contempt of God, and of sacred things. The effect of such an example may easily be conceived. The serious observation of the first day of the week was a decided evidence of Puritanism, which was held in more abomination than the grossest debauchery. A general looseness of manners began to prevail, and the mighty torrent of iniquity threatened to sweep all sobriety and godliness from the land.

It was the duty of all who feared God, and desired to promote the interests of religion, to counteract this growing, and very dangerous evil. The work on the Sabbath was peculiarly calculated to repress iniquity, and to establish truth. It abounds in learned and judicious reasonings which, in general, without quoting opponents, Owen effectually demolishes their sceptical doubts, or sophistical declamations.

351

It reveals his mighty acquaintance with the Scriptures, and with all sacred and profane antiquity, as well as with the history of the church. He establishes, by incontrovertible evidence, the Divine appointment of the first day of the week as the day of holy rest. And in his illustration of its nature, he is equally remote from both the ceremonial rigidity of judaical worship, and the looseness of popish and prelatical allowance. He notes, on one hand, the evil which,

“consists in the accommodation of the laws, and precepts, and institutions of God, to the lusts, and present courses and practices of men. A mystery of iniquity to this purpose has been revealed of late, tending to the utter debauching of the lives and consciences of men. A work exceedingly acceptable to all sorts of persons who, if not given up to open atheism, would rejoice in nothing more, than in a

¹ *Book of Sports*, formally *Declaration of Sports*, was an order issued by King James I of England for use in Lancashire to resolve a conflict on the subject of Sunday recreations, between the Puritans and the gentry — many of whom were Roman Catholics. Permission was given for dancing, archery, leaping and vaulting, and for “having of May games, Whitsun ales and morris dances, setting up May-poles and other sports used with it, so as to be without impediment or neglect of divine service. Women shall have leave to carry rushes to church for decorating it.” On the other hand, “bear and bull-baiting, interludes, and... bowling” were not to be permitted on Sunday. In 1618 James ordered all English clergy to read the declaration from the pulpit. But so strong was the Puritan opposition to Sunday amusements, that he prudently withdrew his command. In 1633 Charles I not only directed the republication of his father's declaration, but insisted on the clergy reading it. Many of the clergy were punished for refusing to obey the injunction. When Charles was overthrown during the English Civil Wars, Puritan prohibitions against sports and games on the Sabbath again prevailed, until Charles II was restored in 1660. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Book-of-Sports>

reconciliation between the rule of their conscience, and their lusts, that they might sin freely and without remorse.”

On the other hand, he acknowledges, that some,

“have collected whatever they could think of that is good, pious, and useful in the practice of religion, and prescribed it all in a multitude of instances, as necessary to the sanctification of this day — so that a man can scarcely, in *six* days, read over all the duties that are proposed to be observed on the *seventh*. They have laboured more to multiply directions about external duties — giving them out, as it were, by number or list — than to direct the mind to a due performance of the whole duty of the sanctification of the day, according to the spirit and genius of gospel obedience. And some measuring others by themselves, and by their own abilities, have been apt to tie men up to such long tiresome duties, and rigid abstinences, that have cloaked their minds, and turned the whole service of the day into a wearisome bodily exercise that profits little.”¹

352

These and some other expressions in this work, occasioned an unpleasant misunderstanding of his meaning among several of his brethren, and brought upon the Doctor great distress and vexation. He had also said that,

“The observation of the Lord’s day is to be commensurate to the use of our natural strength on any other day, from morning to night. The Lord’s day is to be set apart to the ends of a holy rest unto God, by everyone, as his natural strength enables him to employ himself in his lawful occasions any other day of the week.”²

We should think there is nothing in this language very liable to exception, or capable of being misunderstood. That God does not require greater exertion in his service on the Sabbath, than we are capable of making in our own service on other days, would seem to be the doctrine of common sense, as well as of the Scriptures. The sentiment, however, produced an expostulatory letter from Eliot, the apostle of the American Indians, to which the Doctor wrote a reply. This claims our attention, not only because it vindicates Owen from unfounded suspicion of being unfavourable to the moral obligation of the Lord’s day; but also because it affords a fine specimen of the tenderness of his feelings, under the sufferings and unjust reproaches with which he had been frequently loaded.

353

“As to what concerns the *natural strength of man*, either I was under some mistake in my expression, or you seem to be so in your apprehension. I never thought, and I have not said, that the *continuance* of the Sabbath is to be commensurate to the natural strength of man, but only that it is an allowable means of men’s continuance in Sabbath duties. This, I suppose, you will not deny, lest you cast the consciences of professors into inextricable difficulties. When first I engaged in that work, I did not intent to have spoken one word about the *practical observation* of the day; but only to endeavour the *revival* of a truth which, at present, is despised among us, and strenuously opposed by sundry Divines of the United Provinces, who call the doctrine of the Sabbath, *Figmentum Anglicanum*.³ It was on the desire of some learned men in these parts, that I undertook the vindication of it. Having now discharged the debt which I owed to the truth in this matter, and to the church of God, I suppose I shall not again engage on that subject. Though it was not as I ought, it was done with such a composition that I hope, through the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, it might find acceptance with God, and with his saints.

“I suppose there is scarcely anyone alive in the world, who has more reproaches cast on him than I have — though up to now God has been pleased, in some measure, to support my spirit under them. I still relieved myself by this: that my poor endeavours have found acceptance with the churches of Christ. But my holy, wise, and gracious Father sees it needful to test me in this matter also. And what I have received

¹ Vol. ii. of Wright’s Ed. of Owen on the Hebrews, pp. 450-453.

² Ibid. p. 455.

³ [The imagination of the Anglicans.](#)

from you — which, it may be, does not contain your sense alone — has printed deeper, and left a greater impression on my mind, than all the virulent revilings and false accusations I have met with from my professed adversaries. I acknowledge to you, that I have a dry and barren spirit, and I heartily beg your prayers that the Holy One would, notwithstanding all my sinful provocations, water me from above. But that I should now be apprehended to have given a wound to *holiness* in the churches, *is one of the saddest frowns in the cloudy brows of Divine Providence.*

354:

I have asserted the doctrine of the Sabbath, though not as it ought, yet as well as I could. I have pleaded for the observation of it in holy duties, to the utmost of the strength for those whom God shall be pleased to give us. I have also declared the necessity of a serious preparation for it, in sundry previous duties. But now, to meet with severe expressions — it may be, ‘tis the will of God that vigour should hereby be given to my former discouragements; and that there is a call in it to cease from these kinds of labours.”¹

While we sympathise with Owen in the sufferings which this letter describes, and admire the Christian feeling which it reveals, we are taught by it the impropriety of forming rash judgments, and of condemning a writer for the supposed meaning of an insulated² paragraph, to which his general character and sentiments are decidedly opposed. His language respecting his sufferings and reproaches, is fully justified by the statements we have given. And we place him in a point of view in which he is now seldom contemplated: a companion with his brethren in the tribulation and patience of Jesus Christ. The splendour of an object frequently diminishes the nearer we approach it. The glory with which a future generation sometimes encircles a devoted minister of heavenly benevolence is, in many instances, more the effect of their distance from him, than of their just appreciation of the actual value of his services. It is, at times, as dangerous to resist the tide of popular *eclat*,³ as it is at other times to stem the swell of popular prejudice.

355

May it not be feared that some of those who now never mention the name of Owen except with an epithet of distinction, had they lived beside him, would have been among his bitterest enemies? But how small a matter it is, to seek or to obtain the honour of man during any period of this temporary dispensation!⁴

In the beginning of the year 1672, Charles perceived the bad effects of his severity against the Dissenters, or he was desirous to promote the interests of Popery. He issued a declaration of indulgence, in which he assumed the right to dispense with the laws of Parliament in ecclesiastical matters. By his own authority, he suspended the execution of all the penal laws against Non-conformists and Recusants,⁵ and allowed them to meet for public worship upon taking out a *license* to be granted for that purpose. Many of the Non-conformists scrupled about the lawfulness of availing themselves of the privilege thus granted, because it proceeded from the assumption of an illegal power on the part of the crown. But as it only enabled them to enjoy what they were

¹ Mather’s *Magnalia*, b. iii. p. 178.

² *Insolated*: exposed to the rays of the sun.

³ *Eclat*: enthusiastic approval, with accompanying pomp and circumstance.

⁴ The necessity of defending the sacred obligation of the day of rest, at this time, appears to have impressed others as well as Dr. Owen. Within a few months of each other, there appeared, besides Owen’s work, “Aphorisms concerning the doctrine of the Sabbath,” by the Rev. George Hughes of Plymouth, edited by his son, Obadiah Hughes; and “The Divine appointment of the Lord’s Day,” by Richard Baxter. Both these works are valuable, and support the same views which are maintained by Owen, though neither of them treats the subject so fully or so ably as the Doctor. Baxter takes particular notice of the dangerous sentiments of Heylin, in his history of the Sabbath, and points out his perversions, both of Scripture testimony, and of Christian antiquity, to support his lax principles.

⁵ *Recusants*: Under a 1558 Act of Recusancy, the term referred to those who remained loyal to the pope and the Roman Catholic Church, and did not attend Church of England services. It then came to be used against the Dissenters, who likewise refused to attend the services. Cromwell suspended the Act to give relief to non-conforming Protestants, rather than to Catholics. But under Charles II, Protestant Dissenters again fell under its penalties.

naturally entitled to, and which they could not lawfully be deprived of; and as the enjoyment of this privilege was not an act of injustice to others; it seems useless to have perplexed themselves on this subject. They were all sufficiently aware that the grant was not made from any good will toward them; but it was their business to accept the boon, even though bestowed with an ill grace, or from a bad design.

356

“We did, indeed,” says Owen, “thankfully accept, and make use of this royal favour. For so many years, we had been exposed to all manner of sufferings and penalties by which multitudes were ruined in their estates; and some lost their lives. We were without hopes of any remission from the Parliament, by their mistaking the true interest of the kingdom. So, we were glad to take a little breather from our troubles, under his Majesty’s royal protection. It was designed only as an expedient, as was usual in former times, for the peace and security of the kingdom, until the whole matter might be settled in Parliament.”¹

When the Declaration of Indulgence was published, the Non-conformist ministers of London desired to return thanks to his Majesty; but found some difficulty in agreeing to the terms which they ought to employ. An address drawn up by Dr. Seaman and Mr. Jenkins was too eulogistic, and could not be agreed to. Baxter says that when they could not come to an agreement about the form, they concluded on a cautious acknowledgment of the king’s clemency, which was delivered *extempore*, having been introduced by Lord Arlington to the royal presence for this purpose. ² This, however, is not strictly correct. An address was drawn up by Dr. Owen, agreed to by the ministers, and presented by him to his Majesty. I am happy to be able to present a copy of this document here:

357

May it please your Majesty,

We humbly thank you for the favour of this opportunity, in which we may acknowledge that deep sense which we have of your gracious clemency, the effects of which we every day enjoy. It is that alone which has interposed between the severity of some laws, and some men’s principles and us, which otherwise would have effected our ruin — though we are persuaded that neither the one nor the other, could countervail *your Majesty’s* damage thereby.

It is this, principally, in which the kings of the earth may render themselves like the King of heaven, when by their power, wisdom, and goodness, they relieve the minds of their peaceable subjects from fear, distress, and distracting anxieties, and trials on their persons (rendering their lives burdensome to themselves, and useless to others) — which your Majesty has done towards multitudes of your subjects in this nation. And we do rejoice in this advantage, to declare to your Majesty, that as we have a conscientious respect toward all those obligations to loyalty which lie on the commonalty of your subjects, so being capable of a *particular one* in the greatest of our concerns: the liberty of our consciences and assemblies, which others are not (they desire no more than what they esteem their right by law). We hold it our duty, which we engage in before you, not only to be partakers with them, but to preserve in our minds a particular readiness to serve on your Majesty’s commands and occasions, as we shall be required or advantaged for it. And we humbly pray the continuance of your gracious favour, and we shall pray that God would continue His presence with you in all your affairs, and continue your royal heart in these counsels and thoughts of *indulgence*, whose beginnings have restored quietness to neighbours, peace to counties, emptied prisons, and filled houses with industrious workers, and engaged the hands of multitudes into the resolved and endeavoured readiness for your Majesty’s service — as not knowing anything in this world that is desirable to them, beyond what they may enjoy under your government, and by your favour.” ³

¹ Owen’s Address to the Reader, prefixed to his Answer to Stillingfleet.

² Baxter’s own Life, part iii. p. 99.

³ *Gentleman’s Magazine*, vol. xxxi. p. 253. It was sent by a Gentleman, who signs himself R. W. and who vouches for its authenticity, and thinks it was never published. I suppose this was the Rev. Richard Winter, a Dissenting Minister in London, of high respectability.

358

From Owen's connexions, it may easily be supposed that he knew more about what was passing at court and in Parliament, than most of his contemporaries in the ministry. It is curious to notice the account given by adversaries of his anxiety to ascertain what was going on, and of the use which he made of his information.

“Witness his fishing out the king's counsels, and inquiring whether things went well as to his great Diana, liberty of conscience? How his Majesty stood affected to it? Whether he would connive at it, and the execution of the laws against it? Who were, or could be made his friends at court? What bills were likely to be put up in Parliament? How that assembly was united or divided? etc. And, according to the current, and the disposition of affairs, he acquainted his *under officers*, and by their letters each post,¹ they were to inform their fraternity in each corner of the kingdom, how things were likely to go with them, how they should order their business, and for a time either omit or continue their conventicles.”²

359

This account is, no doubt, exceedingly exaggerated. But if every word of it were true, it only does honour to the Doctor's vigilance, and his disinterested anxiety to promote the welfare of his brethren. In such times, neutrality was criminal, and the man who did not employ every honourable means to avert the dangers which threatened the cause he had espoused, was guilty of betraying it.

The Indulgence, such as it was, promoted the comfort and increase of the churches. The Independents and Presbyterians set up a public weekly lecture to testify of their union on the most important subjects; and to resist the progress of Popery, Socinianism, and Infidelity. These lectures were delivered at Pinner's hall, on Tuesday mornings; and continued to be carried on jointly till 1695, when the two parties divided in consequence of the controversy about Crisp.³ The first lecturers were Doctors Owen, Manton, and Bates, and Messrs. Baxter, Jenkins, and Collins. Two of the discourses by Dr. Owen, were published in the Morning Exercises. The subject of the first is, “How we may bring our hearts to bear reproofs?” The second is on the question, “How is the practical love of Truth the best preservative against Popery?” He entitles it, “The Chambers of Imagery in the Church of Rome laid open; or an Antidote against Popery.” The one was preached in 1674, the other in 1682. The last is a very long and very able discourse in which he traces, to its true source, all the apostasy and abominations of the papacy, and of every false system of Christianity — the loss of the personal power and enjoyment of the truth, and the substitution of something external in their place. This affected their views of the object of worship, of its spiritual nature, of the character of the church of Christ, of its proper glory, and its Divinely instituted discipline.

360

The danger from Popery at any time, arises chiefly from the prevalence of ignorance and vice, and from its adaptation to the strongest principles of human depravity. Let the Bible be loved and circulated, and genuine religion prosper in those who have been the subjects of Divine mercy, and no danger may be apprehended from Catholic emancipation, or any other constitutional favour bestowed on the followers of the beast. ^{Rev 13.3}

¹ When we speak of a “post office,” we mean where letters are “posted” for delivery to the recipient. The day is coming, perhaps, when letters are no longer posted, and only email or digital text messages are known. – WHG

² Letter to a Friend, p. 34.

³ Tobias Crisp (1600–1643) He was a Calvinist; but a serious controversy arose from the republication of his works in the 1690s (e.g., *Christ Alone Exalted*). He so emphasized free grace, that it was received as antinomian, by those who sounded like legalists. Works are to be placed under *sanctification*, not *justification*, as Owen made clear in his treatise on the Mortification of Sin. – WHG

In 1672, the Doctor published anonymously, “A Discourse concerning Evangelical love, Church peace, and unity. With the occasions and reasons of present differences and divisions about things sacred and religious. Written in vindication of the principles and practice of some ministers and others.” 8vo. pp. 258. This is a very excellent work, though less known than most of Owen’s books, perhaps as a consequence of its being without his name. His views of love and unity are admirable; and they are brought to bear on the controversy then warmly agitated by Baxter and some others, respecting the Dissenters attending parish churches — to which Owen, for weighty reasons, was decidedly opposed. In the most dispassionate, and Scriptural manner, Owen states the corruptions and defects of national churches, and the reasons which (he conceived) justified his own separation, and that of his brethren, from them. The administration — the kind of connexion between the ministers and the people which obtains in them; the entire destruction of the original terms of communion — namely, evidences of faith and true conversion, and the substitution of other things in their place, by which the church “becomes a mere worldly society, and all Christian love and unity are completely destroyed.” These are the leading grounds on which he rests the necessity of Christians withdrawing from such institutions, and joining together in voluntary societies.

361

It is only in churches constituted of spiritual persons (as the apostolical churches evidently were), who have the unrestricted management of their own affairs, under the regulation of the law of Christ, that all the benefits of Christian fellowship can be enjoyed, and all its duties properly discharged. It is strange, that men seeking to act simply as the primitive disciples did, should be charged with *schism*, and with introducing all manner of evil. Voluntary societies are of apostolical institution, and national churches are a human device of a subsequent age. These are matters of fact so palpably evident that whoever denies them scarcely deserves to be reasoned with. It cannot be matter of surprise that many should choose to follow the former, rather than the latter. And as it is now so publicly avowed by the advocates of Establishments, that they [national churches] are no part of Christianity, but only a wall for its protection, or the means of its propagation, it can still less be wondered at, that many should object to such an unauthorised appendage. The work of Owen is constructed on principles, the progress of which has been widely extended since his time. And as these are founded on the invincible basis of Scripture and of fact, they must ultimately triumph over every secular ecclesiastical establishment on earth. Those who contend for these principles, may *appear* to be the enemies of peace, and unity, and love. But in the end, they will be found to have been their truest friends.

“Speciosum quidem nomen est Pacis, et pulchra opinio unitatis; sed quis ambigat eam solam unicam Ecclesiae Pacem esse quae Christi est?” ¹

362

Mr. Joseph Caryl died February 5th, 1673. He had been pastor of a numerous Congregation, which he collected soon after the Restoration, and which met for some years in Leaden-hall-street. ²

“His labours,” says a friend who knew him well, “were great; his studies incessant; his conversation unspotted; his charity, faith, zeal, and wisdom, gave a fragrant smell among the churches and servants of Christ. — His sickness, though painful, was borne with patience and joy in believing; and so he parted from time to eternity under the full sail of desire and joy in the Holy Spirit. He lived his own Sermons. He at last desired his friends to forbear speaking to him, that so he might retire into himself; which time they perceived that he spent in prayer; oftentimes lifting up his hands a little; and at last, finding his hands did

¹ Hilary (310-367), Bishop of Poitiers. This is taken from the title page of his “Discourse Concerning Christian Love and Peace.” — quoted here by Owen. “Splendid indeed is the name *Peace*, and beautiful is a united *opinion*; but who doubts that the only Peace of the Church, is that of Christ?”

² Wilson’s Hist. of the Diss. Churches, vol. i. p. 252.

not move, they drew near and perceived he had silently departed from them, leaving many mourning hearts behind.”¹

Owen and he had long been intimate friends; they had frequently been colleagued together in the time of the Commonwealth; their habits and sentiments were very similar; and as their churches assembled near each other,² they proposed uniting together under Dr. Owen, after the death of his esteemed friend and brother. As all parties seemed well affected toward this proposition, the two churches met for the first time for the joint worship of God, on the 5th of June that year. Dr. Owen preached a very excellent and appropriate Sermon from Colossians 3.14. He illustrates the nature and exercise of love, as the principal duty required among saints, especially as connected in church-fellowship. He says with much solemnity,

363

“I declare to this congregation, this day, that unless this evangelical love is exerted, not loosely and generally, but mutually among ourselves toward each other — we shall never give our account to Jesus Christ with joy; nor shall we ever carry on the great work of edification among ourselves. And if God is pleased but to give this spirit among you, then I have nothing to fear but the mere weakness and depravity of my own heart and spirit.”³

The united church consisted of one hundred and seventy-one persons, which is reckoned a considerable society among Independents; but it was still more distinguished for the rank of some of its members, than for its number. Among these were Lord Charles Fleetwood; Sir John Hartopp; Colonel Desborough (brother-in-law to Oliver Cromwell); James Berry (a distinguished officer of the Commonwealth army); also Lady Abney; Lady Hartopp; Lady Vere Wilkinson; Lady Thompson; and the celebrated Mrs. Bendish, grand-daughter to Cromwell, and remarkably like the Protector in some of the strong features of his character.⁴ Religion was not then so rare among persons of rank and family, as it has since become. And even the Non-conformists could reckon among their members not a few individuals in the higher walks of society, who considered it an honour to share their sufferings, as well as their privileges. The persons now mentioned continued to adorn the doctrine of Christ for many years, and the Doctor remained in the oversight of them, till his death. I will introduce here, a few gleanings from their history.

364

Charles Fleetwood, son-in-law to Cromwell, was sprung from an ancient family, formerly in Lancashire. He held a post in the court of Charles I, but joined the Parliament, and soon rose to the highest honours which it could bestow. In 1647, he was one of the Commissioners appointed to deal with the King; he had no involvement in the king’s death afterwards. On the death of Ireton, he married his widow; after which he was made Commander-in-chief of the army in Ireland, which he entirely secured. He was made one of Oliver’s Lords, and is therefore often called Lord Charles Fleetwood. He obtained favour after the Restoration, and lived privately for the most part at Stoke Newington, where he died soon after the Revolution, He suffered much for his principles as a dissenter. At one time, the fines imposed on him and on Sir John Hartopp (who was married to one of his daughters), and a few others, amounted to £6000 or £7000.⁵ Owen appears to have been strongly attached to Fleetwood, as some of his letters to him show.⁶ He is accused of cowardice, though I suspect unjustly — this was not a common vice in the leaders of the Commonwealth. Granger says he had no great skill as a soldier, and less as a politician; but he

¹ Dorney’s Div. Contemplations, p. 344.

² Wilson’s Hist. of the Diss. Churches, vol. i. p. 253.

³ Sermons and Tracts, p. 175.

⁴ Wilson’s Diss. Churches, vol. i. p. 253.

⁵ Noble’s Mem. vol. ii. pp. 333-348. ([Roughly £4.5 million in 2005 – WHG](#)).

⁶ See Appendix.

had a very powerful influence over the bigoted part of the army. He thought that prayers superseded the use of carnal weapons, and that it was sufficient to trust in the hand of Providence, without exerting the arm of flesh. ¹ This, however, is the common style, in which the men of that period are reproached for placing dependence on God for the success of their exertions. The measures which they employed, in general, sufficiently prove that they knew how to use means, as well as to exercise trust.

365

Noble acknowledges that “he was religious, and had the greatest veneration for civil liberty.” Determined that what are virtues in ordinary men, should be deformities in Fleetwood, Noble adds, “but his ideas of both were so romantic, fantastical, and erroneous, that they were blemishes instead of ornaments to his character.” ²

Major-General Berry was originally a clerk in an ironwork, according to Baxter; a wood-monger in London, according to Noble. He was at an early period the bosom friend of Mr. Baxter, who highly esteemed him, and says,

“He was a man of great sincerity before the wars, and of very good natural parts, especially mathematical and mechanical. Affectionate in religion, and while conversant with humbling Providences, doctrines, and company, a great enemy to pride. But when Cromwell made him his favourite, and his extraordinary valour was crowned with extraordinary success, his mind, his aim, his talk, and all was altered.”

In a word, he became an Independent, by which he lost Baxter’s good opinion of him; but it does not therefore follow that he *deserved* to lose it. He represented the counties of Hereford and Worcester in 1656, and was removed to Cromwell’s upper house the following year. He was a leading instrument in pulling down Richard Cromwell, and an active member of the Council of State. Baxter admits, which is a strong testimony to Berry’s character (considering the opinion which we just quoted) — “that he lived afterward as honestly as could be expected in one who takes error for truth, and evil to be good. He was for some time after the Restoration, a prisoner in Scarborough Castle; but upon being released, he became a gardener.” I do not know how to reconcile this with the fact that Parliament ordered Berry to retire from London to whichever of his seats was farthest from the city. It is probable that he lost much of his property, but not likely that he lost the whole. I have not been able to ascertain when he died. ³

366

Sir John Hartopp was distinguished both for his Christian character, and for the high respectability of his family. His grandfather was created a baronet by James I in 1619, only a few years after the institution of the order. He was born in 1637, and at an early period of his life cast his lot with the Independents. He married the daughter of Charles Fleetwood, Esq. and thus became allied to the Cromwell family. Lady Hartopp died Nov. 9, 1711. It was after her funeral that Dr. Watts preached and published “The last enemy conquered.” ⁴ Sir John lived to the advanced age of eighty-five, and upon his death, April 1, 1722, Dr. Watts preached the most beautiful of all his discourses: “The happiness of separate spirits made perfect.” As Sir John and Lady Hartopp were not only members of the church of which Dr. Watts was pastor, but as he had resided five years in their house as tutor to their eldest son, the Doctor was particularly qualified to bear testimony to the character of these estimable individuals. He says little of Lady Hartopp, though what he does say is highly to her honour; but he gives a full-length portrait of Sir John.

¹ Biog. Hist. vol. iii. p. 18.

² Noble, *loc cit.*

³ Baxter’s own Life, Part i. pp. 57-97. Noble’s Mem. vol. ii. p. 507.

⁴ An excellent letter from Dr. Owen to Lady Hartopp, on the occasion of the death of an infant daughter, will be found in the Appendix.

“The Book of God was his chief study, and his divinest delight. His bible lay before him night and day, and he was well-acquainted with the writers who explained it best. He was desirous to see what the Spirit of God said to men in the original languages. To this end, he commenced some acquaintance with the Hebrew, when he was more than fifty years old; and that he might be capable of judging any text in the New Testament, he kept his youthful knowledge of the Greek language, in some measure, for the period of his life.

367

Among the various themes of Christian contemplation, he took particular pleasure in the doctrines of grace, in the display of the glories of the person of Christ, God in our nature, and the wondrous work of redemption by his cross. His conversation was pious and learned, ingenious and instructive. He was inquisitive about the affairs of the learned world, the progress of arts and sciences, the concerns of the nation, and the interests of the church of Christ — and on all occasions, he was as ready to communicate as he was to inquire. His zeal for the welfare of his country and of the church in it, carried him out to the most extensive and toilsome services in his younger and middle age. He employed his time, his spirits, his interest, and his riches, for the defence of this poor nation, when it was in the utmost danger of popery and ruin. He was three times chosen representative in Parliament, for his county of Leicestershire, in those years when a sacred zeal for religion and liberty, strove hard to bring in the bill of exclusion to prevent the Duke of York from inheriting the crown of England. Nor was he ashamed to own and support the despised interest of the Dissenters, when the spirit of persecution raged highest in the days of Charles, and King James the second. He was a present refuge for the oppressed, and the special Providence of God secured him and his friends from the fury of the oppressor. He enjoyed an intimate friendship with that great and venerable man, Dr. Owen, and this was mutually cultivated with zeal and delight on both sides, till death divided them.

368

A long and familiar acquaintance enabled him also to furnish many memoirs, or matters of fact, toward that brief account of the Doctor’s life which was drawn up by another hand. Now, can we suppose two such souls to have been so happily intimate on earth, and may we not imagine they found each other among the brighter spirits on high? May we not indulge ourselves to believe that our late honoured friend has been congratulated upon his arrival, by that holy man who assisted to direct and lead him there?”¹

John Desborough was descended from a respectable family, and was originally bred for the law. On the breaking out of the civil wars, he joined the army of the Parliament in which, on account of his valour, he soon obtained a regiment of horse; and in 1648, he rose to the rank of a Major General. He was named one of the High Court of Justice, for the trial of the King; but he had the courage to refuse to sit. He married the sister of Oliver Cromwell, and was one of the Lords of his upper house. Notwithstanding this, he opposed the Protector’s measures, and successfully resisted his attempt to assume the regal dignity. At the Restoration, he attempted to leave the kingdom, but he was arrested, and excepted from the act of indemnity — though not to forfeit his life. The governments of Charles and James seem to have been very jealous of him, which is not to be wondered at, considering their conduct and his principles. It would appear, however, that he lived quietly and privately all the latter part of his life; and died shortly after the Revolution.² Granger says he was clumsy and ungainly in his person, clownish in his manner, and boisterous in his behaviour.³

369

Lady, or rather Mrs. Abney, as her husband was not knighted till after her death, was a daughter of Joseph Caryl, and a partaker of the piety of her father. Sir Thomas was descended from an honourable family at Wilsley, in the county of Derby. He was born in January 1639. Having lost

¹ Gibbon’s *Life of Watts*, pp. 92—96. *Watts’ Death and Heaven*.

² *Noble’s Mem.* vol. ii. pp. 243-250.

³ *Biog. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 72.

his mother when young, he was sent to school at Loughborough, to be under the care of his aunt, Lady Bromley, whose instructions were conducive to those religious impressions which distinguished him throughout life. He became a member of the church in Silver-street, under the care of Dr. Jacomb, and afterwards of Mr. Howe. He was knighted by King William, and chosen Lord Mayor of London in 1700. As an evidence of his piety, on the evening of the day on which he entered on his office, he withdrew silently from the public assembly at Guildhall, after supper, went to his own house, and there performed family worship; then he returned to the company. After the death of his first wife, he married in 1700, the daughter of John Gunston, Esq.

Lady Abney was a member of the church in Bury-street; and while the name of Dr. Isaac Watts continues to be respected, those too of Sir Thomas and Lady Abney, under whose roof he resided for thirty-six years, will be cherished with grateful affection. The Rev. Jeremiah Smith was the pastor of the church when Sir Thomas died. The account which he gives of the family religion of this Non-conformist Knight, deserves to be quoted for the instruction of Christians in similar circumstances.

“Here were, every day, the morning and evening sacrifices of prayer and praise, and reading the holy Scriptures. He strictly observed and sanctified the Lord’s day. God was solemnly sought and worshipped, both before and after the family’s attendance at public ordinances. The repetition of sermons, the reading of good books, the instruction of the household, and the singing of the Divine praises together, were much of the sacred employment of the holy day — variety and brevity making the whole not burdensome but pleasant; leaving at the same time room for the devotions of the closet, as well as for intervening works of necessity and mercy.

370

Persons coming into such a family, with a serious tincture of mind, might well cry out, ‘This is none other than the house of God; this is the gate of heaven!’ Besides the ordinary and stated services of religion, occasional calls and seasons for worship were also much regarded. In signal family mercies and afflictions, in going on journeys, in undertaking and accomplishing any matters of greater moment, God was especially owned by prayer and thanksgiving; the assistance of ministers being often called in on such occasions. Through the whole course of his life, he was priest in his own family, except when a minister happened to be present.”¹

Lady Thompson was a daughter of the Earl of Anglesea, and wife of John Thompson, Lord Haversham. This Nobleman belonged to a republican family, and was himself rather attached to that side in politics. He was made a baronet by Charles I, and was very active against the measures of Court during the two Popish reigns. He accordingly joined the Prince of Orange, by whom he was made a baron and Lord of the Admiralty. Towards the latter part of his life, he is said to have changed his principles, and gone over to the Church party, though he sometimes continued to attend the meetings. His Lordship moved in the House of Peers for the Princess Sophia’s coming over, as a thing necessary to the preservation of the Protestant religion.² Mr. Howe’s funeral sermon for Mr. Matthew Mead, who died in Oct. 1699, is dedicated to Lord and Lady Haversham. He speaks strongly of the value which they attached to Mr. Mead, and of the intimacy of their friendship:

371

“Your Lordship’s great respect,” he says, “to this servant of Christ, was even hereditary, and descended to him by you, from your family. And your Ladyship’s great value of him, though it might take its first rise from so dear and judicious a relative, could not but receive a great increase from his known worth, and your own discerning judgment.”³

¹ Gibbon’s Life of Watts, p. 103.

² Walpole’s Works, vol. i. p. 129.

³ Howe’s Works, vol. ii. p. 461.

Dunton's character of his Lordship, represents him as a man of penetration and deep knowledge in the affairs of Europe; as a patriot who asserted the rights of the Church of England, without punishing Dissenters; as possessed of all the tenderness of good nature, and the softness of friendship, and a generous sense of the miseries of mankind. ¹

Mrs. Polhill, wife of Edward Polhill, Esq. of Burwash in Sussex, was also, I suppose, a member of the church. At least, the Doctor addresses her in a beautiful letter which he wrote on the occasion of her daughter's death, not only as a sister, but as the object of special affection and care. ² Her husband, though a friend of Owen's, and of the Dissenters, was himself in the Established Church. All that I know of him will be found at the end of the volume.

Of Lady Vere Wilkinson, I know nothing. She was the wife of a Knight, I suppose, as I do not observe any title of this description in the Peerage or Baronetage of England.

Of Mrs. Bendish, very full and amusing accounts have often been given. Dr. Owen, it is said, was her favourite author; but her character was more marked by the peculiarities of her grandfather, than by the constant influence of Owen's principles.

372

Dr. Watts addresses a poem against tears to her, and it is to be hoped she is now where all eccentricities forever cease, and where all tears are forever wiped away.

The Parliament which met this year [1672], were highly offended with the king's declaration of indulgence, and insisted on its being recalled. They began, however, to distinguish between protestant and popish dissenters, and were willing to show more favour to the former than they had been accustomed to do. They passed the Test Act [1673], by which dissenters were rendered incapable of holding places of power or trust under the government; and the court soon after renewed its severities, by recalling the licences which had been granted to the Non-conformist ministers, and by issuing a declaration requiring the execution of the laws against Conventicles. By these unrighteous measures, many were made to suffer most grievously. Among the first of them, was Mr. Baxter, notwithstanding his rooted dislike to rigid dissent. ³ I do not find that Dr. Owen suffered personally, but he was far from being unconcerned about the sufferings of his brethren. He wrote a very spirited paper, "Advice to the citizens of London," in which he expresses very strongly his opinion of the unparalleled severities inflicted on protestant dissenters. ⁴ His safety was very probably owing to the high respectability of some of his connexions. He enjoyed the favour and friendship of the Earls of Orrery and Anglesea, Lords Willoughby, Wharton, and Berkely, and of Sir John Trevor, one of the secretaries of state. ⁵

373

A short account of these noblemen, who were distinguished for their attentions to the Non-conformists, and some of them for their personal piety, will perhaps be acceptable to the reader.

Roger Boyle, fifth son of the great Earl of Corke, and brother of the celebrated Robert Boyle, was created lord Broghill when only seven years of age, and under this title he is well known from the conduct of Cromwell toward him on several occasions. He was created Earl of Orrery by Charles II soon after the Restoration, which he had zealously promoted. He was eminent for his attachment to the protestant cause, and rose to the highest posts in the government of Ireland. He never made a bad figure, except as an author. As a soldier, his bravery was distinguished, his

¹ The Life and Errors of John Dunton, p. 499.

² See Appendix.

³ Sylvester, part iii. pp. 153, 155.

⁴ Sermons and Tracts, p. 586

⁵ Memoirs, p. 29.

stratagems remarkable. As a statesman, it is sufficient to say that he had the confidence of Cromwell. As a man, he was grateful and would have supported the son of his friend. Like Cicero and Richelieu, he would not be content without being a poet. Like Atticus, he prudently adapted himself to the changes of the times; but not by a timid and cautious conduct, or securing himself by inaction, much less by mean or sordid compliances. ¹

Arthur Annesley, son of Sir Francis Annesley, Lord Mount Norris, was born in Dublin, in 1614. While a private young man, he was on the side of Charles I; but afterwards he embraced that of the Parliament, to which he rendered some important services. He was not trusted by Cromwell, but was made president of the council of state after the fall of Richard. He was active in this capacity for the Restoration. He enjoyed much of Charles II's favour, by whom he was made Earl of Anglesea, treasurer of the navy, commissioner for resettling Ireland, and Lord privy seal.

374

He was a Calvinist in his religious sentiments, and from his liberal conduct toward men of different parties, he left it doubtful whether he was a Conformist or Non-conformist in principle. The dissenters always considered him as their friend. And as his Lordship and Dr. Samuel Annesley were cousins, and some of the Non-conformist ministers generally resided as chaplains in his house, he knew much about the dissenters, and interested himself greatly on their behalf. He left a valuable collection of books, which he had procured at great expense, and which, after the example of the De Puys and Colberts, he intended should never go out of his family; but it was sold after his death, which took place in 1686. ² The Countess of Anglesea was so much attached to Dr. Owen, that sometime before her death, she requested that the Doctor's widow allow her to be buried in the same vault with him — that in dying, as well as living, she might testify of her regard toward him. ³

Lord Willoughby of Parham, distinguished himself greatly as an officer in the Parliamentary army, at the beginning of the civil war. His father, lord Lindsay, was killed at the battle of Edge-hill, and himself taken prisoner. He was made general of the horse under the Earl of Essex. But being disgusted by the Commons refusing a personal treaty with the king, he assisted the tumults in the city, by which the Parliament was driven to the army, and for which he was afterwards impeached.

375

Not choosing to stand a trial, he retired to Holland, where he was made Vice-Admiral of the fleet fitted out by Charles, then prince of Wales. In 1650, he went out privately to Barbados, where he proclaimed Charles II and assumed the office of governor. He defended the island for a time against Cromwell's fleet, but at last surrendered on condition of being permitted to return to England and enjoy his estate. He was sent out to be governor of Barbados by Charles in 1666, where he died. ⁴ The Parham family appear to have continued dissenters to a very late period. Henry, Lord Willoughby, who died in 1775 in the 79th year of his age, was buried in Bunhill fields, the receptacle of the ashes of the dissenters for two hundred years.

Philip, Lord Wharton, was a Puritan nobleman of considerable note. He was one of the lay members of the Westminster Assembly, and took a most active part in supporting the Parliament against the King. For these services he was created an Earl by the House. He was appointed, with several others, resident commissioner at Edinburgh, to attend the Scotch Parliament. He was sent to the Tower for challenging the legality of the Long Parliament of Charles II. After this, he travelled abroad, carrying Mr. Howe with him. He seems to have been a decided Non-conformist,

¹ Walpole's Works, vol. i. p. 514. Granger, vol. iii. p. 226.

² Walpole's Works, vol. i. pp. 411, 412. Athen. Ox. Bliss, vol. iv. pp. 182, 187.

³ Memoirs of Owen prefixed to the 8vo. Ed. of his Sermons, 1720,

⁴ Whitlocke's Mem. passim.

and his house was a refuge for their ministers in the time of persecution. While attending Dr. Manton's meeting one time, the place was beset, and his name taken down. The place was fined forty pounds, and the minister twenty, which his Lordship paid. Mr. Locke describes him as "an old and expert Parliament man, of eminent piety and abilities, a great friend to the Protestant religion, and the interest of England." ¹

376

In a postscript to a letter written from his house to the church in Bury Street, by Dr. Owen, when he was ill, — the Doctor thus expresses himself respecting the family: —

"I humbly desire that you would in your prayers remember the family where I am, from whom I have received and do receive great Christian kindness. I may say as the Apostle said of Onesiphorus, the Lord give to them, that they may find mercy of the Lord in that day, for they have often refreshed me in my great distress." ²

Also, the Countess of Wharton appears to have been a very excellent woman, and from the language of Mr. Howe, in the dedication of his "Thoughtfulness for the future," she was decidedly a Non-conformist, if not a member of his church. He speaks of her Ladyship having been called to serve the Christian interest "in a family in which it had long flourished; and which it dignified beyond all the splendour that antiquity and secular greatness could confer upon it." ³

George Berkely, created Earl of Berkely, in 1679, was a privy councillor in the reigns of Charles II, James II, and William. He was also Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for several years. He bestowed a very valuable library which had been collected by Sir Robert Cooke, on Sion College, for the use of the city clergy. If we may judge about his religion from a small work which he published in 1670, "Historical Applications, and Occasional Meditations upon several subjects," we must think very favourably of it. Alluding to this book, and its author, Waller exclaims,

"Bold is the man who dares engage
For piety in such an age."

377

He was a nobleman of strict virtue and piety, and of such undistinguishing affability toward men of all ranks and parties, as to occasion his being exhibited by Wycherly in his "Plain Dealer," as *Lord Plausible*. ⁴

Sir John Trevor, was a branch of an ancient and noble family in Wales; and both he and his father were particularly respected by the Protectors, Oliver and Richard. He married Ruth, daughter of the celebrated Hampden, and possessed a portion of his patriotism. Charles either forgot Trevor's services to the republic, or desired to gain the favour of a powerful family; for he not only knighted him, but in 1668 sent him as Ambassador to the Court of France — after his return, he raised him to his privy council, and made him one of his principal secretaries of state. His former connexions sufficiently explain his partiality for the Non-conformists. He died of a fever in 1672. ⁵

Owen was not only known to several of the leading noblemen, or members of administration; both the King and the Duke of York paid him some attentions. Being in a very languishing state of health in 1674, ⁶ Owen was at Tunbridge Wells when the Duke of York was there. The Duke sent for him, and had several conversations with him in his tent about the Dissenters and Conventicles.

¹ Collection of Locke's Pieces, p. 116.

² Memoirs. p. 48.

³ Howe's Works, vol. ii. p. 102.

⁴ Athen. Ox. Bliss, iv. p. 625. Granger, vol. iii. p. 212.

⁵ Noble's Mem. vol. ii. pp. 138-143.

⁶ Hutchison's Col. or original papers.

After his return to London, the King himself sent for Owen, and conversed two hours with him, assuring him of his favour and respect, and told him that he might have access to him whenever he pleased. Charles also made strong professions of his regard for liberty of conscience, and declared how sensible he was of the injuries that had been done to Dissenters. As a proof of his good wishes toward them, he gave the Doctor a thousand guineas to distribute among those who had suffered most by the late severities.

378

The Doctor thankfully received his Majesty's generosity, and faithfully applied it to the objects of his bounty. ¹ When this came to be known, a great clamour was raised by the Churchmen, who reported that Owen and the Dissenters were pensioned to serve the Popish interest. But the Doctor afterwards replied to this with considerable passion,

“That never any one person in authority, dignity or power, in this nation, nor any one that had any relation to public affairs, nor any of the Papists, or Protestants ever spoke one word to him or advised with him about any indulgence or toleration to be granted to Papists, and challenges all the world to prove the contrary if they can. The persons are sufficiently known of whom they may make their inquiry.” ²

Notwithstanding this, Burnet asserts that Stillingfleet told him the Court hired the Dissenters to be silent, and that the greater part of them were so, and were very compliant. ³

This same year, the Doctor had to sustain a very unexpected attack on his work on *Communion with God*, published nearly twenty years before. This came from the pen of Dr. Sherlock, known as the author of some works on Providence and Death, which do him more credit than his book against Owen — though none of them reveal accurate views of the doctrines of the gospel.

379

His strictures on Owen are entitled, “A Discourse Concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, and our Union and Communion with him,” etc. 1674. They are a confused mass of Socinianized Arminianism, in which the doctrines of imputation and of justification by faith are denied; and language is employed respecting the person of Christ and his work, which I will not stain my pages by quoting them. Owen appears to have considered it one of the pitiful attempts to run him down, and to destroy the credit of his writings, to which he had for some time been doomed to submit. He met it in, “A Vindication of some passages in a Discourse concerning Communion with God, from the exceptions of William Sherlock, Rector of St. George, Buttolph Lane. pp. 237, 12mo. 1674.” The work on Communion is so far removed from controversy, that it seems a wonder that it should have excited it; and as it had been well-received during the whole period that it had been published, it seems even stranger. But when a matter for accusation is sought, no human character or production can be proof against its being found. Quoting some of Sherlock's perversions of his words and sentiments, Owen exclaims with considerable feeling:

“What does this man intend? Does he either not at all understand what I say, or does he not care what he says himself? What have I done to him? In what have I injured him? How have I provoked him, that he should sacrifice his conscience and reputation to such a revenge?” ⁴

In railing and abuse, Sherlock was more than a match for Owen; but in the lists of theological warfare, he was a very dwarf in the grasp of a giant. Owen exposes his ignorance, his petulance

¹ This was probably the first of those Royal grants to the Dissenters, which have since received the designation of the *Regium Donum*. They began to be regularly paid in the year 1723, during the administration of Sir Robert Walpole, and continue to be distributed to the present time, among poor Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations. A curious account of them will be found in the London Magazine for 1774, and in Dyer's Life of Robinson, p. 237.

² Memoirs, p. 30. Pref. to Answer to Stillingfleet.

³ Life and Times, vol. ii, p. 16.

⁴ Page 74.

and vanity, the inconsistency and absurdity of his statements in such a manner as must have made him, if he had any sense of shame left, blush that he had ever meddled with a subject that he so ill understood.

380

The controversy was taken up with great spirit by several others besides Owen. Robert Ferguson published in a thick octavo, "The Interest of Reason in Religion, with the import and use of Scripture Metaphors, and some reflections on Mr. Sherlock's writings, etc. 1675." A second attack on Sherlock came from the pen of Edward Polhill, Esq. "An Answer to the Discourse of Mr. William Sherlock, etc., 8vo. 1675." A third publication on the same side came from Vincent Alsop, the South of the Dissenters, "Antisozzo, or Sherlocismus enervatus, etc." This was the first work in which he called attention to himself. Both by his wit and his talents, on this and some other occasions, he rendered important service to the cause of truth. "*Speculum Sherlockiantum*: or a Looking Glass in which the admirers of Mr. Sherlock may behold the man," was supposed to be the production of Henry Hickman, a minister of learning and considerable controversial talents, who afterwards died in Holland. ¹ "Prodromus, or the character of Mr. Sherlock's Book," was the production of Samuel Rolle, who also wrote "Justification Justified," in the same controversy. "A Friendly Debate between Satan and Sherlock," and a subsequent defence of it, were written by Thomas Danson, the ejected minister of Sibton. The object of his treatises was to show that on the principles of Sherlock, Satan might have the same hope of salvation with the human race.

381

Sherlock replied to Owen and Ferguson in 1675, but took no notice of his other opponents. Another clergyman also, Thos. Hotchkis, Rector of Staunton, intervened in the controversy in, "A Discourse concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us, and our sins to Him, etc. 1675." In it, he takes up both Dr. Owen and Mr. Ferguson. This author seems substantially of Mr. Baxter's sentiments, and states the doctrine of imputation in several places, with considerable accuracy. With these publications, the Communion controversy terminated. The subjects discussed were of great importance, and the zeal with which the debate was gone into, reveals the interest that was then taken in them. It must have contributed greatly to the circulation of the work which occasioned it, and which has long out-lived the tempest of temporary rage, and the chilling damp of personal detraction. It remains the object of commendation, while its antagonists are forgotten and unknown.

In 1674 Owen published the second volume of his work on the Hebrews; and in the same year, the first part of his elaborate work on the Spirit appeared. It is entitled

"A Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit. In which an account is given of the Spirit's name, nature, personality, dispensation, operations and effects. His whole work in the Old and New Creation is explained; the doctrine concerning it is vindicated from opposition and reproaches. The nature and necessity also of Gospel holiness; the difference between grace and morality, or a Spiritual life to God in Evangelical obedience, and a course of moral virtues, is stated and declared. Fol. pp. 575."

382

The plan of this work embraced a number of most important subjects, either forming part of the direct work of the Spirit, or collaterally related to it. The Doctor, not being able to finish the whole design at once, published the first part of it in this large volume; and at considerable intervals he published the remaining parts of his plan. As it will save repetitions, and enable us to form a more consistent view of the entire scheme, I will here introduce all the other branches in the order in which they were published. The first of them is "The Reason of Faith, or an answer to that inquiry, Why do we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God? etc., 8vo. 1677." This is the first part of

¹ Calamy, vol. ii. p. 69.

his view of the Spirit's work in illumination. In the following year the second part of this branch of the subject came out: "The Causes, Ways, and Means of understanding the Mind of God, as revealed in his Word; and a declaration of the perspicuity of the Scriptures with the external means of the interpretation of them." 8vo. In 1682 came, "The Work of the Holy Spirit in Prayer, with a brief inquiry into the nature and use of mental prayer and forms." 8vo. And in 1693, two posthumous discourses — "On the Work of the Spirit as a Comforter, and as he is the Author of Spiritual Gifts," — completed the design.

These works evidently embrace an extensive and interesting view of this great department of the Divine administration. As they are filled up with the ability and copiousness of their author, and are the fruit of his most matured experience, they constitute the most complete exhibition of the Scripture doctrine of Spiritual agency and influence, to be found in any language. Any analysis that I could give would afford a very imperfect view of the works themselves; nor indeed is this necessary, as they are better known, either in the originals, or by some useful abridgements, than most of Owen's writings. Therefore, all I will attempt is a short notice of the relative connexion of the several subjects.

383

The first part is properly occupied with an examination of the Divine nature and personality of the Spirit, and his operations in conversion and sanctification. The Doctor justly attaches much importance to correct sentiments on these subjects — for the Deity of Christ, the doctrine of atonement, and the influence of the Spirit are closely connected, and constitute the leading truths of the Revelation of the Gospel. If the Spirit is not God, he cannot be the author of those effects which are ascribed to him; and should not be the object of acknowledgement and supplication. On the other hand, if the corruption of human nature is as extensive and inveterate as the Scriptures represent it, then without the provision of an Almighty agent, whose influence, when put forth, must prove irresistible, we could have no security for receiving the atonement and applying the grace of Christ in the destruction of sin. Owen examines all these subjects, with every plausible objection to them, with great carefulness, and at great length. The whole strength of his theological vigour is put forth, now arrived at its highest maturity; scarcely anything is left which we could desire to be said, either for illustration or defence.

From the Spirit and his influence, he is naturally led to treat the Spirit's Revelation in the Scriptures; the kind of evidence on which we believe them to be the word of God; and the consistency of using means for understanding them, with dependence on spiritual illumination; together with the *kind* of means we are required to employ. This branch of the subject involves some of the finest and most abstruse points of metaphysical and revealed theology.

384-

To say that Owen has removed every difficulty, and disentangled all the intricacies of a subject whose difficulties and obscurities arise — partly from the limited capacities of the human constitution; partly from the limits which God has prescribed to himself in his communications to men; and partly from the perverse reasonings of philosophical divines — would be saying too much. He has, however, done the most that man can do. He has exhibited the doctrine of Scripture fairly and fully, and appealed to general experience for the truth of his representations. On the one hand, Owen was no enthusiast: he expected no illapses,¹ or new revelations, or extraordinary intimations of the will of God. On the other hand, he knows that means are not powers, just as laws are not energies — they are merely the *media* through which a superior influence is exerted, and which is in all cases essentially necessary, to give them a beneficial result. The truth or fact is

¹ *Illapse*: falling or gliding into some sort of transcendental state.

easily established; but the nature of that mysterious link which connects Divine influence with human duty, is perhaps not for us to explain.

Owen is naturally led in the last part of his undertaking, to the office of the Spirit in exciting holy desires, forming religious habits, imparting consolation, and building up the people of God. Here there is much practical instruction, combined with a valuable explanation of the various parts of the heavenly economy. Speaking of the whole work, Nathaniel Mather, who writes the preface to the posthumous volume, says with much justness and felicity,

“They are not the crude, and hasty, and untimely abortions of a self-full, distempered spirit, much less the boilings over of inward corruption and rottenness, put into a fermentation; but the mature, sedate, and seasonable issues of a rich magazine of learning, well-digested with great exactness of judgment.

385

There is in them a great light reflected on, as well as derived from the Holy Scriptures, those inexhaustible fountains of light in sacred things. They are not filled with vain impertinent janglings, nor with a noise of multiplied useless distinctions; nor with novel and uncouth terms, foreign to the things of God, as the manner of some is *ad nauseam usque*.¹ But there is in them, a happy and rare conjunction of solidity, clearness, and heart-searching spirituality.”

This work was not undertaken merely for the sake of writing a book on this important subject; it was called for by the circumstances of the times in which the Doctor lived. During the period of England’s convulsions, many extravagances and abuses prevailed; and on no subject more than on that of Spiritual influence. The wildest doctrines and speculations were sported in the most fearless manner, as if men had been resolved to outvie one another in outrages on Scripture doctrine and common sense. Prophecies and visions, dreams and voices from heaven were publicly reported, to the astonishment of the multitude, the amusement of the scoffer, and the grief of the sober and enlightened Christian. New sects were springing up every day, each more fanatical or erroneous than the former. And though in general they had but an ephemeral existence, they produced, while they lasted, injurious effects on true religion, and left very baneful consequences behind them. The violent excitement of this period could not be of lasting duration. But after its strength was spent, its influence might be traced on three distinct classes of persons, whose existence, in one form or another, remains to the present day. ²

386

The pretenders to high illumination and spiritual enjoyment, independently of the Scriptures and of other external means, settled under the general denomination of *Quakers*. The incongruous atoms which had floated about under different names and various forms, were at length digested into a body combining the elements of fanaticism, philosophical calmness, and moral propriety, in a very singular degree. From carrying the doctrine of invisible and spiritual agency too far, the extreme of denying it altogether was easily gotten to. Hostility to reason as a gift of God, the means of examining the evidence of his revelation, and of ascertaining its meaning, led naturally to its deification as the sole guide and instructor of man. The abettors of these views found an asylum in the cold regions of Socinianism. The Spirit was treated by the former class as a kind of familiar,³ and his written communications were despised. His very existence was denied by the latter, and his operations were blasphemed. A third class, forming no distinct sect or known by any specific designation (though more numerous than both the former), also arose out of the circumstances and changes of the times. It was a class which pretended respect for religion, and hatred of

¹ To the point of nausea.

² Such religious experiences, imagined and ungrounded in Scripture, were lamented and refuted by Jonathan Edwards in his 1746 book, “Religious Affections.” From the 1820s, when Orme wrote this, to the 1880s, an explosion of cults and sects misled millions in search of spirituality (2Th 2.11-12). – WHG

³ *Familiar*: A spirit that acts as an assistant or guide to the realm beyond the tangible.

enthusiasm. But under the latter term of reproach, were included some of the most sacred truths of Christianity, and its most important influence on the human character. Such persons did not deny the existence of the Spirit in words; but His operations in converting, sanctifying, and comforting a sinner, were the objects of their unqualified and never-ending hostility. The follies of the former period and of the few fanatics who still survived it, were exaggerated; and they were charged against the many who maintained the proprieties and doctrines of Christianity. The Court of Charles took the lead in this refined system of irreligion.

387

Nothing was heard of but philosophy and reason — not as opposed to rant and nonsense; but as opposed to Scripture and scriptural piety. Genuine religion was run down under the pretence of laughing at fanaticism, and decrying sectarian folly. Fawning courtiers encouraged the wanton levity of Charles; and worldly ecclesiastics, and hungry poets, furnished his repasts, and regaled the depraved propensities of the admiring and deluded crowd.

Such was the state of the country when Owen formed the plan of his work on the Spirit. The objects which it embraced, included the errors and vices of the various classes now mentioned. It was designed to furnish information to the ignorant but well-meaning enthusiast; as an antidote to the wild sportings of deluded deceivers; as a defence of the Spirit's character and agency against Socinians; as a vindication of the true doctrine of Spiritual influence against the increasing tide of Court infidelity and clerical Arminianism; and as a combined and harmonious view of the truths connected with the main subject of discussion. The work was loudly demanded. The qualifications of the undertaker were beyond any then possessed by "his equals in his own nation." And besides the success which attended it at the time, it has ever since continued to render a most important service to the cause of pure and undefiled religion.

It would have been too much to expect that this work would pass without opposition. Although it professedly wages war with no one, it in fact opposes many. Fanatics and Socinians, indifferent to its reasonings for opposite reasons — the former believing too much, the latter too little — allowed it to proceed unnoticed. But the High Church party felt differently.

388

William Clagett, "Preacher to the Honourable Society of Gray's Inn, and one of his Majesty's Chaplains in ordinary," published "A Discourse concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit; with a confutation of some part of Dr. Owen's book on that subject." 1678. The object of this work is to show that Owen is very ignorant of the meaning of Scripture, a bungler in reasoning, and that his views of the natural wickedness of man, and of the power of God in converting him, are much too strong! The sentiments of Clagett are a confused mixture of Pelagian Arminianism, which distinguished the body of the English clergy in the days of Charles II. And so far as they have any fixed opinions, it seems to be their prevailing creed still.

On this work of Clagett, Mr. John Humfrey (who was but a muddy writer himself) made some observations in his "Peaceable Disquisitions." He complained of the uncivil manner in which Dr. Owen had been treated by his opponent. This led Clagett to publish a second volume of his work, in which he proceeds in his attack on Owen, and harshly criticizes Humfrey's attack on himself. He originally designed that his work should extend to three parts. At the end of the second, he tells Dr. Owen,

"It remains only to show you that the ancients are not for your turn [the Doctor having quoted them occasionally in the margin of his work]; which, through the blessing of God, I intend to do in another part of this discourse, which shall contain a history of their judgments on these points."¹

¹ Vol. ii. p. 290.

The author had prepared this volume for the press, but it happened that the manuscript was lodged with a friend of his, whose house was burned, and the book perished in the flames. ¹

389

An abridgement of the two first parts was published in 1719 by Henry Stebbinor; but neither the original nor the abridgement were ever much known. Clagett himself was a respectable man, and one of those whom Bishop Burnet speaks of as an honour both to the church and to the age in which they lived. But he certainly did not understand the subject on which he undertook to confute Dr. Owen, to whom he was very far inferior as a theologian.

The Doctor anticipated opposition to his work, both from his past experience of the mood of the times, and from what he knew of man's natural dislike for many of the doctrines he had endeavoured to defend and illustrate. In the preface to the *Reason of Faith*, he says,

“Where I differ in the explanation of anything belonging to the subject, from the conceptions of other men, I have candidly examined such opinions, and the arguments by which they are confirmed, without straining the words, cavilling at the expressions, or reflecting on the persons of the authors. And though I have been otherwise dealt with by many, and do not know how soon I may be dealt with again, I hereby free the persons of such temperaments from all fear of any reply from me, or the least notice of what they will be pleased to write or say. I consider such writing to be the same as those multiplied false reports which some have raised concerning me, most of which are so ridiculous and foolish, so alien from my principles, practice, and course of life, that I cannot help but wonder how any persons pretending to gravity and sobriety, are not sensible how their credulity is abused in the hearing and repeating of them.”

390

In pursuance of this resolution, and considering that the work of Clagett is in some respects of this nature, he treated it with entire silence. At times it is necessary to defend the truth to the last; at other times that silence is the best reply that can be made.

Asseveration blust'ring in your face
Makes contradiction such a hopeless case. ²

When the object of a controvertist is evidently to hit blots in his opponent's character, or to quibble with his words and reasonings for the sake of obtaining a pitiful and unworthy triumph, or of exciting public odium against the thing contended for — it is better to leave such a one to Him that judges righteously, ¹Pet 2.23 and to whom it belongs to avenge His own cause, than by employing similar measures to gain a victory at the expense of principle and godliness.

The next work which Dr. Owen produced is, “The Nature and Punishment of Apostasy, declared in an Exposition of Hebrews 6.4-6. 8vo. pp. 612. 1676.” In the preface to this work, he complains most piteously of the state into which the Christian profession had sunk — that the pristine glory of the Christian church was gone, and that the great body of those who assumed the name of Christ had degenerated into cold worldly professors, destitute of the *power*, and many of them even of the *form* of godliness. ²Tim 3.5 The work itself is only an enlarged Exposition of that part of the epistle to the Hebrews which particularly treats apostasy, and on which the Doctor was then labouring. He thought the circumstances of the times required, and the importance of the subject justified, a separate treatise. He examines at considerable length, and with great acuteness, the secret causes or reasons for the apostasy of churches and professors. And he points out the means of prevention or cure, in such a manner as is calculated to render the work exceedingly useful.

391

¹ Biog. Brit. vol. iii. p. 598, Ed. Kippis.

² William Cowper, *Conversation*.

It cannot be ascertained whether the awful evil which is the subject of this treatise, was more common in the days of Owen than our own. But it must be admitted by all who pay any attention to what passes around them, that of the number who set out in early life with a tolerably fair profession, a very large proportion make shipwreck of it before they die. This abandonment of the truth is sometimes sudden and flagrant; but in most cases it is gradual and almost imperceptible till the last. It is the result of latent and unperceived causes which operate in secret long before their effects are externally visible. A Christian profession is so easily taken up, the influence of Divine truth and invisible things is so partial, and the power of inward corruption and outward temptation is so strong, that much as we deplore it, we can scarcely wonder that many become weary of the ways of righteousness, and turn again to folly. It is a comfort, however, to know that the “foundation of God stands sure,” ^{2Tim 2.19} that those who go out from the people of God were never actually of them; ^{1Joh 2.19} and that while all are called not to be high-minded, but to fear, “the Lord knows those who are his,” ^{2Tim 2.19} and will perfect in the day of Christ that which he has here begun. ^{Phi 1.6} Those who desire to examine the subject fully, will find much valuable instruction and warning in this work of Owen.

At precisely what time the Doctor lost his first wife, I have been unable to fully ascertain. In a letter written from Stadham, unfortunately without a date, he speaks of her as much revived, so that he did not despair of her recovery; ¹ but it is not improbable that he was disappointed in this.

392

How long he remained a widower is uncertain. But as his numerous family had all been taken away, and age and infirmities were now fast coming on him, a second connexion seems to have been indispensable to his comfort. In June, 1677, ² he married the widow of Thomas D’Oyley, Esq., brother to Sir John D’Oyley of Chiselhampton near Stadham. Her name was Michel, the daughter of a family of distinction at Kingston Russel, Dorsetshire. She was eminent for her good sense, piety, and affectionate disposition, and she brought the Doctor a considerable fortune which, with his own estate, and other property, enabled him to keep his carriage and country house at Ealing in Middlesex, where he mostly lived during the latter years of his life. This lady survived the Doctor many years. Her funeral sermon was preached by Dr. Watts on the 30th of January, 1704. Mr. Gilbert, who probably knew her well, gives in the following lines from one of his Epitaphs on the Doctor. The character of the second, as he had given that of the first wife, was already quoted.

“Dorothea vice, non ortu, opibus, officiusve, secunda
Laboribus, Morbis, senioque ipso elanguenti
Indulgentissimam etiam se nutricem praestitit.” ³

¹ Memoirs, p. 48.

² Owen’s Will.

³ Memoirs, p. 32.

CHAPTER XII.

Owen's assistants — Ferguson — Shields — Loeffs—Angier—Clarkson — Intercourse between Owen and Bishop Barlow respecting Bunyan — Owen publishes on Justification — On the Person of Christ — The Church of Rome no safe Guide — Death of Goodwin — Owen publishes on Union among Protestants — Controversy with Stillingfleet — Owen's Vindication of the Non-conformists — Publications of others on the same side — Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation — Owen's Answer — Other Answers — Unfair conduct of Stillingfleet — Owen publishes on Evangelical Churches — His humble testimony — On Spiritual-mindedness — Account of the Protestant Religion — Meditations on the Glory of Christ — His declining health — Last sickness — Letter to Fleetwood — Death—Funeral — Clarkson's Sermon on the occasion — Last Will — Sale of his Library — Monument and Inscription — Portraits of Owen — General view of his character as a Christian — A Minister — A Writer — Conclusion.

During the latter part of his life, Dr. Owen generally had some person assisting him in his public labours, and who also acted occasionally as his amanuensis.¹ Among these we may notice Robert Ferguson, a native of Scotland, who possessed a living in Kent before the Restoration. After his ejection, he taught University learning at Islington, and for some time assisted Owen. He afterwards involved himself deeply in political intrigues, by which he brought himself into danger, and needed to flee to Holland. He took an active part in promoting the Revolution, and returned to England with William, by whom he was liberally rewarded. After this, he turned Jacobite, and spent his life in continual agitation. He died at an advanced age in 1714, poor and despised, both by his brethren and the world. He wrote various religious works of some merit, and several political treatises, among which were the Duke of Monmouth's manifesto, on his landing at Lynne, in 1685.²

394

Another of the Doctor's assistants, was Mr. Alexander Shields, a Scotsman also, and a man who suffered much in the cause of God and his country. He is well known in Scotland as the author of some works which were long popular, and contributed much to promote the antipathy of the Scotch to episcopacy — "The Hind let loose."³ "Mr. Renwick's Life, and Vindication of his dying Testimony." "A Vindication of the solemn League and Covenant," etc. He became minister of St. Andrews after the Revolution, and was much esteemed by King William. He was appointed to go to Darien as minister of the Scotch colony there; but as the expedition failed from lack of management and sufficient support, he went to Jamaica, where he died.⁴

Isaac Loeffs or Loafs acted in the same capacity to Owen for a time. He was M. A. and Fellow of Peter House, Cambridge. He was ejected from the Rectory of Shenley in Hertfordshire, after which he came to London. From the Church books of Bury-street, it appears that he was pastor for a time, either with Dr. Owen, or Mr. Clarkson, as his name stands among the list of Pastors, after the latter. He was a respectable man, and author of a work in 8vo., "The Soul's ascension in a state of separation." He died in July, 1689.⁵

395

¹ Someone skilled in the transcription (dictation).

² Calamy's Account, vol. ii. p. 383. Continuation, vol. i. p. 544. Ferguson is described in a proclamation issued in 1683, as "a tall, lean man, dark brown hair, a great Roman nose, thin-jawed, heat in his face, speaks in the Scotch tone, a sharp piercing eye, stoops a little in the shoulders, he has a shuffling gait that differs from all men, wears his periwig down almost over his eyes, about 15 years of age. Granger's Biog. Hist. vol. iv. p. 201. It is curious that, while warrants were issued to apprehend him, the messengers had orders to shun him or let him escape. Calamy *ut supra*.

³ Those who wish to see the cause of the Scotch Covenanters ably defended, with a statement of their grievous wrongs, ought to consult this book. While I by no means subscribe to all the opinions which it maintains, I feel constrained to do justice to the talent with which it is written, the manly abhorrence of tyranny which it avows, and its jealous defence of the exclusive rights of Jesus as the Head of his Church.

⁴ Biog. Scoticana, pp. 367, 368.

⁵ Non-Con. Mem. vol. ii. pp. 312, 313.

Mr. Samuel Angier, who had been a student at Christ Church, where he continued till the Act of Uniformity, also assisted Dr. Owen; and lived in the house with him. He was exposed to frequent trouble on account of his preaching. Warrants were often taken out against him, and in 1680 he was excommunicated at Stockport Church. He was an excellent scholar, a judicious and lively preacher, an eminent Christian, and zealous of good works. He became pastor of one of the oldest Independent Churches in England, at Duckenfield in Cheshire, where he died in 1713 at the age of seventy-five.¹

His last assistant, as pastor and successor in the Church of Bury-street, was David Clarkson. This excellent man had been educated at Cambridge, and was a fellow of Clarehall, where he had under his charge the celebrated Archbishop Tillotson; he maintained the highest respect for his pupil as long as he lived. He was, says Baxter,² a divine of extraordinary worth for solid judgment, healing moderate principles, acquaintance with the fathers, great ministerial abilities, and a godly upright life. Birch, though a High Churchman, speaks of him with equal respect, "He was eminent for his writings, particularly, 'No evidence of diocesan Episcopacy in the primitive times,' in answer to Dr. Stillingfleet; another on the same subject was printed after his death."³

396

He was ejected from the living of Mortlake, in Surry, in 1662,⁴ after which he lived in concealment for some time. In July 1682, Clarkson was chosen co-pastor with Dr. Owen, and succeeded to the entire charge on his death. Such a colleague must have been a great comfort to the Doctor, who speaks of him in some of his letters with great respect and affection. He did not, however, survive him long, as he died suddenly on the 14th of June, 1686, at the age of sixty-five. I cannot resist quoting part of the conclusion of the beautiful sermon which Dr. Bates preached on the occasion of his death.⁵

"He was a man of sincere godliness, and true holiness, which are the divine part of a minister, without which all other accomplishments are not likely to be effectual for the great end of the ministry, which is to translate sinners from the kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Conversion is the special work of divine grace, and it is most likely that God will use those as instruments in that blessed work, who are dear to him, and earnestly desire to glorify him. God ordinarily works in spiritual things as in natural: for as in the production of a living creature, besides the influence of the universal cause, there must be an immediate agent of the same kind for forming it; so the Divine wisdom orders it, that holy and heavenly ministers should be the instruments of making others so.

397

Let a minister be master of natural and artificial eloquence, let him understand all the secret springs of persuasion, let him be furnished with learning and knowledge, yet he is not likely to succeed in his employment, without sanctifying grace. That gives him a tender sense of the worth of souls; that warms his heart with ardent requests to God, and with zealous affections toward men for their salvation. Besides, an unholy minister unravels in his actions his most accurate discourses in the pulpit; and like a carbuncle that seems animated with the light and heat of fire but is a cold dead stone; so, though he may urge men's duties on them with apparent earnestness, he is cold and careless in his own practice, and his example

¹ Ibid. vol. i. pp. 220, 221.

² Life, Part iii. p. 97.

³ Life of Tillotson, p. 4. This was his "Primitive Episcopacy, stated and clarified from the Holy Scriptures, and ancient Records." 8vo. 1688. In this work, he successfully proves that a Bishop, in the days of the apostles, and for three centuries afterwards, was no more than a pastor of a single Congregation. His "Discourse concerning Liturgies," printed in 1689, successfully shows that no forms of prayer were prescribed or imposed during the first four centuries; "till the state of the Church was rather to be pitied than imitated; and what was discernible in it, different from preceding times, were wrecks and ruins rather than patterns," p. 198. Both works abound with valuable learning, and cogent reasonings, and are entitled to a distinguished place in the Episcopal controversy.

⁴ [The Great Ejection, caused by the Act of Uniformity 1662. Two-thousand Puritans were ejected from their pulpits.](#)

⁵ Non-con. Mem, vol. iii. pp. 305, 306

enervates the efficacy of his sermons. But this servant of God was a real saint, a living spring of grace in his heart, diffused in the veins of his conversation. His life was a silent repetition of his holy discourses. While opportunity lasted, with alacrity, and diligence, and constant resolution, he served his blessed Master, till his languishing distempers prevailed upon him. But then the best Physician provided him the true remedy of patience. His death was unexpected; yet, as he declared, it was no surprise to him; for he was entirely resigned to the will of God. He desired to live no longer than he could be serviceable. His soul was supported with the blessed hope of enjoying God in glory. With holy Simeon, he had Christ in his arms, and departed in peace to the salvation of God above.”¹

398

About this time, some correspondence took place between Owen and his old tutor Barlow, now advanced to the Episcopate, respecting John Bunyan. This excellent man, more celebrated than most of the persons who ever wore a mitre, had suffered long and grievously from imprisonment, by which the servant had been bound, but not the word of the Lord. During his confinement, he produced those works which have immortalised his name, and diffused most extensively the knowledge of Christ. By the existing law, if any two persons went to the bishop of the diocese, and offered a cautionary bond that the person would conform in half a year, the bishop might release him on bond. A friend of Bunyan requested Dr. Owen to give him a letter of introduction to the bishop on his behalf, which he readily granted. When the letter was delivered to Barlow, he told the bearer that,

“he had a particular regard for Dr. Owen, and would deny him nothing he could legally do; and that he would be willing even to stretch a little to serve him. But this, he said, is a new thing. I must therefore take a little time to consider it; and if in my power, I will readily do it.”

Being waited upon about a fortnight for his answer, Barlow replied that he was informed he might do it; but as the law provided, in case the bishop refused, application should be made to the Lord Chancellor, who thereupon would issue an order to the Bishop to take the bond and release the prisoner. “Now, as it is a critical time,” he said, “and I have many enemies, I desire that you would move the Chancellor in the case, and upon his order, I will do it.” He was told this would be an expensive mode of proceeding, that the man was very poor, and that as he could legally release him *without* this order, it was hoped he would remember his promise to Dr. Owen. But he would consent on no other terms — which at length were complied with — and Bunyan was set at liberty.²

399

I give this anecdote as it occurs in Asty’s memoirs of Owen, although I find some difficulty in reconciling it with the chronology of the period. Bunyan was imprisoned in 1660, and is said to have been kept in durance about twelve years and a half. He must consequently have been released in 1673. But Barlow was not made a Bishop till 1675. Whether Bunyan’s first term of imprisonment was divided, or whether he was confined a second time after the first twelve years, I cannot ascertain; but this is the only mode of obviating the difficulty. There must have been some foundation for the reported intervention of Owen and Bishop Barlow, as all the memoirs of Bunyan, as well as those of Owen, take note of it. It is said that Owen was in the practice of frequently hearing Bunyan preach when he came to London; which led Charles II to express his astonishment that a man of the Doctor’s learning could hear a tinker preach. To which Owen replied, “Had I the tinker’s abilities, please your Majesty, I would most gladly relinquish my learning.”³ Bunyan appears to have been a very popular preacher, and must have had something very attractive in his address. In the middle of winter, he would sometimes have more than twelve hundred hearers before seven o’clock in the morning on a week-day. And when he visited the

¹ Bate’s Works, pp. 841. 842.

² Owen’s Memoirs, p. 30.

³ Ivimey’s Hist. of the Eng. Bap. vol. ii. p. 41.

metropolis, one day's notice of his preaching would bring many more than the place of worship could contain. ¹ I do not know that anything of the same nature occurred again till the days of Whitfield and Wesley.

400

Barlow's conduct in the affair of Bunyan did not altogether break up the intercourse between him and Owen. Being together afterwards, the Bishop asked the Doctor what he could object to their liturgical worship, which he could not answer? Owen replied, "Means appointed by men for attaining an end of Christ — exclusive of the means appointed by Christ himself for attaining that end — is unlawful. And the worship of the liturgy with all its ceremonies, is a means appointed for an end of Christ — the edification of his church — exclusive of the means appointed by Christ for that purpose. Therefore, it is unlawful." He urged the argument from Eph. 4.8-12. "He gave gifts to men for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." The Bishop answered, "Their ministers might preach and pray." The Doctor said, "the administration of the sacraments is one principal means of the edification of the church. But the use of the *liturgy* is exclusive of the exercise of all gifts in the administration of the Lord's Supper." The Bishop paused — "Don't answer suddenly," said the Doctor, "but think about it till our next meeting," which never took place. ² Liturgies were not introduced into the church till, from its corruption by secular influence, it began to be served by persons who could not lead its devotions. The great body of the English clergy after the Reformation were in this condition. They were unfit to preach, and therefore the state provided them with sermons; they were unable to pray, and therefore it provided them with a service book. Suspicion of their capacity, or consciousness of their unfitness, is implied in that very provision which the Church has made for her clergy, and in which, notwithstanding, they profess to glory!

401

The latter years of Owen's life were mostly devoted to writing, and to the labours of the ministry as he was able to perform them. He appears to have been frequently laid aside from his *public* work. But every moment of his *private* retirement must have been employed, because during this period, some of his most elaborate performances were published or prepared for the press. It is proper to now direct our attention to these, in their order.

In 1677 he published, "The Reason of Faith," of which we have spoken in our account of his work on the Spirit. This year also appeared, "The Doctrine of Justification by Faith, through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, explained, confirmed, and vindicated." 4to. pp. 560. The subject of this volume embraces the grand truth of the Gospel — what Luther called "Articulus stantis et cadentis Ecclesiae" — *the great evidence of a standing or falling Church*. From the days of Paul, it has met with opposition not only from the world, but from men professing godliness, who have not understood it. In proportion to how well this doctrine is known and believed, the religion of an individual will be comfortable to himself, and acceptable to God. And from the degree of clearness and decision with which it is preached, we may infer the degree in which true religion flourishes in any community. Owen had studied the subject long and profoundly. The doctrine was dear to his own heart, as he derived from it all his comfort as a sinner; and it constituted the favourite theme of his public labours. He had examined many controversial books on the subject, and attended to the innumerable scholastic and metaphysical arguments by which it had either been attacked or defended. He derived little satisfaction from these. He considered it a doctrine that is not at all suited to a speculative state of mind.

402

¹ Gillies' Collections, vol. i. p. 254.

² Memoirs, pp. 30, 31.

“But where any persons are made sensible of their apostasy from God, of the evil of their natures and lives, with the dreadful consequences that attend it in the wrath of God, and eternal punishment due to sin, they cannot judge themselves more concerned in anything, than in the knowledge of the Divine way of deliverance from this condition.”

Entirely for the sake of such persons, he investigates the Divine revelation on this subject, and he endeavours to ascertain “how the conscience of a distressed sinner may obtain assured peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

To such believers, and to them alone, will this doctrine appear to be of importance. When engaged in the serious inquiry, “What must we do to be saved?” everything that explains the nature, certainty, and way of deliverance will be considered of unspeakable moment. In prosecuting his investigation, the Doctor does not allow himself to wander through the mazes and contradictions of human opinion. He constantly keeps in view the character of God as a Judge and Lawgiver, the actual condition of man as a sinner, and the glorious provision made by the plan of mercy for securing the honour and harmony of the Divine perfections, and extending salvation to guilty, helpless rebels. He examines the nature and use of faith — the import of the terms *justification*, *imputed righteousness*, and *imputation of sin to Christ*. He points out the difference between personal and imputed righteousness; he illustrates a number of passages of Scripture in which the subject is treated, and refutes the objections against his views. He maintains the consistency of the doctrine with living soberly, righteously, and godly in the world; and shows there is a perfect agreement between Paul and James, as they are treating the subject under different aspects.

403

The great extent of this work is one of the strongest objections to it. Written with the views that he had, it should have been his study to reduce the subject within the narrowest limits possible. An anxious inquirer is in danger of losing himself in the multitude of his words, and the variety and prolixity of his discussions. But Owen could more easily expand than contract, and the present volume is much fitter for an established Christian who knows how “to distinguish things that differ,” than for a bewildered, distressed sinner, who wishes a simple answer to the question, “How may I be *just* before God?”

The principal works of Owen, indeed, are to be considered as so many Bodies or Systems of Divinity, in which one leading principle is placed in the centre, and all the others are arranged round it — establishing its truth, illustrating its importance, and exhibiting its influence on them, and their influence on it. This remark applies to his work on *Perseverance* — his *Vindicias* — the *Person of Christ* — and the *Spirit*, — as well as to the present work. In this respect, they are very valuable, as they contain a more expanded illustration of the magnitude and relative connexions of the errant points in the Revelation of Heaven which they treat, than almost any other human productions. While this plan of discussion has important advantages, it is also attended with various inconveniences. It is unfavourable to that simplicity with which the Bible states all its doctrines, and with which it is of importance that they ever be viewed. It gives Divine truth too much the appearance of artificial or systematic arrangement. By the very terms it employs, it exposes it to opposition, and oppresses it with explanations that impede rather than further its progress.

404

Few points in theology have been made more mysterious and apparently inexplicable than those of *imputation* and *justification*. Perhaps, if we could divest them of the embarrassments of theoretical speculation, they would appear in a different light. I apprehend that the *imputation of guilt* and of *righteousness*, in the Scripture use of these phrases, amounts chiefly to a transfer — not of *character* or *deserving*, but of their effects or consequences — either in the way of enjoyment, or of suffering.

Righteousness is imputed, or reckoned to us, just as sin was imputed to Christ. On our account, though without sin, he was *treated* as a sinner. On his account, though sinners, we are *treated* as righteous. His sufferings were the evidences of the imputation of our guilt — our enjoyment of pardon, acceptance, and eternal life, are the evidences of the imputation of his righteousness to us. That is, it is entirely for his sake, and on account of his work, that we receive them. By voluntary engagement, he became subject to the one; and by faith we partake of the other.

Justification is another expression for the same thing: for, according to Psalm 32.1-2, quoted in Rom. 4.1-8. the justification of a sinner — the imputation of righteousness, — the non-imputation of sin — and the forgiveness, or covering over of transgression — are all tantamount expressions; they all convey substantially the same idea.

Sanctification is a change of character; *justification* a change of state, or condition. There is no declaration of innocence — no transfer of desert — no communication of personal merit — no bestowment of right — but an alteration of the relative situation of God and the sinner in their views and treatment of one another. As soon as a sinner believes the testimony of God concerning Christ's work, there is a deliverance from the displeasure of God, and from all the penal consequences of his transgressions; he obtains the enjoyment of positive happiness or favour from above, and the hope of eternal life.

405

This is God's revealed method of treating the ungodly who believe. On their part, there is a ceasing to look on God as an enemy — the love of his revealed and gracious character — an aversion to sin — and a readiness to obey Divine authority. The sinner is condemned in law, and found guilty by the judge. But he is forgiven and restored to favour by the gracious act of the Sovereign, in consideration of the glorious character and mediation of his Son. The continuance of this treatment, or the perpetuation of this state, is secured by the particular provisions of the covenant of mercy. And it constitutes that *justification* which commences with the saving belief of the gospel, and will at last be declared before the august assembly of the universe — when the solemn sentence of acquittal will be pronounced from the Throne of Mercy, upon the multitude of the redeemed.

The following paragraph from the work now under consideration, contains almost everything of importance on the subject. And as far as it goes, it agrees with the sentiments expressed above:

“Everything contained in Scripture concerning justification is proposed under a *judicial* scheme, or a forensic trial and sentence.

1. A *judgment* is supposed in it, concerning which the Psalmist prays that it may not proceed on the terms of law, Psa 143.2.
2. The *Judge* is God himself, Isa 1.7, 8; Rom 8.33.
3. The *tribunal* on which he sits is the throne of Grace, Heb 4.16.
4. A *guilty person*. This is the *sinner*, who is *υποδικος τω θεο*ς — so guilty of sin as to be liable to the judgment of God, Rom 3.19; 1.32
5. *Accusers* are ready to propose and promote the charge against the guilty person — the Law, Conscience, and Satan; Joh 5.45. Rom 2.15; Rev 12.10.

406

6. The *charge* is admitted and drawn up into a handwriting, in the form of Law, and it is laid before the tribunal of God, in bar to the deliverance of the offender, Col 2.14.
7. A *plea* is prepared in the Gospel for the guilty person; and this is grace, through the blood of Christ, — the atonement made by the Surety of the covenant, Rom 3.23-25; Eph 1.7.
8. The *sinner enters this plea*, renouncing all other apologies and defences whatsoever, Psa 130.2, 3; Rom 5.11, 19; 8.1, 3; 1Joh 1.7, etc. There is no other plea before God; and the one who knows God, and knows himself, will not provide or trust any other.

9. To make this plea effectual, we have an *Advocate* with the Father, who pleads his own propitiation for us, 1Joh 2.2.
10. The *sentence* pronounced on this is absolution, on account of the ransom, blood, or sacrifice of Christ; with acceptance into favour, as persons approved by God — Job 33.24; Psa 32.1, 2; Rom 8.33, 34; Gal 3.13, 14.”¹

Owen proves successfully that the object of that faith by which we are justified, is not Divine truth in general, to which an assent is given; and it is not the belief that *our sins in particular* are pardoned, which is no part of the testimony of God; but “the Lord Jesus Christ himself, as the ordinance of God in his work of mediation for the salvation of lost sinners, and as to that end proposed in the promise (testimony) of the gospel.”² It is just believing, on God’s authority, that Jesus is the all-sufficient and appointed Saviour of sinners. The long chapter which follows this, on the *nature* of justifying faith, is unnecessary, and more calculated to perplex than enlighten. His definition is clumsy and incorrect. The apostles never entered into such definitions or discussions

407

For, after pointing out the proper object of faith, explaining the ground on which it is the duty of men to believe on Christ, and its genuine effects, what use is there in endless disputes about the nature of the act of believing? Why not also discuss the nature of *understanding, willing, seeing, hoping*, etc.? Such speculations may belong to the science of metaphysics, or pneumatology, but they have no relation to the doctrine of Christ. They only confound the simple, and bewilder the inquirer. Faith is connected with justification, because it is by God’s testimony that we are made acquainted with the character and work of Christ; and it is only by faith that a testimony can be received. Salvation is through faith, merely as faith is opposed to works and to merit of every kind. “It is of faith, that it might be by grace, or favour.” Paul answers in one sentence, what the greater part of this thick quarto is engaged in ascertaining. “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved.” This declaration, without note or comment, conveyed so distinct and satisfactory an idea to the mind of the anxious inquirer, that it at once allayed all his fears and perplexities, and filled him with unspeakable joy. We do not see why it should require more explanation to us than to the Philippian jailor; or being received, why it should not produce the same effects.³

408

A feeble reply was attempted to this work by a clergyman named Hotchkis, who had formerly attacked some things on the same subject, in Owen’s work on Communion. The Doctor threw out a few remarks in the course of the discussion on Justification, on Hotchkis’ seemingly willful perversions of his words and sentiments. But he took no notice of the second attack, which does not seem to have deserved much attention. John Humfrey also harshly criticized some parts of it. But he says, “the Doctor, in presence of Sir Charles Wolsley, declared that he could bear with him in the difference; and though one chapter of the ‘Peaceable Disquisition’ is professedly against the Doctor, he never took offence or offered any vindication.”⁴ Humfrey was nearly of Baxter’s

¹ pp. 187, 188.

² p. 114.

³ A curious fact respecting this book, is mentioned in the life of Mr. Joseph Williams of Kidderminster. “At last, the time of his (Mr. Grimshaw’s, an active clergyman of the Church of England) deliverance came. At the house of one of his friends he lays his hand on a book, and opens it with his face towards a pewter shelf. Instantly his face is saluted with an uncommon flash of heat. He turns to the title page, and finds it to be Mr. Owen on Justification. Immediately he is surprised with such another flash. He borrows the book, studies it, is led into God’s method of justifying the ungodly, has a new heart given to him, and now *behold*, he prays.” Whether these flashes were electrical or galvanic, as Southey in his *Life of Wesley* supposes, it deserves to be noticed that it was not the *flash*, but the *book* which converted Grimshaw. The occurrence which turned his attention to it, is of importance merely as the secondary cause which, under the mysterious direction of Providence, led to a blessed result.

⁴ Humf. *Mediocria*, p. 56.

sentiments on the subject of Justification. The same remark applies to Sir Charles Wolsley, who speaks of Owen's work on Justification as written in reply to one of his. ¹ This is his "Justification Evangelical: or a plain impartial account of God's method in Justifying a sinner." 1677. The first part of this small work, which treats justification and imputation, is on the whole very excellent; but in the latter part of it, he speaks very improperly on the subject of faith, and on justification by performing the *conditions* of the gospel. Sir Charles appears to have been a pious and well-informed man, who took a deep interest in the state of religion, and in the discussions respecting it, which then agitated the country.

409

Besides this work, Wolsey wrote several others: — "The Unreasonableness of Atheism." 1669. "The Reasonableness of Scripture Belief." 1672, which is a very excellent book, and frequently quoted by Professor Hallyburton in his work on Deism. And "The Mount of Spirits," 1691, of which I know nothing. The worthy Baronet appears to have taken an active part in the civil wars on the side of the Parliament, and afterwards in the affairs of the commonwealth; but he was, notwithstanding, often employed by the Royal party after the Restoration. ²

In 1679, appeared Owen's "*Christologia: or a Declaration of the Glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ, God and Man; with the infinite wisdom, love, and power of God, in the contrivance and constitution of it. As also, of the grounds and reasons of his Incarnation, the nature of his Ministry in Heaven, the present state of the Church above thereon, and the use of his Person in religion. With an account and vindication of the honour, worship, faith, love, and obedience due unto him from the Church.*" 4to.

The preface to this work, as usual, contains some historical notices of the controversies respecting the person of Christ, which had agitated the church, and of the means which the friends of truth had employed in its defence.

410

Speaking of the Councils, which were called in the fourth and following centuries, for the purpose of declaring the orthodox doctrines, and of healing divisions, he says,

"They proved the most pernicious engines for the corruption of the faith, worship, and manners of the church. Indeed, from the beginning, they were so far from being the only way of preserving the truth, that it was almost constantly prejudiced by the addition of their authority for confirming it. Nor was there any one of them, in which the mystery of iniquity did not work towards laying some rubbish in the foundation of that fatal apostasy which afterwards openly ensued." ³

The entire treatise is founded on our Lord's declaration to Peter, respecting the foundation of the church, Mat. 16.16. The Doctor conceives this declaration to contain three important truths — that the person of Christ, the Son of the living God, as vested with his offices, is the foundation of the church — that the power and policy of hell will ever be exerted against the relation of the church to this foundation — but the church, built on this Rock, shall never be disjoined from it, nor destroyed. The work is accordingly devoted to the illustration of these and the other topics noted in the title, which I have given at length.

¹ I suppose you know his book of Justification was particularly written against mine. Very many have pressed me to answer it, which I acknowledge to you, I did not look upon as *duram provinciam* [difficult province]. The great friendship that was between him and me, might well seem sufficient to have biased me not to reply; but the true reason was, I thought that little cottage I had erected was in no great danger of being shocked or demolished by anything in that book," — *Letter from Sir Charles Wolsey to Mr. Umfrey, inserted in the Mediocria.*

² Whitlocke and Ludlow, *passim*.

³ p. 10. Edit. 1731.

The volume contains many important, and some beautiful passages, both in the direct discussion of the subject, and incidentally introduced. His views of the mediation and glory of Christ in Heaven, are uncommonly elevated. Losing sight of the refinements of a technical theology, he speaks out the feelings of his soul, as one whose faith and hope had long been fixed on that which is within the veil, and whose heart burned with love for that Redeemer whose presence and glory fills the holiest of all. The eternal life, and unlimited power of Jesus secure the existence of the church, and encourage the most perfect confidence in its future triumphs.

411

Amidst all its declensions and tribulations, its perpetuity has never been endangered; and whatever may be the scenes of its future condition, we know that full provision is made in the scheme of revealed love, for the universality of its establishment on earth, and the eternity of its glory in heaven. The Doctor's views of the person and undertaking of Christ, as motives to love him, are also very fine. "These things," he says, "have not only rendered prisons and dungeons more desirable to the people of God, than the most goodly palaces — on future accounts — but have made them really places of such refreshment and joy, that men must seek in vain to extract them out of all the comforts that this world can afford.

O curvae in terris animae et coelestium inanes." ¹

While the work, as a whole, is full of instruction and consolation, there are parts of it which I either imperfectly understand, or cannot fully approve. I confess I am hostile to all prolix discussions, or attempts at explaining the doctrine of the Trinity, or the mode of subsistence, either in the Deity or in the constitution of the person of Christ. In so far as these things are at all revealed, they are matters of fact requiring belief. In so far as they remain mysteries, endeavouring to explain them is useless and absurd. The statements of Scripture on these subjects are all very short, and abundantly more intelligible than any human dissertations which have ever been written on them. When Owen speaks of the Divine nature of Christ as God, or of his human nature as man, or of these natures united constituting Immanuel, I understand, and go along with him. But when he speaks of the "Eternal generation of the Divine person of the Son, being a necessary internal act of the Divine nature, in the Person of the Father," he uses language, which I conceive to be both unscriptural and unintelligible.

412

This is travelling out of the record, the only effect of which, in all such cases, is darkening counsel by words without knowledge. The language of the ancient creeds, and the discussions of the schoolmen have, I believe, done more to cause men to stumble at the doctrine of the Trinity, than all other things put together. How difficult, but how important it is, to follow revelation fully, and to be satisfied within its limits! It is but a very small portion of the volume, however, to which any objection can attach. A judicious Christian will derive no injury from any part of it, and may receive much comfort and establishment from the whole. The concluding exhortation of his preface, which he quotes from Jerome, demands the attention of all. "Whether you read or write, whether you watch or sleep, let the voice of love toward Christ, sound in your ears: let this trumpet stir up your soul; being overpowered with this love, seek him on your bed, whom your soul desires and longs for." ²

This large work was followed, the same year, by a 4to, pamphlet of forty-seven pages, "The church of Rome no safe Guide, or reasons to prove that no rational man, who takes due care of his own

¹ "Oh ye souls bent down to earth and void of everything heavenly." — *Persius*.

² Should the reader desire to examine what is said on the Sonship of Christ, he will find various views of it, and much information, in the following works: Roei Diss.de generatione filii. Faber's *Horae Mosaicae*, vol. ii. § 2. chap. ii. Bryant's *Philo Judaeus*, p. 253. Dr. Adam Clarke's note on Luke 1.35. Ridgley's *Body of Divinity*, pp. 73-77. Edit. Glas. 1770. And a very able Tract on the subject, by the late Mr. Archibald M'Lean of Edinburgh.

salvation, can give himself up to the conduct of that church in matters of religion.” It was the substance of two discourses preached to a private congregation, and which he published in consequence of the importunities of many who heard them.

413

Instead of recommending any church as a guide, he advocates the exclusive right of the Holy Scriptures to this office, and points out the extreme danger of men giving themselves up to the blind guidance of the Romish church. As matters then stood in the country, a tract of this nature was very necessary, and much calculated to promote the object he had in view. The Morning Exercise against Popery among the Dissenters (in which the Doctor was engaged), had been established for some years, and had already published several learned discourses on the popish controversy. No class of men then opposed so powerful a barrier to the restoration of Popery, or so vigorously exerted themselves in defence of the reformed faith, as the Protestant Dissenters. Most of the Church clergy would have quietly submitted. And yet, though the more respectable class of them felt and owned the services of the Dissenters to the common cause, they afterwards basely deserted them, or united with the high church party in oppressive measures to crush them. It is thus that the friends of truth are often rewarded; their disinterested labours and sufferings are soon forgotten. But their reward is in heaven, and their record is on high.

This year, the Doctor lost his old friend and fellow-labourer at Oxford, Dr. Thomas Goodwin, the last of the five Independent brethren of the Westminster Assembly. After the Restoration, he went to London, where he founded the Church which now meets in Fetter Lane. He lived very privately, and was employed chiefly in writing. The inscription on his tomb-stone in Bunhill fields, drawn up by Mr. Gilbert, gives him a very high character, which his numerous writings very amply support. He had a most extensive acquaintance with church history — was profoundly skilled in the knowledge and interpretation of the Scriptures. The matter, form, discipline, and all that relates to the constitution of a church of Christ, he thoroughly investigated, and was eminently useful in his public labours.

414

He died in his 80th year. In his last moments, he expressed himself with so much joy, thankfulness and admiration for the grace of God, that it extremely affected all who heard him. ¹

In the beginning of 1680, the Doctor produced another Ecclesiastico-political tract, in reference to the fears still entertained of the return of Popery. It is entitled, “Some considerations about union among Protestants, and the preservation of the interests of the Protestant religion in this nation.” It contains only thirteen 4to pages, and has no name prefixed. There are some very judicious observations in it on the constitutional prerogatives of the throne — on the rights and liberties of the subject — and on the proper means of preserving the Established Church, and the toleration of Dissenters. He protests against the exercise of civil power in merely religious affairs.

“Let the church be protected in the exercise of its spiritual power, *by spiritual means only*; such as preaching the word, administration of the sacraments, and the like; whatever is further pretended as necessary to any of the ends of true religion, or its preservation in the nation, is but a cover for the negligence, idleness, and insufficiency of some of the clergy, who would have an outward appearance of effecting by external force, that which they themselves by diligent prayer, sedulous preaching of the word, and an exemplary conversation, ought to labour for in the hearts of men.” ²

415

¹ Life prefixed to his works.

² p. 12

He contends that magistrates, by limiting themselves to the punishment of the crimes cognizable by human judgment, and confining the church to the exercise of her spiritual powers ¹ — freedom of opinion and practice being enjoyed by others, Popery might be defied, and Protestantism forever maintained in Britain. Our past history illustrates the wisdom and justness of these sentiments, and any departure from them must prove equally dangerous to the throne and the subject, to religion and liberty.

On the 11th of May, 1680, Dean Stillingfleet — who had formerly made himself known by publishing what Robinson calls “an oily book, with a *nasty title*,” ² preached a sermon before the Lord Mayor, “On the Mischief of Separation.” In it he brands all the Dissenters with the odious crime of *schism*. The peace-maker now became a sower of discord, not without suspicion of being influenced by venal motives — because, according to Burnet, “he went into the moods of the high sort of people, beyond what became him, perhaps *beyond his own sense of things*.” This unexpected and uncivil attack, roused all the energies of the Dissenters, and in a short time a number of able and spirited replies were published.

Dr. Owen produced “A brief vindication of the Non-conformists from the charge of schism, as it was managed against them in a sermon, by Dr. Stillingfleet.” 4to pp. 56. 1680. This is a very excellent pamphlet. Some of the Dissenters had complained of the untimeliness of the learned Dean’s philippic,³ on account of the danger to the Protestant faith that was apprehended from Popery. Owen was of a different opinion.

416

“For it is meet,” he says, “that honest men should understand the state of those things in which they are deeply concerned. Non-conformists might possibly suppose, that the common danger of all Protestants had reconciled the minds of the Conforming ministers to them, and I was really of the same judgment myself. If it be not so, it is well they are fairly warned, what they have to expect, that they may prepare themselves to undergo it with patience.” ⁴

We need not be surprised at the feelings of Dissenters, and the conduct of churchmen then. Innumerable attacks of the same kind since, and a hundred years more experience, are scarcely sufficient to teach us the folly of expecting forbearance or liberal treatment from an established church. Owen points out the unfairness of charging the Non-conformists with the sin of schism, and their ministers with insincerity. He shows that the tendency of the Dean’s discourse was to stir up persecution against the Dissenters, of which they had already gotten quite enough; and he very fairly argues with him on the ground that he had himself taken, the subject of schismatic separation. Towards the close, he replies to the Dean’s advice, that the Dissenters “should not always be complaining of their hardships and persecutions.”

“After so many of them have died in common jails, so many of them endured long imprisonments, not a few being at this day in the same imprisonment; so many driven from their habitations into a wandering condition, to preserve for a while the liberty of their persons; so many have been reduced to want and penury by taking away their goods, and from some the very instruments of their livelihood — after the prosecutions which have been against them in all courts of justice in this nation; after so many ministers and their families have been brought into the utmost outward straits which nature can subsist under; after all their perpetual fears and dangers — they think it hard that they should be complained of for complaining, by those who are at ease.” ⁵

¹ What today we call *separation of church and state*.

² Irenicum, or A weapon salve for the Church’s wounds, 1659.

³ *Philippic*: a speech of violent denunciation.

⁴ pp. 2-3.

⁵ pp. 53, 54.

417

Stillingfleet said of this Vindication,

“Dr. Owen treated me with such civility and decent language, that I cannot but return him thanks for them, though I was far from satisfied with his reasonings.”¹

Dr. Owen was followed in the controversy by Mr. Baxter, who in his “Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet’s charge of Separation,” did not treat the Dean with so much courtesy; who accordingly complains “of his anger and unbecoming passion.” A third reply was from a man of better spirit, Mr. John Howe, who in “A letter written from the country to a person of quality in the city,” expressed himself very firmly; but as the Dean himself acknowledged, he was “more like a well-disposed gentleman than a divine, without any mixture of rancour, and even with a great degree of kindness.” Vincent Alsop opposed his “Mischief of *Impositions*” to Stillingfleet’s Mischief of *Separation*. He briskly turns upon him his own words and phrases, and retorts his accusations. The book, said the Dean, resembled the bird of Athens, for it seemed to be made up of face and feathers. The fifth antagonist, was Mr. Barret, of Nottingham, who published an ingenious exposure of Stillingfleet’s inconsistency and equivocation in “The Rector of Sutton (Stillingfleet’s parish when he published the *Irenicum*) committed with the Dean of St. Paul’s; or a defence of Dr. Stillingfleet’s *Irenicum*, against his recent sermon.”

418

This seems to have galled the learned Dean exceedingly. He remarked, it was enough to make the common people suppose some busy justice of the peace had taken on the Rector of Sutton, and Dean of St. Paul’s, at some conventicle. And as a defence of his changes, he gravely tells the reader that the *Irenicum* had been written twenty years before the laws against Dissenters had been established!

Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis!²

In the following year, the Dean took up all his opponents, in the “Unreasonableness of separation, or an impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas, of the present separation from the communion of the church of England, To which several letters are annexed of eminent Protestant divines abroad, concerning the nature of our differences, and the way to compose them.” 4to. This work reveals considerable acuteness and research. The historical part of it displays a minute acquaintance with the sentiments and writings of the early separatists from the English church, and with the very different views of the Presbyterian Puritans. He shows successfully that many of the Puritans employed the same arguments against the Brownists, which the churchmen now urged against themselves. It cannot be denied that on the principles of many of his adversaries, the Dean had the belter of the argument. The discussion turned chiefly on this point: Are the parochial churches true churches? If they are, why desert them? If you deny that they are, you are guilty of the uncharitableness which your forefathers charged on the separatists. If you hold occasional communion with them, which many of you do, and for the lawfulness of which most of you contend, why separate from them at all? Such were the dilemmas, on the horns of which the reverend Dean endeavoured to toss his opponents.

419

Dr. Owen met him again in reply to this work. — “An answer to the Unreasonableness of Separation, and a defence of the Vindication of the Non-conformists from the guilt of schism.” 4to. It was published along with his “Inquiry into the nature of Evangelical churches.” In this work, Owen endeavours to avoid adopting any of the alternatives which the Dean had pointed out.

¹ Unreasonableness of Separation, Pref. p. 69.

² “*Times are changing, and we are changing with them!*”

He explains what he understood as necessary to the character of a true church, and declares that wherever the scriptural evidences of it were afforded, he would most gladly acknowledge it. He also points out what he conceived to affect the character of a church, and wherever these evils prevailed, he could not be. On his side, therefore, he pushes his adversary to make an election which must have greatly puzzled him. Could he maintain that the parish churches of England generally consisted of "faithful men?" Could he believe that the ministry was generally blameless, that discipline was faithfully administered, and that no unlawful impositions were laid on the conscience? Although Owen does not make any positive assertion on the subject, it is quite clear that the established church was never conducted on the principles for which he contends; and his views of the character of church members, and the exercise of discipline alone, must have prevented his fellowship with any parochial assembly.

The controversy still raged. "More work for the Dean," was published by Mr. Thomas Wall, in answer to some of the Dean's reports against the Brownists. Mr. Barret replied a second time, in an "Attempt to vindicate the principles of the Non-conformists, not only by Scripture, but by Mr. Stillingfleet's Rational Account."

420

Mr. Lob produced his "Modest and Peaceable inquiry;" Mr. Baxter, his "Second True defence of the mere Non-conformists;" Mr. Humphrey, his "Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet's book, as far as it concerned the Peaceable design;" and Mr. Gilbert Rule, as late as 1689, his "Rational defence of Non-conformity." The Dean (now made Bishop as a reward for his faithful services to the church), was not left to fight her battles alone. An octavo volume appeared from the pen of a Presbyter of the Church of England, defending Dr. Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*. Being taken up by some of the Dissenting pamphlets already noted, he produced the next year, another thick octavo in its defence. This Presbyter, according to Baxter, was none other than Dr. Sherlock, who perhaps was not displeased to secretly get at his old adversaries, on account of their treatment of his book on the Knowledge of Christ. These are all the pamphlets, or volumes, on the Stillingfleet controversy, which I have discovered. It must be admitted, they were numerous and prolix enough. The characters engaged in it, and the place it must have occupied in the public mind, rendered some account of it necessary. Many of the pamphlets were anonymous; but I have assigned them to their respective authors on evidence derived from the replies of their opponents, or for other reasons too unimportant to bring forward.

I cannot dismiss the subject without noting another part of the debate. To Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*, were subjoined some letters from *foreign* Presbyterians: Le Moyne, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, L' Angle, Minister of Charenton, and the celebrated Claude. All these letters seemed to condemn the conduct of the English Non-conformists, and were evidently procured for the purpose of making it appear that their separation was not the result of principle, but of caprice, or something worse.

421

The behaviour of these foreign Dissenters appeared very inexplicable at the time. It was not till a volume of Claude's letters were published, long after, that it was fully explained. Stillingfleet, says Robinson,

"Driven to great distress, got Compton, Bishop of London, to write to Claude, Le Moyne, and other French Presbyterians, for their opinion of English *Presbyterianism*. They gave complaisant, but wary answers. These letters were published by Stillingfleet as suffrages for Episcopacy, and against Non-conformity. There could not be a more glaring absurdity; for no art can make that a crime at Dover, which is at the same time a virtue at Calais. Episcopacy and Non-conformity rest on the same arguments in both kingdoms; and a man who does not know this is not fit to write on the controversy. Mr. Claude complained bitterly of this ungenerous treatment; but the letters that contained these complaints were *concealed till his death*; when they were printed by his son."

After quoting some strong passages from these letters to a lady, and to the Bishop of London, Robinson justly remarks in conclusion:

“The case then is this. Episcopalians not being able to maintain their cause by argument, endeavoured to do it by a majority of votes. In order to procure these, they sent a false state of the case to the French Protestants. The French, as soon as they understood the matter, complained of having been treated with duplicity, declared against the Bishops, and against the cause they were endeavouring to support.”¹

422

Such tricks are exceedingly despicable, whether resorted to by Bishops or by meaner men, and only tend, in the issue, to ruin the cause they are designed to promote. Truth is equally independent of numbers and of names; but it is infamous to represent those as enemies to each other, who are really friends; and by unprincipled artifice to sow suspicion and discord among brethren.

The next work we have to notice, which was published partly during the Doctor’s life, and partly after his death, is the important *Treatise on Evangelical Churches*. The first part of it, entitled “An Inquiry into the Origin, Nature, Institution, Power, Order, and Communion of Evangelical Churches,” was published in 1681. This was combined, as has been noted, with his answer to Stillingfleet. The second part, entitled “The True Nature of a Gospel Church, and its Government,” did not appear till 1688, when it was published with a preface, by I. C. — whom I take to have been Isaac Chauncey, who succeeded Mr. Clarkson in the pastoral charge of the church in Bury Street. He tells us that,

“the Doctor lived to finish it under his great bodily infirmities; whereby he saw himself hastening to the end of his race. Yet so great was his love to Christ, that while he had life and breath, he did not draw back his hand from his service. Through the gracious support of Divine power, he corrected the copy before his departure. The reader may be assured that what is here is *his* — and likewise, that it ought to be esteemed as his legacy to the Church of Christ, being a great part of his dying labours. Therefore, it is most charitable to suppose that this work was written with no other design than to advance the glory and interest of Christ in the world; and that its contents were matter of great weight on his own spirit.”

423

We have ascertained the sentiments of Dr. Owen on the subject of the Constitution and Government of the Churches of Christ, at an early period of his career. We have seen what they were while he enjoyed honour and public support. It is gratifying to have so full a view of them at the end of his life, and in the very prospect of eternity. He adopted his views of the kingdom of Christ with the prospect before him of losing all that was dear to him on that account. Prosperity effected no change on his sentiments; amidst succeeding adversity and trouble he held them fast and defended them, and he took leave of the world with a solemn testimony in their support. These things are at least proofs of his growing confidence in their truth and importance; and of the sincerity of his own attachment to them.

I shall then endeavour to ascertain, from the work now before us, what were the last sentiments of the Doctor on these subjects. In the first part, he examines the origin of a church, or church state — shows that it is a Divine, and not a human appointment; and that all interferences of human authority with it are unlawful.

“Unless men, *by their voluntary choice and consent*, from a sense of duty to the authority of Christ in his institutions, enter into a church state, they cannot by any other means be so framed into it, as to find acceptance with God in it. And the interpositions that are made by custom, tradition, the institutions and ordinances of men, between the consciences of those who belong, or would belong to such a slate, and the immediate authority of God, are highly obstructive of this Divine order and all the benefits of it. For hence

¹ Robinson’s life of Claude, prefixed to the 3d Edit. of the Translation of his Essay, pp. 66, 67.

it comes to pass that most men know neither how nor whereby they came to be members of this or that church, except on this ground: that they were *born* where it prevailed.”¹

424

He denies the existence of a *Legislative* authority either in or over the church of God, and after briefly sketching the baneful consequences which have resulted from Bishops and Councils, and civil Government usurping this power, he says: —

“This, therefore, is absolutely denied by us, namely, *That any men, under any pretence or name soever, have any right or authority to constitute any new frame or order of the church, to make any laws of their own for its rule or government,* that should oblige the disciples of Christ in point of conscience to their observation.”²

He shows fully and successfully, that the churches of Christ have laws to *observe*, and not laws to *make*; and that the assumption of an opposite principle and conduct is derogatory to the glory of Christ, to the perfection of Scripture, and inconsistent with the acknowledgment of the infallibility, faithfulness, and Divine authority of the apostles. He goes on to inquire into “The continuation of a church state, and of churches, to the end of the world, and the causes on which they depend.” He shows that they depend on the Father’s grant of the kingdom to Christ — on the Saviour’s promise to preserve his church to the end — on the continued existence of the word of Christ — and the communication of gifts from him. In regard to believers, it depends on their sense of duty, the instinct of the new creature, and the fact that it is only in churches that they can attend to the will of Christ. He argues, therefore, that the idea of the continuance of the church depending on a regular succession of office-bearers from the apostles, is a baseless figment; it is as unnecessary to the existence of the church, as it is unsupported by Scripture, contrary to fact, and pernicious in its operation.

425

In chap. iv. he inquires into the special nature of the Gospel Church State appointed by Christ, which he thus defines:

“An especial society, or congregation of professed believers, joined together according to His mind, with their officers, guides, or rulers whom he has appointed; which does or may meet together for the celebration of all the ordinances of Divine worship, the professing or authoritatively proposing the doctrine of the gospel, with the exercise of the discipline prescribed by Himself, to their own mutual edification, with the glory of Christ, in the preservation and propagation of his kingdom in the world.”³

Having thus defined it, he goes on to explain his definition more particularly, concluding with asserting “That to such a church, and *every one* of them, belongs of right all the privileges, promises, and power that Christ grants to the church in this world.”⁴ He then proceeds to prove first, that “Christ has appointed this church state of a *particular, or single congregation*; and secondly, that he has appointed *no other church state* that is inconsistent with this, much less destructive of it.” These quotations must satisfy the reader, that Owen was not only an Independent, but a firm believer in the *jus divinum* [Divine justice] of Independency. Comparing them with our statement of the principles of Independency in Chapter III of this work, it will appear how far Dr. Owen and those now called *Independents* are of the same mind; and, comparing them with his language in *Eshcol*, published in 1648; with his language to Cawdry in 1657; with the language of the Savoy declaration in 1658; with what he says in his *Theologumena*

¹ p. 12.

² p. 25.

³ p. 60.

⁴ p. 61.

in 1662; in his *Catechism* in 1667; and in his *Discourses on Christian Love* in 1673 — it will be seen that his sentiments throughout were radically, and I may say *verbally*, the same.

426

In supporting his views of the exclusive appointment of Congregational Church Government, he shows that it is suited to, and sufficient for, all the Spiritual ends of the Divine appointment of a church, and “that it is in *Congregational Churches* alone that these ends can be done or observed.” He maintains that the very meaning of the words *קהל* (*qahal*) and *εκκλησία* (*ecclesia*) establishes that they signify a particular congregation — which he argues at great length from Mat 18.17, in connexion with other passages. He maintains, in the third place, that “All the churches instituted by the apostles were Congregational, and of no other sort.”¹ Having amply illustrated these various positions in a way that is familiar to all who are acquainted with this controversy, in the fifth chapter he urges the precedent and example of the first churches. And he endeavours to show “that in no approved writers for the space of 200 years after Christ, is there any mention made of any other organic, visibly professing church, except that which is Parochial or Congregational.”²

This being dispatched, he returns to illustrate at greater length some of the sentiments previously thrown out. In chapter 6, he shows that “Congregational churches alone are suited to the ends of Christ in the institution of his church.” This being fully confirmed, the next chapter is occupied in proving that “no other church state is of Divine institution.” In this chapter he denies that there are any such things as national churches, or churches of office bearers of any kind.

427

The remaining part of the work is occupied in pointing out the duty of believers to join themselves in church fellowship — and what sort of churches they ought to join; and in showing the impossibility of conscientiously joining the Parish Churches in England (because they consisted mostly of improper persons), he shows it required a reformation which they had no power to effect themselves, and involved the observation of many things not agreeable to the will of Christ.

The second part, or volume of the work is divided into eleven chapters, in which he treats the *material* of a church — its formal cause, its polity or discipline, officers and their duties; and the *rule* of a church — the duty of elders and deacons, excommunication, and the communion of churches. There is, in parts of this volume, a lack of that rigid attention to method or order which sometimes occurs in the writings of Owen, and which occasions both repetition and confusion, and even an apparent lack of consistency.

He clearly establishes a very important principle, that none but those who give evidence of being regenerated, or holy persons, ought to be received or counted fit members of visible churches; and that where this is lacking, the very, essence of a church is lost.

“If the corruption of a church,” he says, “as to the matter of it, is such that it is inconsistent with and overthrows all that communion which should exist among the members of the same church, in love and without dissimulation; — if the scandals and offences which must of necessity abound in such churches, are really obstructive of edification; — if the ways and walking of most of their members is dishonourable to the gospel and its profession, giving no representation of the holiness of Christ or his doctrine; — if such churches *do not, cannot, and will not* reform themselves — then it is the duty of every man who takes care for his own edification, and the future salvation of his soul, *to peaceably withdraw from the communion of such churches*, and to join in others, where all the ends of church societies may in some measure be obtained.”³

¹ p. 78.

² p. 82.

³ p. 15.

Two things in this volume have a particular claim on our attention: the Doctor's sentiments on the subject of ruling Elders, and of the communion of Churches — which have been supposed to be either peculiar to, or a species of Presbyterianism. If this were the case, it would *not* follow that either Independency or Presbytery, would be right or wrong, as the truth on these subjects is entirely independent of Owen's sentiments or authority. But it *would* follow that the Doctor was inconsistent with himself, presuming that we alleged incontrovertible evidence that he held all the great and fundamental principles of Independency. There is no room to allege any change of mind on his part, as the present volume is only a part of the former work on the same subject; and it was written nearly at the same time, though on account of his death, published several years after. And as the Doctor never hints in the most remote manner, at any change of mind having taken place, we are bound to consider his sentiments to have been the same to the end of his life. In consequence of the quantity which he wrote, the rapidity with which he composed, the little attention which he paid to revising or correcting his works, and the multitude of words which he generally employed on every subject, he is at times liable to be misunderstood.

And it would be an easy matter for a captious writer, or a contradiction-hunter, like Daniel Cawdry, to fasten the charge of inconsistency on a variety of sentiments in Owen's numerous productions. Attention to the scope of his writing, however, and a comparison of the parts, will in general satisfy us that little actual inconsistency or contradiction exists.

On the subject of Pastors or Elders, and the distinction between teaching and ruling Elders, one or two quotations will enable us to ascertain his real sentiments. He lays it down, let it be observed, as an established position, that the New Testament acknowledges no distinction of power, office, or authority in the pastoral office.

“In the whole New Testament, Bishops, and Presbyters, or Elders are in every way the *same persons*, in the *same office*; they have the *same function*, without distinction in *order or degree*.”¹

This is a clear and decisive statement, with which everything else in the work must be made consistent. Again he says:

“These works of teaching and ruling may be distinct in several officers, namely, of teachers and rulers. But to divide them in the same office of Pastors — that some Pastors should feed by *teaching only*, but have no right to rule by virtue of their office, and that some should attend in exercise for *rule only*, not considering themselves obliged to labour continually in feeding the flock — is almost to overthrow this office of Christ's designation, and to set up *two* in its place, by men's own projection.”²

These passages clearly show that Dr. Owen considered the pastoral office as *one office*, including both teaching and ruling. Now, the principles and practice of Presbyterians make them *two*. In the Confession of Faith, under the head of Church Government, after the office of Pastor and Teacher is spoken of, there is a section designated “Other Church Governors;” whose office it is “to join with the Minister in the Government of the Church, which officers, Reformed Churches commonly call Elders.”

According to this statement, which is confirmed by other chapters, there are *three offices* in every congregation, Pastors, Elders, and Deacons. This accordingly corresponds with the general fact. A Minister, the Elders, and the Deacons commonly exist in every regular congregation, and constitute the *Session*, or first court of inspection. These offices are held to be so distinct, that the

¹ p. 4.

² p. 51.

Ministers alone are ever considered as Pastors or Clergymen, and the Elders are considered mere Laymen, for whom it would be as unlawful to preach, baptize, or dispense Divine ordinances, as for other members of the congregation. Whether this plan is Scriptural or not, I do not now inquire; but certainly it was not Dr. Owen's.

"I acknowledge," he says, "that where a church has greatly increased, so as there is a necessity for many Elders in it for its instruction and rule, that decency and order require that one of them *preside* in the management of all church affairs. Whether the person that is to so preside, is directed by being the first *converted* or first *ordained*, or on account of age, or gifts and abilities; whether he continues only for a *season*, and then another is deputed to the same work, or for his life, are things indifferent in themselves. I will never oppose this order; but rather I desire to see it in practice; namely, that particular churches were of such an extent as to necessarily require many Elders — both teaching and ruling — for their instruction and government. And among these Elders, one should be chosen by themselves, with the consent of the Church, not into a new order, not into a degree of authority above his brethren, but only into his part of the common work in a particular manner, which requires some kind of precedency. Hereby no new officer, no new order of officers, no new degree of power or authority, is instituted in the Church; only, its work and duty are cast into such an order, as the very light of nature requires." ¹

431

The ground on which he evidently rests here — the necessity and importance of a number of persons being associated in the same office — is the extent or number of the church. This is a sentiment far from peculiar among Independents, and to Dr. Owen, It is equally clear, at the same time, that he considers them all as holding the same office, names, and authority — though, with mutual consent, acting more or less prominently in its several departments. It also deserves to be noticed, in connexion with considering his sentiments, that in his own church in Bury Street, there were no ruling Elders. This is a proof that he did not consider them essential to the management of the church, or that he found it easier to maintain his theory than to reduce it to practice, by finding a number of persons suitably qualified for the office. To such persons, however few or many, he ascribed no power or authority as a body distinct from their brethren, or from the church. "The power of the Keys," he says, "as to binding and loosing, and consequently as to all other acts proceeding from there, is expressly granted to the whole church. Mat 18.17, 18." ² This right, he afterwards remarks, "is exemplified in apostolic practice." ³

He has a chapter on the office of Teaching Elders, in which he discusses various views of the subject; and in which he professes to think that it is "of the same kind as that of the Pastor, though distinguished from it in degree." ⁴

432

After noting the question whether there may be one or many officers, Pastors, or Elders in a church, he says,

"Therefore, let the state of the church be preserved, and kept to its original constitution, *which is Congregational and no other*; and I judge that the order of the officers, which was so early in the primitive church, namely, of one Pastor or Bishop, in one church, assisted in rule and all holy ministrations, with many Elders — teaching or ruling only — do not so overthrow church order, as to render its rule or discipline useless." ⁵

The amount of the whole of his reasonings seems to be that in every numerous or fully organized church, there may or ought to be an Eldership, or Presbytery of gifted persons. All of them hold

¹ pp. 48, 49.

² p. 73.

³ p. 74.

⁴ p. 125.

⁵ p. 128.

substantially the same office, but some act more stately and distinctly in a particular department of it than the others. Those who are at all acquainted with the sentiments of Independents, well know that this view of the subject is far from peculiar to Dr. Owen. In fact, Independency has no necessary connexion with the question respecting the number of office bearers. An Independent church may have one, or it may have six Pastors; or it may have one Pastor and Teacher, and any number of Elders for managing other matters — and still act on the same principles.

The long chapter on ruling Elders must be explained consistent with the sentiments we have shown to be contained in the former part of the work — otherwise the Doctor must not have clearly understood himself. In that chapter, he seems to contend for a distinct office of ruling Elder, or for Elders who are called to rule and not to teach; who “had no interest in the pastoral, or ministerial office, as to the dispensation of the word and administration of the sacraments.”¹

433

Whoever can, let them reconcile these things. The Doctor himself did not, or could not, act on these principles; nor do we believe they have ever been acted on in the manner or to the extent he seems to plead for, by any churches, whether Independent or Presbyterian. This is not the place for discussing the propriety or impropriety of any particular view of the subject; those who wish to do so, will easily find what can be said, in the numerous works which have been published on both sides of the controversy.

We pass on to his sentiments on the subject of the Communion of Churches. From employing the term *synod* in the sense of *council*, or meeting for advice, and some other phraseology more usual among other bodies than Independents, it has been inferred that the Doctor was a believer in the Divine right of ecclesiastical courts, or meetings of church rulers, for the purpose of exercising authority over their respective churches. It must be obvious that such sentiments would be subversive of all his former views as a Congregationalist, inconsistent with the language we have already quoted from this volume itself, and they would place him in the strange predicament of seeking to build again the things he had destroyed. The Doctor is not chargeable with these things, further than some peculiar phraseology is concerned. This will clearly appear from a few passages in which we have printed, *in italics*, the words which show that he contended for no meetings of councils, except those which were perfectly consistent with the freedom and authority of every particular church.

434

He defines the Communion of Churches thus:

“Their consent, endeavour, and conjunction in and for the promotion of the edification of the Catholic Church, and therein their own, as they are parts and members of it.”

I presume every Independent will subscribe to this definition. He contends for the absolute equality of all churches, in respect to power or privilege. Speaking of the Catholic Church, he says with great propriety, “While Evangelical faith, holiness, obedience to the commands of Christ, and mutual love abide in any on the earth, there is the Catholic Church; and while they are professed, that Catholic Church is visible. I believe there is no other Catholic Church upon the earth; nor any that needs other things for its constitution.”²

When he comes to speak of outward acts of Communion among Churches, he refers them to two heads: “*Advice* and *Assistance*.”³ These are evidently very different things from power or authority.

¹ p. 160.

² p. 244.

³ p. 249.

“Synods,” he says, “are the meetings of diverse churches by their messengers or delegates, to consult and determine about those things which are of common concern to them all, by virtue of this communion which is exercised in them.”¹

He then proceeds to state the grounds on which he conceives the necessity and use of them to rest. In the course of which he remarks,

“No Church, therefore, is so *Independent* that it can always, and in all cases, observe the duties it owes to the Lord Christ, and to the Church Catholic, by all those powers which it is able to act in itself distinctly, without conjunction with others. And the Church which confines its duty to the *acts of its own assemblies*, cuts itself off from the external communion of the *Church Catholic* — nor will it be safe for any man to commit the conduct of his soul to such a church.”²

435

This passage has been often quoted as the testimony of Dr. Owen *against* Independency. How far it can be so, consistent with his sentiments, may be judged from his previous language and history. But to what does it amount? — That the church which has no connexion with any other churches — which holds no correspondence with them — which takes no interest in their affairs or circumstances — which refuses all co-operation with them — separates itself from the body of the people of God, and it must fail in the discharge of many important duties. Therefore, it cannot be safe to be connected with it. But who are the defenders of this species of Independency? Let those who believe it to be inconsistent with union, and incompatible with co-operation do so. Need I say that this is not the faith or practice of modern Independents, any more than it is of ancient Independents? If I should assert that for every practical and important purpose, there is as much union and co-operation among them, as among any other body of professing Christians; and that these are no less effective because they are voluntary; I should not be afraid of confutation. What is the meaning of their local associations — of their meetings at ordinations — of their united support of academies — of their union for the support and diffusion of the gospel, both at home and abroad? If these are not the proofs and the best fruits of union, let others show them a more excellent way.

When we call the union of Independent Churches *voluntary*, we do not mean to say that they hold it to be *optional* whether they have communion with other Churches — or as Dr. Owen expresses it, with the Church Catholic — on all proper occasions. They acknowledge that they are bound to improve for this purpose as matter of *duty* to the great Head of the Church, and for the good of themselves and their brethren. Their only meaning is that they acknowledge no human authority, whether in individuals or synods, whether by office or delegation.

436

Dr. Owen has been represented, in the above passage, as making a singular concession to Presbyterianism, whereas he is expressing the genuine principle of Independency. The connexion to which he belonged, while he lived, and the state of it at present, to say the very least, is as far removed from the insulated and selfish society he describes, as any denomination of Christians whatever.

After the Doctor has noted some of the ends or uses of such meetings, he proceeds to speak of the persons who ought to constitute them.

“It must therefore be affirmed,” he says, “that no persons, merely by virtue of any office, have light to be members of any *Ecclesiastical Synods* as such. Nor is there either example or reason to justify any such

¹ Ibid.

² pp. 250-1.

pretence. For there is *no office-power to be exerted in such synods as such, either conjunctly by all the members of them, nor singly by any one of them.*"¹

Again, referring to the meeting at Jerusalem, of which we have an account in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, he says,

"The Church of Antioch chose and sent messengers of their own number, to advise with the Apostles and Elders of the Church at Jerusalem, at which *consultation* the members of the *Church were also present. And this is the whole of the nature and use of Ecclesiastical synods.*"²

Nothing can show more evidently than this language, that the Doctor considered them as entirely voluntary meetings of the Churches for the purpose of advice, consultation, and cooperation about matters of common concern. He invests them with no power over the churches, or their office-bearers, further than that of advice, or of explaining and persuading to obey the will of Christ.

437

As an antidote to any use that might be made of his sentiments or authority on this subject, the following passage will show how little faith he himself had in the good such meetings had done, how jealous the people of God ought to be of them; and how little authority he was disposed to ascribe to them.

"Hence nothing is more to be feared, especially in a state of the Church in which it is declining in faith, worship, and holiness, than synods — according to the usual way of their calling and convention, where these things are absent. For they have already been *the principal means of leading on and justifying all the Apostasy which Churches have fallen into. For there was never yet a synod of that nature, which did not confirm all the errors and superstitions which had in common practice entered into the Church, and opened a door to their progress; nor was ever the pretence of any of them, for outward reformation. The authority of a synod determining articles of faith! — Constituting orders and decrees for the conscientious observance of things of their own appointment — to be submitted to and obeyed by reason of that authority, under the penalty of excommunication — and the trouble annexed to it by custom and tyranny, or enacted through jurisdiction over Churches or persons — is a mere human invention, for which nothing can be pleaded but a prescription from the fourth century of the Church, when the progress of the fatal apostasy had become visible.*"³

Those who claim the suffrage of Owen in support of Ecclesiastical authority, are now made quite welcome to it. It must be very evident, what he thought of it, how far he would himself have submitted to it, or have recommended to others to acknowledge it.

438

There is a vast difference between the unity of love, or the co-operation of voluntary agreement, and the union of mere systematic arrangement — between application for advice, and the interference of uncalled for authority — between a simple reference to brethren of reputation, for counsel and assistance in cases of difficulty (which may occur either among individuals or churches), and the multiplied forms, regular gradations, and interminable appeals of Ecclesiastical courts. Those who believe Owen to have been favourable to the latter, must have paid little attention to his sentiments or history. Those who believe modern Independents to be inimical to the former, must know just as little about them. Apart from some of the language in which it was customary for Owen to clothe his theological conceptions, we believe there are few Independents who do not hold substantially the same sentiments on the subject we have now so fully gone over. They may doubt some of his arguments, and they could question some of his explanations of Scripture. These are only what might be remarked on many other subjects as well

¹ p. 260.

² p. 261.

³ pp. 265-6.

as this. And they will ever be found where men are taught to acknowledge no authority in religion, but that of Christ, as exhibited in the revelation of His will.

The next work of our indefatigable author's pen is, "A Humble Testimony to the Goodness and Severity of God, in his dealing with Sinful Churches and Nations." 1681. It is the substance of some discourses on Luke 13.1-5. The period was alarming. The dissolution of the Parliament called at Oxford, within seven days of its meeting — the evident determination of the Court to support the popish succession in the person of the Duke of York — and the oppressive measures against the Dissenters, which were still continued and increased, produced much alarm and suffering in the country.

439

"On various accounts," says the Doctor, "there are continual apprehensions of public calamities, and all men's thoughts are exercised about the ways of deliverance from them. But as they fix on various and opposite means for this end, the conflict of their counsels and designs increased our danger, and is likely to prove our ruin."¹

He notices very properly the interest that ministers ought to feel, not only that their congregations prosper during their own lives; but that they might be preserved for future generations. And he notes that it is a great mistake to suppose that a church can be injured only by heresy, tyranny, and false worship — while "a worldly corrupt conversation in most of its members may be no less ruinous." The Testimony contains much of that practical wisdom which the Doctor had acquired from his long and deep study of the word of God, and from his extensive experience in the ways of Providence. He very cautiously avoids referring to the conduct of the Court, and the measures of Government. He was aware how ready they were to lay hold on all who took notice of their proceedings, and how little good was likely to result from political allusions on his part, and interference on theirs.

The Testimony was followed by "The Grace and Duty of being Spiritually Minded," 4to. 1681. This is one of the most valuable and deservedly popular of all the Doctor's writings. It was originally the subject of his private meditations, during a time in which he was entirely unfitted for doing anything for the edification of others, and little expecting he would be able to do more in this world.

440

After he obtained a partial recovery, he delivered the substance of these meditations to his own congregation, partly influenced by the advantage he had derived from the subject himself, and partly from considering it suitable to the circumstances of his people. The same considerations induced him to publish it for the benefit of others. If Owen thought the world was too keenly pursued in his time (which was probably the case), and that Christians then stood much in need of a powerful counteractive to its baneful influence, what would he have thought of the state of things now, when the spirit of speculation, the love of grandeur, and conformity to the world, seem to be the snares which are entangling and trying all those who dwell upon the earth? The only remedy, we apprehend, is that which he proposed and exemplified. Scriptural spirituality will enable us to bear the perplexities and pressure of distress, and to resist the elations and other unholy tendencies of prosperity and honour. This state of mind which is the opposite of earthliness as well as carnality; which is the result of the peculiar and habitual influence of the Spirit of Christ; which consists in the constant exercise of faith on the Divine testimony, of hope in the certain promises of the gospel, and of delightful fellowship with the Father and with his dear Son — is admirably described by Owen. This is the life which every Christian is called to cultivate, and without which, no name or profession is of any importance. Its operations may be

¹ Introduction.

manifested and its felicities enjoyed in a palace or in a cottage. It is the name which only he who receives it knows — the water of life which proceeds from the throne of God and of the Lamb, and of which, whoever drinks never thirsts again for worldly or sensual happiness.

441

It is, in a word, that immortal existence, which is begun on earth, and perfected in heaven. As Owen approached nearer and nearer to “the bosom of his Father and his God,” he appears to have improved in spirituality of mind himself, and in his desire to impart a relish for it to others. His spirit was soon to ascend to the brightness of that eternal love and glory on which it had long delighted to gaze. And before its departure, it reflected a portion of its heaven-derived lustre for the benefit of his brethren left behind. May his mantle rest upon them, and in the enjoyment of a double portion of his spirit, may they experience that the Lord God of Owen is still the same; and that He is able to do for his people infinitely beyond what they can ask or think!

In 1683, he published a quarto pamphlet of 40 pages, “A Brief and Impartial Account of the Protestant Religion; its present state in the world; its strength and weakness,” etc. In this tract he points out what he conceives to be the grounds of Protestantism as contained in the Bible; examines the danger to which it was exposed from a general defection, from the operation of force, or from a reconciliation with Rome. While he intimates his fears from these causes, he balances them by other grounds of confidence; such as the honour of Christ to maintain his cause, the remnant of his people found among the nations, and the magnanimous spirit by which they were actuated. He concludes by expressing his full conviction that it would ultimately and universally triumph.

442

The last work of his pen, was, his “Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ,” which were committed to the press on the day in which he died. They consist of two parts: the first treats the Person, Office, and Grace of Christ; the second (which did not appear till 1691) consists of the application of the truths contained in the former, to sinners and declining believers. Between this publication, and the “Dying Thoughts” of Baxter, a considerable similarity subsists. Whatever the differences were between these eminent men on minor points, there was an intimate union between them, in spirituality of affections, in deadness to the world, and in longing aspirations toward that heavenly felicity, so large a portion of which they both enjoyed and diffused on earth. It has been remarked, that disputants will often agree in their prayers, when they differ in their writings. Christians may differ while they live; but will generally agree in their feelings and sentiments towards each other in the near prospect of death. Eternity, when closely viewed, must materially affect our estimate of the transactions of time; and one thing alone can render the prospect of entering it, pleasing and delightful to the mind. The glory of Christ, like that of the sun, increases in splendour as we advance upon it. It increasingly reveals the meanness and pollution of our earthly residence, and sheds a lustre over the “inheritance of the saints in light,” which renders it infinitely attractive. The exercise of faith, hope, and love, directed towards heavenly things, acquires the strength and influence of a habit — futurity, often contemplated, is felt to be present — and invisible things acquire a form and consistency in the mind.

443

It does not indeed appear what we shall be; but as we become weaned from this sinful world, and feel that our life is hid with Christ in God, our earnest of heavenly happiness not only becomes more sure, but it is better understood, and more abundant. The love of life loses its power, the fear of death diminishes; knowledge ripens to perfection, and the song of victory begins to be sung on the borders of the tomb. In this life, Christians suffer immense loss from not meditating on the person and glory of Christ as they ought to do. It is a mistake to suppose that this will be easy on a death bed, if the mind has not been previously tutored to it. It is a subject which ought to become

increasingly familiar, and increasingly delightful. If it constitutes the perfection and employment of heaven, it ought surely to be the subject of chief regard on earth. The more that it is so, the more our conduct will be marked with the decision of Christianity, and the more the mind will be imbued by its spirit; till, from sipping the streams, we rise to the full enjoyment of the ever-living and infinite fountain of heavenly joy. “Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now we know in part; but then shall we know even as we are known.” ^{1Cor 13.12}

Besides all the works we have noted, Owen was the author of some other productions which appeared at distant intervals after his death. He also wrote a great number of prefaces, or commendatory epistles to the works of other writers. Some account of all these will be found in the Appendix, as far as they are known to me. To have introduced them here, would have diverted us too long from the concluding scenes of his earthly career, to which we must now attend.

444

The health of Dr. Owen appears to have been much reduced for several years before his death. His intense and unwearied application, the fruits of which appear in his numerous and elaborate writings, and his anxious solicitude respecting the affairs of his Master’s kingdom, must have destroyed the vigour of any constitution. He was severely afflicted with the stone, that painful and common accompaniment of a studious life. To this was added asthma, a complaint peculiarly unfavourable to public speaking. These disorders frequently confined him to his chamber; but though they often prevented him from preaching, they must have interfered little with his writing; otherwise, so many works could not have been composed during the last years of his life.

While tried by these painful afflictions, he experienced much sympathy from his Christian friends. He had frequent invitations to the country residences of persons of quality, and particularly to that of Lord Wharton, at Woburn, in Buckinghamshire. While occasionally at the seat of this benevolent and Christian nobleman, he was often visited by persons of rank, and enjoyed the company of many of his Christian brethren in the ministry, who resorted there. From his house, during one of his severe attacks, he wrote a letter to the Church, so characteristic of the man, so suitable to the circumstances of the times and of his people, that the reader will be gratified by finding it entire at the end of this volume.

His infirmities rendering a fixed residence in the country necessary, he took a house at Kensington, where he lived for some time. During this period, an accident occurred which shows the state of the times, and the hardships to which Dissenters were then exposed.

445

Going one day from Kensington to London, his carriage was seized by two informers. This must have been exceedingly painful to the Doctor at any time, but especially when in a state of health made him ill capable of bearing the violent excitement of such an interference, and its probable consequences. It providentially happened, however, that Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, a justice of the peace, was passing at the time. Seeing a carriage stopped, and a mob collected, he inquired into the matter. He ordered the informers and Dr. Owen to meet him at a justice’s house in Bloomsbury square, on another day, when the cause would be tried. In the meantime, the Doctor was discharged. And when the meeting took place, it was found that the informers had acted so illegally, that they were severely reprimanded, and the business dismissed.

In the last year of his life, when Owen was probably thinking of another world, rather than of the politics of this one, a vile attempt was made to involve him and some of the other eminent Non-conformists, in the Rye house plot. ¹ Mr. Mead, Mr. Griffiths, and Mr. Carstairs, were charged

¹ The Rye House Plot of 1683, was a plan to assassinate Charles II and his brother James, Duke of York (heir to the throne), while journeying to a horse race in Newmarket. Because of a major fire there, the races were cancelled, and the planned attack never took place.

with meditating the assassination of the King and the Duke of York! Several distinguished individuals, among whom was the amiable and patriotic Lord Russel, were sacrificed for their supposed connexion with this business. The ministers, however, seem to have been free from any other blame than that of conversing freely with each other, about what they ought to do in the event of things coming to a crisis. ¹ The testimony of Mr. Carstairs, who was more connected with the politics of the country than any of the other ministers, and who suffered most severely and unjustly on account of this sham-plot, is full and explicit as to the innocence of the Dissenters.

446

“I should be guilty,” he says, “of the most horrid injustice, if I should accuse any of the worthy gentlemen of my own country, that were my fellow prisoners, or any of the *English Dissenting ministers*, of having the least knowledge of, or concern in the abominable assassination of the King or his brother. For I did then, as I do now, abhor such practices; nor can I, to this hour, tell really what was in that matter that makes such a noise.” ²

Indeed, there can scarcely be a doubt that it was entirely a contrivance of the court, to involve the friends of religion and liberty in disgrace; and to gain some of its own iniquitous ends. The business is of too infamous a nature to induce the smallest suspicion that men of religious character or honour could be engaged in it. ³

From Kensington, the Doctor moved to Ealing, a few miles farther into the country, where he had some property and a house of his own; and where he was destined to finish his course. His state of mind in the prospect of eternity, might be inferred from his work on spiritual-mindedness, and his meditations on the glory of Christ; so that without any further evidence, we might be convinced of the falseness of Anthony Wood’s assertion, “That he very unwillingly laid down his head and died.” ⁴ But we are not dependent entirely on the evidence of these works, for our estimate of the Doctor’s feelings in this interesting situation. The following letter to his intimate friend, Charles Fleetwood, dictated the day before Owen died, reveals the state of his mind to have been not only composed, but highly animated by the glorious hope of eternal life.

447

“Although I am not able to write one word myself, yet I am very desirous to speak one word more to you in this world, and do it by the hand of my wife. The continuance of your entire kindness, knowing what it is accompanied with, is not only greatly valued by me, but will be a refreshment to me, as it is even in my dying hour. I am going to Him whom my soul has loved, or rather who has loved me with an everlasting love, which is the whole ground of all my consolation. The passage is very irksome and wearisome, through strong pains of various sorts, which are all issued in an intermitting fever. All things were provided to carry me to London today, according to the advice of my physicians; but we are all disappointed by my utter disability to undertake the journey. I am leaving the ship of the church in a storm; but while the great Pilot is in it, the loss of a poor under-rower will be inconsiderable. Live, and pray, and hope, and wait patiently, and do not despond; the promise stands invincible, that He will never leave us nor forsake us. I am greatly afflicted at the distempers of your dear lady; the good Lord stand by her, and support and deliver her. My affectionate respects to her, and the rest of your relations, who are so dear to me in the Lord. Remember your dying friend with all fervency; I rest upon it that you do so, and am yours entirely.” ⁵

This letter exhibits the ground of the Doctor’s hope — the tranquillity of his mind — the humility of his disposition — his interest in the afflictions of the church, but confidence in her security —

¹ Pierce’s Vindication of the Dissenters, pp. 253, 258.

² Wodrow’s Hist. vol. ii, p. 388.

³ [And yet, in the 20th century, Dietrich Bonhoeffer was involved in an assassination attempt on Adolf Hitler. Religion is no preventative to sin, even if faith in Christ is a curative. – WHG](#)

⁴ Athen. Ox. vol. iii. p. 564.

⁵ Memoirs, p. 51.

his attachment to his friends and the pleasure which he derived from the fellowship of their kindness and prayers. It is just such a letter as we might have expected from the preceding life and character of the writer.

448

His sufferings previous to his death, appear to have been uncommonly severe, arising from the natural strength of his constitution, and the complication of his maladies. But the blessed truth which he had long preached to the edification and comfort of many, and in defence of which he had written so much and so well, proved fully adequate not only to support him, but to make him triumph in the prospect of eternity. On the morning of the day on which he died, Mr. Thomas Payne, an eminent tutor and Dissenting minister, at Saffron Waldon, in Essex — who had been entrusted with the publication of his *Meditations on the glory of Christ* — called to take his leave, and to inform him, that he had just been putting that work to the press. “I am glad to hear it,” said the dying Christian; and lifting up his hands and eyes, as if transported with enjoyment, exclaimed — “But O! brother Payne! the long wished for day has come at last, in which I shall see that glory in another manner than I have ever done, or was capable of doing in this world.” This exclamation reminds us of the beautiful words of Cicero, to which there is a striking resemblance; but which have a very different emphasis in the mouth of a dying saint, from what they have in the mouth of a heathen philosopher.

“O praeclarum diem, cum ad illud divinum animorum concilium coetumque proficiscar, cumque ex hac turba et colluvione discedam! proficiscar enim non ad eos solum viros, de quibus ante dixi; sed etiam ad Catonem meum,” etc. ¹

449

It was not, however, the prospect of seeing a Cato, though that Cato was a beloved son; or a Paul, though that Paul was an apostle, that animated the hopes of Owen; but the prospect of beholding him who once died for the guilty, who is the sum of all perfection; and the sight of whom imparts to all who behold him immortal happiness, and heavenly purity. To him, death would be a deliverance from the burden of sin, from the anxieties and cares which had long disturbed his repose, and from those excruciating pains of body, which had been the long forerunners of dissolution. It would also be, what is more than all the rest, absence from the body, to be present with the Lord.

“Happy day that breaks our chain!
That manumits; that calls from exile home;
That leads to nature’s great metropolis,
And re-admits us, through the guardian hand
Of elder Brother’s to our Father’s throne.”

His death took place on the twenty-fourth of August, 1683, the anniversary of the celebrated Bartholomew ejection, and in the sixty-seventh year of his age. He was speechless for several hours before; but showed by lifting up his eyes and hands with great devotion, that he retained the use of his mental faculties, and his devotional feelings to the last. He was attended by Dr. Cox and Dr. (afterward Sir) Edmund King, who assigned a physical reason for the extreme severity of his last agonies. “Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace!” — “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord — they rest from their labours; and their works follow them.”

450

¹ Cicero’s *De Senectute*. “O happy day, when I shall quit this impure and corrupt multitude, and join myself to that divine company and council of souls who have quitted the earth before me! There I shall find, not only those illustrious personages to whom I have spoken, but also my Cato,” etc.

From Ealing, where he died, his body was conveyed to a house in St. James' where it lay some time. On the fourth of September, it was conveyed to Bunhill fields, attended by the carriages of sixty-seven noblemen and gentlemen; besides many mourning coaches and persons on horseback. Such a testimony to the memory of a man who died destitute of court and of church favour — who had been often abused by the sycophants of tyranny, and the enemies of religion; and at a time when it was dangerous to take part with the persecuted Non-conformists — was equally honourable to the dead and to the living. He was doubtless dear to many whom he had instructed by his preaching, and comforted by his writings. They must have sorrowed over his grave, as it closed upon the remains of a valuable and most devoted servant of Christ. But their sorrow would be mingled with joy, when they reflected on his deliverance, and indulged the sure and certain hope of his resurrection to eternal life. He indeed left the church in a storm, when there were comparatively few who cared for her state. But he entered into rest, and in a few years she obtained deliverance and repose. How he would have exulted if he had lived till the Glorious Revolution (1688), and enjoyed for a little, the happy effects of that long and arduous struggle in which the country had been engaged, and in which he and his brethren bore so prominent a part! They were honoured to sustain the burden and heat of the day, while we repose with comfort in the shade. They fought the battle, and we reap the fruit of the victory. They, however, will have their due reward when the reproach of the world, and the abuse of party prejudice — as well as all the effects they have produced — will be forever destroyed by the applauding approval of the Righteous Judge.

451

His death was improved to the church on the Lord's day after the funeral, by his brother and colleague, Mr. Clarkson, from Philippians 3.21. — "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like his glorious body." It is a short, but consolatory discourse. He does not enter largely into the Doctor's character, and gives nothing of his history. The last paragraph is solemn and affecting, and must have sensibly touched the church,

"His death falls heaviest and most directly upon this congregation. We had a light in this candlestick, which not only enlightened the room, but gave light to others far and near: but it is put out. We did not sufficiently value it; I wish I might not say, that our sins have put it out. We had a special honour and ornament, such as other churches would much prize; but the crown has fallen from our heads, indeed, may I not add, 'Woe unto us for we have sinned.' We have lost an excellent pilot, and lost him when a fierce storm is coming on us. I dread the consequences, considering the weakness of those who are left at the helm. If we are not sensible of it, it is because our blindness is great. Let us beg of God, that He would prevent what this threatens us with, and that he would make up this loss, or that it may be repaired. And let us pray in the last words of this dying person to me — "That the Lord would double his spirit upon us, that he would not remember against us former iniquities; but that his tender mercies may speedily prevent us, for we are brought very low."

By his Will, he left the estate of Eaton, in Berkshire, to his wife during her life. Upon her death, that estate and another at Stadham, were bequeathed to his brother Henry Owen (who, however, died before himself), or to his son Henry who, I suppose, succeeded to both.

452

Among the legacies are twenty pounds to John Collins, the pastor of a respectable Independent church in London; five pounds apiece to Mr. David Clarkson, Mr. Robert Ferguson, and Mr., Isaac Loafs; thirty pounds to one female servant, and twenty to another, who had attended him during his illness. ¹

¹ Copy of the Doctor's Will. — Had there been anything of importance in the Will, besides what I have noted, I would have inserted it entire in the Appendix; but it is very short, and contains nothing that would interest the reader.

His Library was sold in May 1684, by Millington, one of the earliest of our book auctioneers. ¹ Considering the Doctor's taste as a reader, his age as a minister, and his circumstances as a man, his library, in all probability, would be both extensive and valuable. He had become the possessor of the Greek and Latin MSS. which had belonged to Patrick Young, better known by his Latin name Junius: one of the most celebrated Greek scholars of his time, who had been keeper of the Royal Library, at St. James', and the author and editor of several learned works. ²

A monument of free stone was erected over the vault in Bunhill fields, where his body was laid, on which the following Latin Epitaph was inscribed, drawn up by his old friend Mr. Thomas Gilbert, and which still remains in fine preservation.

453

JOHANNES OWEN, S. T. P.

Agro Oxoniensi Oriundus;
 Patre insigni Theologo Theologus ipse Insignior;
 Et seculi hujus Insignissimis annumerandus:
 Communibus Humaniorum Literarum Suppetiis,
 Mensura parum Coramuni, Instructus,
 Omnibus, quasi bene Ordinata Ancillarum Serie,
 Ab illo jussis suae Famulari Theologiae:
 Theologia Polemicae, Practicae, et quam vocant Casuum
 (Harum enim Omnium, quae magis sua habenda erat, ambigitur)
 In illa, Viribus plusquam Herculeis, serpentibus tribus,
 Aiminio, Socino, Cano, Venenosa Strinxit guttura:
 In illa suo prior, ad verbi Amussim, Expertus Pectore,
 Universam Sp. Seti. Œconomian Aliis tradidit:
 Et, missis Caeteris, Coluit ipse, Sensitque,
 Beatam quam scripsit, cum Deo Communionem:
 In terris Viator comprehensori in caelis proximus:
 In Casuum Theologia, Singulis Oraculi instar habitus;
 Quibus Opus erat, et copia, Consulendi;
 Scriba ad Regnum Caelorum usqueoque institutus;
 Multis privatos infra Parietes, a Suggesto Pluribus,
 A Prelo omnibus, ad eundem scopum collineantibus,
 Pura Doctrinae Evangelicae Lampas Praeluxit;
 Et sensim, non sine aliorum, suoque sensu,
 Sic praelucendo Periiit,
 Assiduis Infirmatibus Obsiti,
 Morbis Creberrimus Impetiti,
 Durisque Laboribus potissimum Attriti, Corporis,
 (Fabricae, donec ita Quassatae, Spectabilis) Ruinas,
 Deo ultra Fruendi Cupida, Deseruit;
 Die, a Terrenis Protestatibus, Plurimis facto Fatali;
 Illi, A Coelesti Numine, felici reddito;
 Mensis Scilicet Augusti XXIV Anno a Partu Virgineo.
 M.DC.LXXXIII Ætat. LXVII §.

454

¹ Nichol's. Lit. Anec. vol. iv. p. 29.

² Wood's Fasti, vol. 1. pp. 793, 794. The Libraries of many of the Dissenting ministers of this period, were both extensive and valuable. Dr. Lazarus Seaman's Library, the first that was sold by auction, brought £700. The half of Dr. Goodwin's Library, which was burnt, was valued at £500 Dr. Iacomb's sold for £1300. The collection of Dr. Bates was bought by Dr. Williams, for £500, or £600, to lay the foundation of the valuable library now in Red Cross Street. Dr. Evans' Library, in the beginning of last century, contained 10,000 volumes. It is probable Dr. Owen's was not inferior to some of these.

Translation:

JOHN OWEN, D.D.,

Born in the County of Oxford,
The son of an eminent Minister,
Himself more eminent.
And worthy to be enrolled
Among the first Divines of the age.
Furnished with human literature
In all its kinds,
And in all its degrees,
He called forth all his knowledge
In an orderly train
To serve the interests of Religion,
And minister in the Sanctuary of his God.

In Divinity, practic, polemic, and casuistic.
He excelled others, and was in all, equal to himself.
The Arminian, Socinian, and Popish errors,
Those Hydras, whose contaminated breath,
And deadly poison infested the Church,
He, with more than Herculean labour.
Repulsed, vanquished, and destroyed.
The whole economy of redeeming grace,
Revealed and applied by the Holy Spirit,
He deeply investigated and communicated to others;
Having first felt its divine energy.
According to its draught in the Holy Scriptures,
Transfused into his own bosom.
Superior to all terrene pursuits.
He constantly cherished, and largely experienced.
That blissful communion with Deity,
He so admirably describes in his writings.

While on the road to Heaven
His elevated mind
Almost comprehended
Its full glories and joys.
When he was consulted
On cases of conscience
His resolutions contained
The wisdom of an Oracle.
He was a scribe every way instructed
In the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

In conversation, he held up to *many*,
In his public discourses, to *more*,
In his publications from the press, to *all*,
Who were set out for the celestial *Zion*,
The effulgent lamp of evangelical truth
To guide their steps to immortal glory.
While he was thus diffusing his divine light,
With his own inward sensations,
And the observations of his afflicted friends,
His earthly tabernacle gradually decayed,
Till at length his deeply sanctified soul,
Longing for the fruition of its God,
Quitted the body.

In younger age
A most comely and majestic form;
But in the latter stages of life,
Depressed by constant infirmities,
Emaciated with frequent diseases,

455

And above all, crushed under the weight
Of intense and unremitting studies,
It became an incommodious mansion
For the vigorous exertions of the spirit
In the service of its God.
He left the world on a day,
Dreadful to the Church
By the cruelties of men,
But blissful to himself
By the plaudits of his God,
August 24, 1683, aged 67. ¹

Dr. Owen was tall in stature, and toward the latter part of his life, inclined to stoop. He had a grave majestic countenance; but the expression was sweet rather than austere. His appearance and deportment were those of a gentleman, and therefore much suited to the situations which he was called to fill. Several portraits of him have been executed, all of which, though done at different periods of his life, exhibit a considerable resemblance to each other. The engraving given in the first edition of Palmer's Non-conformist's Memorial, appears to be from the earliest painting. It is said to be taken from an original picture in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Gifford. There is a very fine engraving by Vertue, prefixed to the folio collection of his Sermons and Tracts, published in 1721. The painting or drawing from which this print was taken, must have been done toward the latter part of the Doctor's life. The plate is a large oval, in which he is represented in his library, supporting his gown with his left hand. Round the margin of the plate is engraved, "Joannes Owen. S. T. P. Decan Æd. Chr. et per Quinquenn. Vice Canc. Oxon." In a scroll above the oval, "Queramus Superna," is inscribed; in a small tablet at the bottom, his arms are inserted, and on a square pedestal supporting the whole, the following lines, said to be by himself, occur: —

456

Umbra refert fragiles, dederunt quas cura dolorque
Reliquias, studiis assiduusque labor
Mentem humilem sacri servantem Limina veri
Votis supplicibus, qui dedit, ille vidit.

Of these lines, we have an elegant translation from the pen of Dr. Watts; who speaks of them with great approval, and as the production of Owen himself.

This shadow shows the frail remains
Of sickness, cares, and studious pains.
The mind in humble posture waits
At sacred truth's celestial gates,
And keeps those bounds with holy fear,
While he that gave it sees it there. ²

The engraving prefixed to this work, is from a very fine painting done in 1656, when the Doctor was Vice-Chancellor, and in the fortieth year of his age. Nothing is known of the painter or its history, but the proprietor has kindly allowed it to be used for these Memoirs, as he had before to

¹ Translated by Dr. Gibbons.

² Watt's Works, Parson's Edit. vol. ii. p. 389.

Mr. Palmer, for the second edition of the Non-conformist's Memorial. The facsimile of Owen's handwriting is taken from a letter to Baxter, written in 1668, now in the Red Cross Street library.

From the materials contained in the preceding part of this volume, and from the numerous works of Dr. Owen, the reader might safely be left to form his own estimate of his general character. But as our discussions have frequently been of a very miscellaneous nature, an attempt to bring together the leading features of his character, as a Christian, as a minister of the gospel, and as a writer, will form a suitable conclusion and improvement of the whole.

457

One of the first things which appears in Owen's religious history, and which constituted a prominent feature in his character through life, is his conscientious submission to the Supreme authority of the word of God. This led him at an early period, to abandon all his hopes and wishes of rising in the Episcopal hierarchy, and to take part with the despised and persecuted Puritans. The same principle induced him afterwards to adopt the sentiments of the Independents, then struggling for existence. It was this which made him maintain his adherence to that body through all its various fortunes, and to resist with equal perseverance and steadiness every inducement to leave it, whether arising from the allurements of preferment, or the temptations of adversity, "To the Law and the Testimony," he uniformly bowed with humble and cheerful subjection. Where they pointed the way, he felt it his duty to follow; what they called him to bear, he willingly sustained. The path was often rugged, the burden heavy; but the love of Christ always smoothed the one, and enabled him to bear the other. With a conscience alive to every precept of the Sacred word, and a heart filled with gratitude to its Divine author, all things were felt to be easy. And he experienced what all who imitate his conduct will find that the path of duty, even when it leads through tribulation, is the path of safety and comfort.

With conscientious obedience was associated the deepest humility of disposition. Possessed of eminent talents, and great enlargement of mind — placed in the most dignified and often envied situations — consulted, applauded, and courted by authority, learning, and rank — he could not be altogether unconscious of his own superiority. Yet this scarcely ever appears.

458

There was little of pride or overbearing in his manner. The tendency of his talents and honours to elate him, was counteracted by the deep insight which he had into the character of God, and the interior of human nature. He had been completely humbled by the convictions of the Divine law. His knowledge of the gospel deepened his impressions of the malignity of sin, and the deceitfulness of the heart. Instead of comparing himself with others, he always examined his motives and actions by the standard of an unalterable and perfect rule. Conscious of innumerable imperfections which were unperceived by men, he walked before God as a sinner, constantly dependent on sovereign mercy to cover his transgressions, and on gracious influence to perfect his obedience. "What have I, that I have not received," is a sentiment which he seems constantly to have carried in his mind.

The account given of his private manners, corresponds with the idea we form of him from his writings. He was very affable and courteous, familiar and sociable; the meanest persons found easy access to his conversation and friendship. He was facetious and pleasant in his common discourse, jesting with his acquaintances, but with sobriety and measure; a great master of his passions, especially that of anger. He was of a serene and even temper, neither elated with honour, credit, friends or estate; nor easily depressed with troubles and difficulties. ¹

¹ Memoirs, p. 33.

He combined, in a manner worthy of imitation, liberal love toward all the people of God, with firmness and attachment to his own peculiar sentiments. He walked according to the light which he had himself received, and loved those who minded the same things; but his benedictions extended to all the true Israel of God.

459

He was a devoted friend to the truth, but a lover of many who did not see every part of it as he did; and he only pitied and prayed for those who opposed it. Like Melancthon, he contended for unity in those truths which are necessary to be believed, for liberty in those things which God has left free, and for love toward all who bore the image of Christ. He was of great moderation in his judgment, willing to think the best of all men as far as he could; not censorious, but a lover of piety wherever it was exhibited; not limiting Christianity to any one party, and ever endeavouring to promote it among men of all professions. Those who wish to cultivate the diffusive charities of Christianity, and to be “lovers of all good men,” would do well to imbibe his spirit, and to study his character: and those who suppose all principled attachment to distinctive sentiments and practices must be narrow-minded bigotry, are referred to the conduct of Owen for the reproof of their ignorance and folly. No man could exhibit more of the blandness of affection to those who differed from him on minor points; and no man could more sternly resist all interference with his own sentiments, or encroachments on his own liberty. To grant to others the same right which we exercise ourselves, is more commonly acknowledged to be equitable in principle, than generally reduced to practice.

Unwearied diligence in the business of the Christian profession, is another distinguishing trait in the life of Owen. He was a passionate lover of light and truth, especially of Divine truth. He pursued it unweariedly through painful and wasting studies which impaired his health and strength, and brought upon him those distempers which issued in his death.

460

Some blamed him for this, as a sort of intemperance; but it is, says Mr. Clarkson, the most excusable of any, and looks like a voluntary martyrdom. ¹ His laborious diligence appeared in his varied learning, in his preaching, in his writings and in his numerous and often discordant labours. Idleness must have been utterly unknown to him. Every moment of his time was filled up; and in obedience to the Divine injunction, whatever his hands found to do, he did it with all his might. In the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge, he found a large portion of his earthly reward.

But that which appears most conspicuously in the character of Owen, is the deep and constant spiritual tone of his mind. To this, all the other qualities in his temper, and every other attainment must be made to bow. The grand ingredient in all his practical and experimental writings, is spirituality — in which he was superior to most of the men of his own age, and comparatively few since have arrived at the measure of his spiritual stature. His eminence in this grace, or rather this combination of the graces of the Spirit, is deserving of even more attention, when we reflect on the circumstances of his life. He was no ascetic, living far from the haunts of men, and conversing in solitude with himself, with nature, and with God. Nor did he spend his days in village labours, amidst a rustic population, “far from the madding crowd’s ignoble strife.” He did not live when “the churches had rest and were edified,” or when the Olive branch of peace was suspended over the land. He did not study how he might most quietly creep through the world, and obtain an unperceived dismissal from its ills.

461

¹ Funeral Sermon.

His circumstances, and “manner of life,” were the very reverse of these. He mixed much in the world, moved even among the great of the earth, and often stood before the principalities and powers of the land. Many of his days were spent amidst the noise of camps, the bickerings of party, and the heat of controversy. His country was convulsed by internal wars and religious animosities; and the churches of Christ were either agitated by “diverse and strange doctrines,” or called to endure “a great fight of afflictions.” In all these circumstances, the soul of Owen remained unmoved. “In the land of peace, and in the swellings of Jordan,” it persevered in its undeviating spiritual career. Superior to the influence of external things, his pursuits and feelings often exhibit an extraordinary contrast with his situation. While governing the contending spirits of Oxford, surrounded by the turbulent elements of the commonwealth, and discussing the intricacies of the Arminian and Socinian debates, he wrote on the *Mortification of Sin*, and on *Communion with God*. While struggling with oppression, and sometimes concealing himself for safety, he produced his *Exposition of the 130th Psalm*, and his work on the *Hebrews*. When racked with the stone, and “in deaths oft,” he composed his *Defence of Evangelical Churches*, and his *Meditations on the Glory of Christ*. The change of subject, or of circumstances, appears to have effected little change on his spirits, or on the state of his mind.

The secret of this enviable attainment is certainly to be found in the extraordinary measure of Divine influence which he enjoyed. This produced a life of faith, of self-denial, and of heavenly tranquillity. When he describes the mortification of sin, it was what he himself daily practised. When he exhibits the nature and excellencies of communion with God, we have a view of his own enjoyments.

462

When he enforces the grace and duty of spiritual-mindedness, he illustrates what he daily loved and sought. His mouth spoke from the abundance of his heart, and what he had tasted and felt himself, he desired to communicate to others. “He set the Lord always before him;” ^{Psa 16.8} which delivered him from the fear of man, and enabled him to act the part of a faithful minister of Christ. When contending for the faith, however, he remembered that the servant of the Lord must not strive, but “in meekness instruct those who oppose themselves.” ^{2Tim 2.25} When surrounded by the “poms and vanities of the world,” he thought of their fading nature, and on the superior glory of the “better and more enduring inheritance.” ^{Heb 10.34} When struggling with the tribulations of the kingdom, he rejoiced in the rest that remains for the people of God. When exposed to the strife of tongues, and reviled by unreasonable and wicked men, he comforted himself with the words of his Lord: “Blessed are you when men shall revile you and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my name’s sake.” ^{Mat 5.11} When fainting with weakness, and dissolving in death, the thoughts of heaven and of him who occupies its throne filled him with “joy unspeakable and full of glory.” ^{1Pet 1.8}

These were the grand principles and springs of his feelings and conduct. Spirituality of mind was his life and his peace. After Owen, let no man find a reason for the lack of it in the supposed peculiarity or difficulty of his circumstances. Let not public life be an apology for a worldly spirit. Let not prosperity excuse pride, or adversity depression. Let not the contumelies of reproach justify a spirit of rancour, nor controversy be considered as necessarily incompatible with the meekness and gentleness of Christ.

463

He seems to have been intended as a specimen of what the grace of God can do for an uninspired individual, to encourage others to emulate his virtues, and to be followers of his patience and his faith. It would be wrong to refer to him as an authority; it would be sinful to clothe him with perfection; but if respect is due to Christian excellence, and enlightened sanctified obedience is entitled to esteem, then the character of Owen demands the veneration of all the people of God.

As a Minister of Christ, his character and qualifications stand eminently high. Of his learning, knowledge of the Scriptures, and piety, the grand requisites of the gospel ministry, it is scarcely necessary to say anything, after what has been brought forward. The languages of the cross were familiar to him as his mother tongue. To this his adversaries bear testimony. "He was," says Wood, "a person well-skilled in the tongues, Rabbinical learning, and Jewish rites and customs." Those who want further evidence, have only to refer to his *Theologumena*, and his work on the *Hebrews*. We may still say something about the use he made of his superior advantages as a public teacher, and the pastor of a Christian church.

His talents as a public speaker were of the first order. His voice was strong, but not noisy; sweet, but exceedingly manly, with a certain sound of authority in it. His gesture was far removed from theatrical affectation, but always animated and adapted to his subject. ¹ His personal appearance aided most powerfully the advantages of his voice, and all were supported by a presence of mind which seldom forsook him, even in the most trying circumstances.

464

"His personage," says Wood, who knew him at Oxford, "was proper and handsome, and he had a very graceful behaviour in the pulpit; an eloquent elocution; a winning and insinuating deportment. And by the persuasion of his oratory, in conjunction with some other outward advantages, he could move and wind the affections of his admiring auditory, almost as he pleased." ² He seldom used notes.

"He had an admirable facility in discoursing on any subject pertinently and decently; and could better express himself *extempore*, than others with premeditation. He was never at a loss for lack of language, a happiness few can pretend to; and this he could show in the presence even of the highest persons in the nation. He thus showed that he had the command of his learning. His vast reading and experience were hereby made useful in resolving doubts, clearing obscurities, and healing breaches which sometimes seemed incurable." ³

His published discourses are far from unfavourable specimens of his pulpit talents. Those redundancies of which we complain in reading, must have been more tolerable in their delivery. Though diffuse and generally prolix, he is often energetic. And considering the state of the language at the time, and his careless habits of composition, it is surprising that so many eloquent and touching passages should be found in them. *Usefulness*, however — rather than display or effect — was the great object of all his public labours. He preached for eternity —

Ambitious, not to shine or to excel,
But to treat justly, what he loved so well.

465

By this rule, therefore, all his pulpit compositions must be tried. He considered the state and circumstances of his hearers, and endeavoured to adapt his instructions to them. As a good steward, he studied rightly to divide the word of truth, and to give to all the members of the family of God their due portion.

"By him, the violated law speaks out
Its thunders; and by him, In strains as sweet
As ever angels use, the gospel whispers peace.
He 'stablishes the strong, restores the weak.
Reclaims the wanderer, binds the broken heart.
And, arm'd himself in panoply complete

¹ One of Gilbert's Epitaphs. Works, p. 37

² Athen. Ox. vol. ii. p. 559.

³ Clarkson's Funeral Sermon.

Of heavenly temper, furnishes with arms
Bright as his own, and trains by every rule
Of holy discipline, to glorious war.
The sacramental host of God's Elect."

His attention to the church, so far as we are now capable of judging, seems to have been very exemplary. The Catechisms which he published to aid the young and the ignorant, the discourses which he addressed to the church on particular occasions, the short addresses which he delivered at private meetings, on practical and experiential subjects, and those which he made at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, are specimens of the manner in which he discharged the functions of his office; and of his anxiety that he might be found faithful to the trust committed to him. He prescribed two things to himself, for his regulation in the work of the ministry: "To impart those truths of whose power, he had in some measure a real experience, and to press those duties which present occasions, temptations, and other circumstances rendered necessary to be attended to." ¹ He exemplified in himself, the correct and ample view which he gives of the duty of Pastors in his work on the *Nature of the Gospel Church* — the fifth chapter of which ought most seriously to be considered by all who occupy this important office.

466

As many persons of rank and fortune were members of his church, the Doctor's circumstances, former connexions, and superior understanding, with his eminent attainments as a Christian, particularly suited him for the management of such a body. He knew how to combine dignity of deportment as a gentleman, and superiority as a scholar, with the meekness and gentleness becoming the servant of his brethren for Christ's sake. "His conversation was not only advantageous for its pleasantness and obligingness; but there was in it that which made it desirable to great persons, natives and foreigners, and that [desire was] by so many, that few could have what they desired." ²

His influence among the Non-conformists, and particularly among his brethren of the Congregational body, was very extensive. It is needless to recapitulate the circumstances which naturally promoted this. He outlived most of the generation of Independents who took part in the civil commotions. He was looked up to by his brethren, both near and at a distance, on all occasions of public difficulty — and from his connexions, he could be of more service in those circumstances than any other individual. He was consulted by his brethren in the ministry when they were perplexed about the path of duty; and churches also applied for the assistance of his counsel and advice when differences occurred in them which they found it difficult to settle. ³ Thus his usefulness must have extended greatly beyond the sphere of his personal labours.

467

But it is as a writer that Dr. Owen has been most useful, and is now most generally known. Having so often had occasion to speak of his publications, it cannot be necessary now, to go into any details respecting them. But a general observation or two may still be made, on his faults and his merits as an author. His chief deficiency is to be found in his style. His sentences are frequently long, perplexed, and encumbered with adjectives, often carelessly selected.

"Accustomed to dictate his ideas, he surveys the stores of a mind rich in knowledge; and perceiving clearly the leading truth which he meant to illustrate, he brings forward a long series of thoughts, all bearing on the subject. The associations which linked them together in his mind, were probably most natural; but

¹ Pref. to Spirit. Mind.

² Clarkson's Funeral Sermon.

³ A Letter of advice from the Doctor to Mr. Asty, then in Norwich, is annexed to his Memoirs, 1721, p. 50. Another Letter of advice from him and Mr. George Griffiths, to the Church in Tyler's Street, Hitchin, in Hertfordshire, is inserted in the Non-conformist's Mem. vol. i. p. 107. The Letters to the Churches in New England have already been noted.

these thoughts were perhaps not all requisite at the time — parentheses frequently occur, and the passage becomes perplexed. He had neither leisure nor inclination to revise and retrench; perhaps though he had made the attempt, he was not qualified to render his writings much more acceptable by improvements in style. In general, however, it is not difficult to perceive his meaning. And when the sentence is intricate, a little attention will commonly enable the reader to disentangle the several clauses.”¹

This is, perhaps, the best apology that can be offered for the obvious defects in the compositions of Owen. It may also be added, that even his own editions of his writings are, in general, most carelessly printed. Almost no attention has been paid to the punctuation, and every subsequent edition has adopted and added to the blunders of the preceding.

468

The language too, when he wrote, had not attained that classical purity and neatness at which it arrived in the beginning of the following century. I am doubtful, however, whether Owen would have studied it, though it had. He was inexcusably indifferent to the vehicle of his thoughts. Had he written less, and paid more attention to the pruning and arranging of his sentiments and language, he would doubtless have been more useful. But to all ornament in theological writing, he was an enemy on principle.

“Know reader that you have to deal with a person who, provided his words but clearly express the sentiments of his mind, entertains a fixed and absolute disregard of all elegance and ornaments of speech. For, ‘*Dicite Pontifices, in sacris quid facit aurum?*’²

In my opinion, indeed, someone who in a theological contest would please himself with a display of rhetorical flourishes, would derive no further advantage from it, but that his head adorned with magnificent garlands and pellets, would fall a richer victim to the strokes of the learned.”³

But it is not of the lack of tinsel and glitter that we complain against Owen; it is of simplicity and condensation. Most readers murmur against his prolixity and heaviness: and though the labour is repaid when persevered in, still, it might have been better, if this exercise of self-denial had been unnecessary. How different is his style from the chaste and flowing elegance of Bate, and from the point and energy of Baxter — though the latter is far from a model of good writing. It is useless, however, to complain now. The exterior of the casket has nothing to attract; but its contents are more valuable than rubies.

469

Perhaps no theological writer of the period was better known, and among a large class of Christians so greatly respected. His Latin works extended his fame on the Continent, and led to the translation of several of his English productions, or induced foreign divines to learn the language, so that they might enjoy the benefit of them. Many travelled into England to see and converse with him; many also were the letters which he received from learned persons abroad; but which unfortunately cannot now be recovered. Among these correspondents was the celebrated Anna Maria Schurmann, whose letters it would have been most gratifying to possess; but they also are lost.⁴

The influence of Owen’s works in forming or directing the religious opinions, not only of his own age, but of the succeeding, was doubtless very great. Of this, the price which his larger performances continue to bring, and the numerous editions and abridgements of his various writings still published, are alone sufficient proofs. Among the Dissenters, they have always been standard books; and the evangelical party in the Established Churches now equally respect them.

¹ Wright’s Preface to his Edition of Owen on the Hebrews.

² “Say, bishops, of what avail is glitter to sacred subjects?”

³ Preface to Divine Justice.

⁴ Memoirs p. 34.

Those of his works which continue most popular, are all on the most important subjects. And from the extent in which they have been read, the amount of good which they have effected, will never be ascertained in this world.

I do not know that Owen ought to be considered an original writer. His works do not contain any important discoveries in theological science, or any great novelty of illustration. He seldom diverges from the common path trod by Calvinistic writers. This is noted by Clarkson in his Funeral Sermon:

470

“It is usual with persons of extraordinary parts, to straggle from the common road and affect novelty, though thereby they lose the best company; as though they could not appear eminent unless they march alone. But this great person did not affect singularity. They were old truths that he endeavoured to defend, those which were delivered by the first Reformers, and owned by the best divines of the Church of England.”

Indeed, novelty in Christianity is not to be expected, nor perhaps should it be desired. A passage of Scripture may receive a new interpretation; an argument may be placed in a stronger light; a doctrine or a duty may be enforced by more powerful or more suitable reasonings — but the great truths which constitute the foundation of faith and practice, must ever remain the same.

As a controversial writer, Owen is generally distinguished for calmness, acuteness, candour, and gentlemanly treatment of his opponents. He lived during a stormy period, and often experienced the bitterest provocation; but he very seldom lost his temper. He often handled the arguments of his adversaries very roughly; but he always saved their persons and feelings as much as possible. Most of them were obliged to acknowledge this. Wood declares that “he was one of the fairest and most genteel of the writers who appeared against the Church of England; handling his adversaries with far more civil, decent, and temperate language than many of his fiery brethren — and confining himself wholly to the cause, without the unbecoming mixture of personal slanders and reflections.” Stillingfleet acknowledges that he “treated him with civility and decent language.” Henry Dodwell admits, “He was of a better temper than most of his brethren.” “Dr. Owen,” says John Humfrey, “is a person whose name I honour for his worth, learning, and comprehensive parts; and one in whom there was more of a gentleman as to his deportment, than any Divine I ever knew among us.”

471

And even Richard Baxter, his frequent and troublesome opponent, bears honourable testimony to his character.

“I do not doubt,” he says, “that he was a man of rare parts and worth. That Book of Communion is an excellent Treatise; and his great volumes on the Hebrews all show his great and eminent parts. It was his strange error if he thought that freedom from a Liturgy would have made most or many ministers like himself — as free, and fluent, and copious of expression. In recent times, he would never have been so long Dean of Christ Church; so oft Vice-Chancellor of Oxford; so highly esteemed in the army, and with the persons then in power — if his extraordinary parts had not been known. If this excellent man had one mistake, he was yet in recent years of more complying mildness, and sweetness, and peaceableness than ever before, or than many others. I do not doubt that his soul is now with Christ, where there is no darkness, no mistakes, no separation of Christ’s members from one another.”¹

These are honourable testimonies, especially the last. If controversy had been always carried on in the spirit of Owen, it would not have been that baneful thing which it has so generally proved — till every book bearing a controversial title, is the object of disgust to many who might be much

¹ Baxter’s Reply to Owen’s Twelve Arguments.

benefitted by reading both sides of a question. In this respect, most modern writers have a great advantage over those who wrote in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

472

There is, however, some danger of theological politeness becoming unhealthy.¹ The disposition to please and to compliment, may be carried too far. The flattering adulation addressed by Watson to Gibbon, and the literary correspondence between Robertson and Hume, induce a suspicion that these distinguished writers, though they appeared as combatants on a public arena, were after all, not of radically different sentiments. To abuse and vilify on the pretence of defending truth with spirit, and to tamely surrender its interests, from a desire to stand well with its enemies, are very different things, and ought to be forever distant.

By far the greatest portion of Owen's writings are controversial. This arose, not so much from the warlike disposition of the man, as from his circumstances. The Arminian, Socinian, Popish, Episcopalian, and Independent debates, occupied his attention, and were the subjects of his elaborate illustration. They were all deeply interesting then; and none of them have become altogether uninteresting since his death. One thing appears prominent in all his productions of this class: his strong desire to give them a practical direction, and to render them as useful as possible to his opponents and readers. His appeals to the conscience and the heart, and his constant reference to the good or evil tendency of particular sentiments, are calculated to improve the dispositions, as well as to enlighten the understanding. What good end is gained by silencing or triumphing over an adversary, if he is not convinced? If it is evident that a victory is secured at the expense of exciting the malevolent propensities of human nature, then it calls for humiliation rather than boasting. Men sometimes write in such a manner, as if it were their object to run down an opponent, rather than to convince or instruct him; and to excite hatred toward his person, as much as dislike for his opinions.

473

Owen was repeatedly the object of this treatment; but nothing which ever fell from his pen retaliated. The united voice of the Christian Republic should be raised against such unprincipled conduct, till the very attempt becomes hazardous to the character or the cause to which it may belong.

As an expository writer, I have spoken of Owen at large in my account of his Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is as a practical, and especially as an experiential writer, that Owen is most generally known, and for which he enjoys the greatest popularity — and it must be allowed that this is the department in which he chiefly excels. Here he was eminently at home. Possessed of the most accurate and extensive views of the whole scheme of Redemption, of a singularly spiritual mind, and of a high degree of devotional ardour, he enters into the minutest details of the Christian character with the utmost familiarity; and traces all its lineaments and graces with the hand of a master. He is never so taken up with the ornament or drapery, as to daub “The Christian face divine;” nor in exhibiting the countenance and the figure, is there ever anything distorted or disproportioned. Spiritual life is the vital energy which pervades the morality and the practice recommended by Owen. It is not the abstraction of a mystical devotion, like that of Fenelon or Law; nor is it the enthusiastic raptures of a Zinzendorf — but it is the evangelical piety of Paul, and the heavenly affection of John. For every practice, mortification, and feeling, Owen assigns a satisfactory reason, because it is a scriptural reason. The service which he recommends, is uniformly a reasonable service; and to every required exertion, he brings an adequate and constraining motive.

¹ Originally, “becoming morbid.”

In examining the practical writings of such men as Hall, and Taylor, and Tillotson, we miss that rich vein of evangelical sentiment, and that constant reference to the living principle of Christianity, which are never lost sight of in Owen. They abound in excellent directions, in rich materials for self-examination, and self-government; but they do not state with sufficient accuracy the connexion between gracious influence, and its practical results, from which all that is excellent in human conduct must proceed. They appear as the anatomists of the skin and the extremities; Owen is the anatomist of the heart. "He dissects it with remarkable sagacity, tracing out its course and turnings in every path that leads from integrity, and marking the almost imperceptible steps which conduct to atrocious sins."¹ While others attend to the faults or the excellences of the outer man, he devotes himself chiefly to the sins and enjoyments of the inner man — illustrating at the same time how they regulate the exterior behaviour. He uniformly begins with the grand principles of Christian action, and traces them from their source in the sovereign love of the Redeemer, through all their windings in human experience; examining all that retards, and noting all that promotes their progress; showing how they fertilize the soil through which they flow with the fruits of righteousness, and finally return in the incense of grateful praise to the atmosphere of heaven.

Owen, Goodwin, Baxter, and Howe, were the four leading men among the Non-conformist worthies. In assigning the first place to the subject of these memoirs, I am not aware of being improperly influenced by my partiality for a favourite author — a partiality which I confess has been greatly increased by my researches into his history.

It is the place which I apprehend to be indisputably due to him, and which the general voice of enlightened Christians has long conferred.² They were "all honourable men," whose characters and talents would have graced any cause. To each of them, Owen was perhaps inferior in some prominent feature or attainment; but none of them was equal to him on the whole, or occupied so public and important fields of labour. Goodwin possessed his learning, but not his discernment or his public talents. Baxter was his equal in diligence, and perhaps his superior in acuteness and in energy; but possessed neither his learning, nor temper, nor accuracy of sentiment. Howe was more original and philosophical; but had less of the simplicity of Gospel doctrine, and wrote on fewer subjects. Comparisons, however, are invidious and unnecessary. Each filled his own station with propriety, and shone in his own circle; and all are now enjoying together the fruits of their labours and sufferings.

¹ Arthur Young's *Oweniana*, Preface.

² Hervey's classification of the leading Non-conformists, and his character of them nearly corresponds with what is given in the text. "Dr. Owen, with his correct judgment, and an immense fund of learning. — Mr. Charnock, with his masculine style, and an inexhaustible vein of thought. — Dr. Goodwin, with sentiments eminently evangelical, and a most happy talent at opening, sifting, and displaying the hidden riches of Scripture. These I think are the *first* three: — Then comes Mr. Howe, nervous and majestic; with all the powers of imagery at his command. — Dr. Bates, fluent and polished; with a never-ceasing store of beautiful similitudes. — Mr. Flavel, fervent and affectionate; with a masterly hand at probing the conscience, and striking the passions. — Mr. Caryl, Dr. Manton, and Mr. Poole, with many others, whose works will speak for them ten thousand times better than the tongue of panegyric, or the pen of biography." — Theron and Aspasio, vol. iii. p. 206. Edit. 1767. The high opinion entertained of Baxter and Owen by the late Arthur Young, Esq. Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, is evident from the selections from their works which he published under the title of *Oweniana* and *Baxteriana*. That of Mr. Wilberforce is no less decided. Baxter he classes "among the brightest ornaments of the Church of England." Others, he says, were men of great erudition, deep views of religion, and unquestionable piety; among whom he mentions in particular Dr. Owen, Mr. Howe, and Mr. Flavel. The heavenly-mindedness of Owen and his work on the Mortification of Sin, he strongly recommends. — Wilberforce's *Practical View*, pp. 242, 243.

“They were the chiefs of the mighty men,” whom God raised up “to strengthen his kingdom for Him;” and they deserve to be held in everlasting remembrance. Should these imperfect Memoirs of him who occupied the first rank among them, induce any to examine his principles, to cultivate his dispositions, and to follow his steps, then I will not consider that I have spent my time in vain, in collecting the scanty and widely scattered fragments of the life, writings, and connexions of JOHN OWEN.

APPENDIX

CONSISTING OF

NOTES, ILLUSTRATIONS, LETTERS,
etc.

FAMILY OF OWEN — p. 8.

DR. CALAMY mentions that Mr. John Singleton, pastor of the Independent Church, which was originally formed by Philip Nye, and in which Mr. Neal was afterwards minister, was nephew to Dr Owen. It is therefore probable that Owen had more than one sister, though I can procure no account of Mr. Singleton's parents. It appears that he was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, during the period of his Uncle's residence in the University; and that he lost his student's place at the Restoration, After this, he went to Holland and studied medicine, which he occasionally practised. After his return, he lived with Lady Scot in Hertfordshire, and preached to some Dissenters in Hertford. He was also at Stretton, and Coventry, and finally removed to London, to an Old Independent Church, in which he was pastor from 1698 to 1706. He also kept an Academy at Hoxton and Islington. In the *Britannia Rediviva*, Oxon 1660, there is an English poem by him; and one sermon in the Continuation of the Morning Exercises, on the best way to prepare to meet God in the way of his judgments or mercies. — (Calamy's continuation, Vol. I. p. 105 — Wilson's Diss. Churches, Vol. III. pp. 89, 90.)

On a black stone Pavement of Remnam Church, where William Owen was minister (eldest brother to the Doctor), there is a Latin Inscription, perpetuating his name. It describes him as "Humilimus Evangelii Christi Minister." — It mentions that he died on the 16th of the 4th month, A. D. 1660, aged 48; and also that an infant son of William died the 10th day of the 7th month, 1654, aged 3 months. Below it are six Latin verses on the death of the child. — (Private information.)

THE SYNOD OF DORT, p. 32.

The Synod of Dort and its proceedings occupied a considerable portion of attention during the early part of the seventeenth century. The accounts which have been given of it are quite varied. While I entertain no doubt, in general, respecting the doctrinal sentiments which it maintained, I just as firmly believe that little good resulted from its conduct and decisions.

478

These were too influenced by party politics to have weight with opposers; and some of its proceedings and their consequences, were highly improper. Brandt, who gives the fullest account of the Synod, was a Remonstrant, and must therefore be read with caution. Heylin's violent anti-Calvinistic, and anti-Presbyterian prejudices, give a decided colouring to all his statements respecting it, both in his *Quinquarticular* history and his history of the Presbyterians. The best account, so far as it goes, is that furnished by Hales of Eaton, who was secretary to the English Ambassador then at the Hague. Even *his* letters by no means prepossess us in the Synod's favour. He thus introduces the last of them: — "Our Synod goes on like a watch, the main wheels upon which the whole business turns, are least in sight; for all things of moment, are acted in private sessions; what is done in public, is only for show and entertainment." (Hales' works, Vol. III. p. 148.) In the "*Acta Synodi Dordrechtii*," published by the Synod, and the "*Acta et Scripta Synodalia Remonstrantium*," all the documents on both sides will be found. But the former is a large folio, and the latter a thick quarto, which few have either time or inclination to consult. An abstract of the former was published in English in 1818, by the Rev. Thomas Scott; on which a very smart critique appeared in the *Eclectic Review*, for Dec. 1819; which well deserves the attention of the reader.

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY, — p. 72.

A DISPASSIONATE and impartial History of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, is yet a desideratum; and as Lord Hailes observes (Remarks on the History of Scotland, p. 236.) “would be a work curious and useful: it is probable, however, that we shall never see such a work; for the writer must be one who neither hates, nor contemns, nor admires that Assembly.” I do not know that there is so much ground for despondency on this subject as his Lordship expresses. The materials for such a work are very ample. Lord Hailes mentions a Journal of the Assembly, drawn up by Mr. George Gillespie, one of the Scotch Commissioners, among the Wodrow MSS. It begins 2d Feb. 1644, and proceeds to the 14th May, 1645. There is then a blank. It recommences 4th September 1645, and proceeds to 25th Oct. 1645. Baillie’s Journals and Letters contain much important and authentic information. The printed pamphlets of the period are exceedingly numerous, and many of them curious. The lives of the Members of the Assembly also throw light on its sentiments and proceedings. It is generally reported that the minutes of the Assembly are deposited in the Red Cross Street Library; but I suspect this is a mistake. Dr. Thomas Goodwin, one of the Dissenting brethren, is said to have left notes of its transactions in 14 or 15 volumes. — (Palmer’s Non-Con. Mem. vol. i. p. 239.) What has become of these volumes does not appear, unless they are contained in the MS. in the Red Cross Street Library, supposed to be the minutes of the Assembly. This MS. is in three thick volumes folio, which appear to have been bound uniformly, about the beginning of the last century.

479

On turning them over, they appeared to me to each contain four or five distinct series of notes; corresponding with the number of the volumes of Goodwin; nor did they seem to be written in the form of minutes. As my time was limited, and my object in visiting the Library of a different nature, I did not pursue the examination; but the Librarian, Mr. Morgan, promised to follow up my suggestion. It is worth inquiring whether the minutes of the Assembly are not in the Library of Sion College.

Very different accounts have been given of the Assembly. Baxter’s and Neal’s opinions of it are highly favourable; those of Clarendon and other high church writers, quite the opposite. Lord Hailes in the work already quoted, gives a curious extract from Gillespie’s MS. of the Assembly’s statement of its own sins, with a view to a solemn fast. “*The sins of the Assembly in nine points.* 1. Neglecting attendance in the Assembly, though the affairs are so important; late coming, 2. Absence from the prayers. 3. Reading and talking in time of debates. 4. Neglect of committees. 5. Some speak too much, others too little. 6. Indecent behaviour. 7. Unseemly language and heats upon it. 8. Neglect of trying ministers. 9. Members of Assembly drawing on parties, or being frightened with needless jealousies.” p. 239. Milton’s account of the Assembly is exceedingly severe, and evidently written under strong feelings of irritation, excited by the Assembly’s hostility to religious liberty. Milton’s *History of England*, quoted in Symmond’s Life of Milton, p. 401.

PAMPHLETS ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, — p. 100.

From the breaking out of the civil wars, till the Restoration of Charles II, the Press teemed with pamphlets discussing this interesting subject. Some of them attacked intolerance by scripture and serious argument; others of them attacked it by ridicule, and endeavoured to bring its supporters into contempt. A few of those which treat the subject seriously, I have noted in the text; one or two of the other description, I will introduce here, for the amusement of the reader. There is now before me, “A sacred Decretal, or hue and cry from his superlative holiness. Sir Simon Synod, for the apprehension of reverend Young Martin Mar Priest. In which are displayed many witty synodian conceits, both pleasant and commodious.” The centre of the title page is occupied by a Bull sitting in an arm chair writing, and tossing the figure of persecution upon his horns, into a fire burning at his back. At the bottom, it is said to be printed in “Europe, by Martin Claw Clergy,

printer to the Reverend Assembly of Divines for Bartholomew Bang Priest, and are to be sold at his shop in Toleration Street, at the sign of the subjects liberty, right opposite to Persecuting Court." It is a violent attack on the Westminster Assembly's hostility to toleration. Of the same nature is another production from the same quarter.

"The arraignment of Mr. Persecution, presented to the consideration of the House of Commons, and to all the common people of England. In which he is indicted, arraigned, convicted, and condemned of enmity against God, and all goodness, of treasons, rebellion, bloodshed, etc. and sent to the place of execution. In the prosecution of which, the Jesuitical designs, and secret encroachments of his defendants, Sir Simon Synod, and the John of all Sir Johns, Sir John Presbyter, upon the liberty of the subject are detected," etc.

480

The trial is managed with some ingenuity, and the pamphlet must have stung dreadfully at the time. "Certain additional reasons to those presented in a letter by the Ministers of London, to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, Jan. 1st, 1645; of like power and force, against the toleration of Independency." These additional reasons are all ironic; but some of them are as deserving of attention, as those which the London ministers had drawn up against tolerating the Independents. The letter of the London Ministers, opened the eyes of many to the designs of the Presbyterians, and produced a number of answers and replies. "Toleration justified, and Persecution condemned, in an Examination of the London Minister's Letter," is a sensible joco-serious pamphlet, which was replied to in "Anti-Toleration, by a well-wisher of peace and truth," 1646. It was followed by "Groans for Liberty, presented from the Presbyterian (formerly Non-conforming) brethren, reported the ablest and most learned among them, in some treatises called SMECTYMNUUS; now awakened and presented to themselves in the behalf of their now Non-conforming brethren, by John Saltmarsh." In this pamphlet, Saltmarsh extracts from Smectymnuus, the reasons formerly assigned why the prelates should tolerate Presbyterians, and shows that they equally prove that the Presbyterians should tolerate others. On the back of the title, it is said,

"If any are ignorant who this SMECTYMNUUS is,
 Stephen Marshal,
 Edmund Calamy,
 Thomas Young,
 Matthew Newcomen,
 William Spurstow, } can tell you."

Saltmarsh was perhaps wild enough in some of his doctrinal sentiments; but was quite sober on the subject of liberty of conscience, as this and some other of his productions on the same topic prove.

ADVOCATES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, — p. 106.

Among the friends and advocates of religious liberty, I ought to have introduced the name of William Penn, the Quaker; though he did not appear so early as those whom I have mentioned, both by his writings and his sufferings, he powerfully contributed to promote the glorious cause. While in Newgate in 1670m he published an admirable pamphlet entitled, "The great cause of liberty of conscience, once more briefly debated and defended, etc." in which — from reason, scripture, and antiquity — he defends unanswerably the immutable rights of conscience. The last sentence of his address "to the supreme authority of England" deserves to be quoted:

481

"But if this fair and equal offer [of a free conference] does not find a place with you on which to rest its foot much less that it should bring us back the olive branch of Toleration — we heartily embrace and bless the providence of God; and in his strength, resolve *by patience to out-weary* PERSECUTION', and by our

constant sufferings, seek to obtain a victory, more glorious than any our adversaries can achieve by all their cruelties. *Vincit qui patitur.*"¹

With the unbroken spirit of a Christian and an Englishman, he concludes the pamphlet by declaring —

“If, after all we have said, this short discourse should not be credited nor answered in any of its sober reasons and requests, but sufferings should be the present lot of our inheritance from this generation, let it be known to them all, THAT MEET WE MUST, and MEET we cannot but encourage all to do, (whatever hardships we sustain) in God’s name and authority, who is Lord of hosts, and King of kings; at the revelation of whose righteous judgment, and glorious tribunal, mortal men shall give an account of the deeds done in the body.”

His iniquitous trial at the Old Bailey, for assembling at the doors of the meeting-house in Gracious Street, produced a powerful sensation in the country. He published an account of this trial, and also that of Rudyard and Moor, while in Newgate. Acting on the principle which he avowed in the passages we quoted, he and his friends ultimately tired out the persecuting spirit of the government, and procured for themselves more ample privileges than any other class of Dissenters enjoyed. It ought to be mentioned, to the honour of Penn, that he established in that district of America which bears his name, and which he received in lieu of debts due by the crown, those liberal principles of civil and religious liberty for which he had so nobly contended and suffered in his native land.

ORIGIN OF TOLERATION AMONG INDEPENDENTS, — p. 109.

Long after I had written what appears in the text, on the origin of the tolerating principles held by Independents, I met with Laing’s Account of that Body, in his history of Scotland. His historical notices are, on the whole, not incorrect. But though his views of the principles of the sect are more liberal and enlightened than those of Hume and Smith, they participate in that irreligious spirit which pervades the writings of the two more distinguished philosophers. On its tolerating principles, he explains himself (to a certain extent) in the same manner that I have done. He mentions in a note, that “toleration is the incessant reproach, re-echoed by Baillie, Rutherford, Edwards, and every writer against the Independents. The Presbyterian, having once been persecuted, naturally became a persecuting religion upon its triumph; a general principle from which the Independents form a singular and honourable exception.” — (Vol i. p 273.) In the text he says,

“the most distinguished attribute, and in that age, the reproach of their sect, was religious toleration. Without assuming to themselves any temporal authority, they denied the right of the civil magistrate to interpose in the religious and speculative opinions of mankind.

482

Satisfied with the spiritual powers of admonition and excommunication — of which the one was more freely, and the other more sparing and temperately administered — they were the first Christians who adopted the principles of toleration in adversity, and maintained them during the prosperity of their sect. Their mind, says a philosophical historian, set afloat in the wide sea of inspiration, could confine itself within no certain limits. And the same variations in which an enthusiast indulged himself, he was apt (by a natural train of thinking) to permit in others. — (Hume). It is difficult to resist a solution so truly ingenious. But its authority is impaired by an obvious consideration: that amidst the revolutions and incessant fluctuations of religion, no system has yet inspired that extreme zeal, of which mild and tolerating principles are the natural result. A better reason is contained in the peculiar form of their ecclesiastical institution. They had searched their Scriptures for the earliest model of the primitive church. But from the loose texture and imperfect union of Independent congregations, persecution was impracticable. When expelled from one congregation, the offender might obtain easy access to another, or establish a separate church of his own. The civil authority could neither be appropriated, nor lent

¹ [He conquers, who suffers – Persius.](#)

occasionally, to these different churches. And when the necessity of toleration was once acknowledged, its benefits were soon recommended by an influx of proselytes from every persecuted or afflicted sect.” — (Vol. i. pp. 273, 274.)

After noting the sentiments of Smith, which we have quoted, he thus concludes;

“From the western shores of the Atlantic to the banks of the Ohio, the citizen chooses his own altar. The sect provides for its own pastor, and from Independent congregations — connected by no discipline nor cherished by the partial support of the state — a harmonious moderation is the universal result.” — (*Ibid.* p. 278.)

Without agreeing to every sentiment in the above extract, it is clear that, so far as Laing had the opportunity or the capacity of judging, his opinion — as to the origin of the doctrine of religious liberty — is not materially different from what we have contended for. I am fully satisfied that it is to be found in the peculiar constitution of the Independent Churches; but in a part of that constitution with which Laing was unacquainted. It arises, not from the looseness of their texture and the imperfection of their union — for these are neither so loose nor so imperfect as many suppose — but from the principles noted in the text, and the high importance which they attach to the right and exercise of PRIVATE JUDGMENT in all religious matters. The detached and separate nature of their ecclesiastical polity, however, must prevent their ever being objects of jealousy to any civil government, and from being formidable to one another, or to other religious professions. And, it is supposed, a part of its excellence consists in this.

I am aware that it may be said, the Independents, during the period of our history, were never so completely possessed of power, or so established in the country, as to be *able* to oppress others. To this, the answer is easy. Granting that is true, it is clear that, with the degree of power and influence which they possessed, they still continued to advocate the rights of conscience.

483

Besides, during the Commonwealth the Independents were as fully established as the nature of their system allows. They were protected in the profession and propagation of their sentiments, and all civil privileges and rights were enjoyed by them. More than this, they never sought; and anything beyond this would have been a departure from their fundamental principles, which would have been attended with evil; but that evil would not have attached to consistent Independency.

PREACHING OF THE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, — p. 116.

The preaching or exhorting of private persons, some of them in high circumstances, and others in low, was a very common thing in the time of the Commonwealth. Bulstrode Whitelocke, Keeper of the Great Seal of England, Ambassador to Christina, Queen of Sweden, and a man of high legal attainments, was not ashamed to exhort himself; and even when he had two chaplains on board, to hear “one of the ship’s company, and in his mariners’ habit, preach a very honest and good sermon, and much beyond what might be expected from him.” — (Journal of the Swedish Embassy, vol. ii. p. 133.) The conversation between the Queen of Sweden and him, on this subject, is very curious.

“*Queen.* — I have been told that many officers of your army pray and preach to their soldiers. Is that true?

Whitelocke. — Yes, Madam, it is very true. When their enemies are swearing, or debauching, or pillaging, the officers and soldiers of the Parliament’s army are encouraging and exhorting one another out of the Word of God, and praying together to the Lord of Hosts, for his blessing to be with them — who has shown His approval of this military preaching, by the successes he has given them.

Q. — That’s well. Do you use to do so too?

W. — Yes; on some occasions, in my own family; and I think it as proper for me, being the master of it, to admonish and speak to my people when there is cause, as to be beholden to another to do it for me, which sometimes brings the chaplain into more credit than his lord.

Q. — Do your generals and other great officers do so?

W. — Yes, Madam, very often, and very well. Nevertheless, they maintain chaplains and ministers in their houses and regiments; and those who are godly and worthy ministers, have as much respect, and as good provision in England, as in any place of Christendom. Yet, 'tis the opinion of many good men with us, that a long cassock, with a silk girdle and a great beard, do not make a learned or a good preacher — not without gifts of the Spirit of God, and labouring in his vineyard. And whoever studies the Holy Scriptures, and is enabled to do good to the souls of others, and endeavours the same, is nowhere forbidden by that word, nor is it blameable. The officers and soldiers of the Parliament's army held it not unlawful, when they carried their lives in their hands, and were going to risk them in the high places of the field, to encourage one another out of His word, Who commands over all. And this had more weight and impression with it, than any other word could have; and was never denied being made use of, except by the popish prelates who would, by no means, allow lay people (as they call them) to gather from there, that instruction and comfort which can be found nowhere else.

Q. — I think you preach very well, and have now made a good sermon. I assure you, I like it very well.

W. — Madam. I shall account it a great happiness if any of my words may please you." — (Ibid pp. 252, 253.)

484

The practice defended by Whitelocke must be considered a proof of the very general diffusion of religious knowledge during the Commonwealth. It cannot be doubted that it was frequently abused; but I have just as little doubt that it often produced good. The total incapacity, in general, of our ambassadors and their suites, and of our general officers and common soldiers, for such exercises — not to say their lack of love for what they imply — is, I fear, the chief reason why such things are now considered deserving of nothing but ridicule, as the fanatical employment of canting hypocrites.

THE EARLY STATE OF INDEPENDENCY IN IRELAND, p. 123.

I HAVE been able to glean only a few particulars respecting the first appearances of Independency in Ireland. Some of the Brownists are said to have reached Ireland, and to have left some disciples there. In 1650, Dr. Samuel Winter went over with four Parliamentary commissioners. He relinquished a living of £400 per annum in England, for an appointment of £100, that he might promote the interests of the Gospel in Ireland. He was made Provost of Trinity College, which he found almost desolate and forsaken. But under his care, it became a valuable seminary of piety and learning. He was pastor of an Independent church in Dublin at the same time. The Restoration drove him from the College, and from Ireland. — (Calamy, vol ii. pp. 544, 546.) Dr. Thomas Harrison went over with Henry Cromwell, and preached for several years in Christ Church, Dublin. He returned to England a short time before the Restoration; but afterwards he went back to Dublin, where he died, lamented by the whole city. Lord Thomond used to say of him, "that he would rather hear Dr. Harrison say grace over an egg. than hear the Bishops pray and preach." (Ibid. vol. ii. p 122.) Mr. Stephen Charnock went over at the same time with Dr. Harrison, and usually had persons of the greatest distinction for his hearers. He returned about 1660. — (Noncon. Mem vol i p. 208.)

Mr. Samuel Mather also went over about the same time, and became colleague to Dr Winter. He preached every Lord's day morning at the church of St Nicholas; and once in six weeks, before the Lord Deputy and his council. Though an Independent, even Wood acknowledges he was a man of much moderation, and civil to Episcopalians, even when he had the power of injuring them. When the Deputy gave a commission to him and others to displace the Episcopal clergy of the provinces of Munster and Dublin, he declined acting, alleging that he had come to Ireland to preach the

Gospel, not to hinder others from doing it. He had previously preached for two years in Leith. He died in Dublin in 1671 — (Ibid vol. ii pp. 355, 357.)

485

Hugh Peters went with the army of Cromwell to Ireland, but soon returned to England. I may be permitted to speak a little good of this man, who has been the subject of incessant reproach, and whose character has been loaded with every crime. He resided five years in Salem, in New England, during which the rapid improvement made in the place, is ascribed to him.

“The arts were introduced; a water-mill was erected; a glass-house; saltworks; the planting of hemp was encouraged, and a regular market was established. An almanac was introduced to direct their affairs. Commerce had unexampled glory. He formed the plan of the fishery; of the coasting voyages; of the foreign voyages, and among many other vessels, one of 300 tons was undertaken under his influence.” — (Holmes’ American Annals, vol. i. p 263.)

Such was his influence in Holland, where he had resided for some time, that he raised £30 000 in it for the relief of the suffering Protestants in Ireland. He was also a diligent and earnest solicitor for the distressed Protestants in the valleys of Piedmont — (Ludlow, vol iii. p. (61.) These things are not like the actions of a fool or a profligate.

“I travelled into Germany,” he says. “with that famous Scotsman, Mr. John Forbes, and for about six years, enjoyed in him much love and sweetness; and from whom I never had anything but encouragement, though we differed in the way of our churches. The learned Amesius [William Ames] breathed his last into my bosom, who left his professorship in Friezland to live with me at Rotterdam, because of my church’s independency. He was my colleague and chosen brother to the church, where I was an unworthy pastor.” — (Peter’s Last Report of the English wars, 1646.)

His Legacy to his daughter breathes the spirit of Christianity, and solemnly professes his innocence of the grievous charges which were heaped upon him. And his conduct on the scaffold fully supported the previous heroism of his character. But Peters was a soldier, as well as a preacher of Christianity; and for violating the principles of his Master’s kingdom, by this improper combination, he perhaps brought on himself the execution of his Master’s threatening: — “Those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword.” ^{Mat 26.52}

John Rogers was pastor of a church in Dublin, of which Colonel Hewson, the governor of Dublin, was a member. John Eyewater, and Thomas Huggins, preachers of the Word, joined this church in 1651. (Roger’s Tabernacle for the Sun, p. 302.) From the same book it appears that there was a Baptist church at Waterford, which addresses a letter to the saints in Dublin on that subject; it was signed by twelve persons. Mr. Thomas Patient was minister of this church. He was some time co-pastor of the Baptist church in London with Mr. Kiffin. He went over to Ireland with General Fleetwood, and usually preached in the Cathedral. He was very active in promoting the interests of the Baptists. Crosby thinks he was the founder of a Baptist church in Cloughkeating, which became very numerous. (Crosby’s Baptists, vol. iii. pp. 42, 43.) Mr. John Mureot moved from West Kerby to Ireland, and was very useful the short time he lived. He preached generally in Dublin, and for some time in Cork. There he assisted at a public dispute on the subject of Baptism, in which he and Dr. Worth were on one side, and Dr. Harding on the other. — (Murcot’s Life, prefixed to his works.)

486

There was a church in Youghall, in which Mr. Joseph Eyres laboured for some time; and afterwards moved to a church in Cork. — (Ibid.) Mr. Timothy Taylor, pastor of a church at Duckenfield in Cheshire, went to Ireland, and became pastor of a church in Carrickfergus. At the Restoration, he removed from the parochial edifice, and preached the Gospel in his own hired house to all who came to him. In 1668, he went to Dublin, and became colleague, first to Mr. Samuel Mather, and at his death, to his brother Nathaniel Mather, till his death. — (Athen. Oxon.

vol. ii. p 508.) In 1655, Claudius Gilbert, pastor of a Congregational church in Limerick, Edward Reynolds, Min., and J. Warren, Min. etc., unite with Dr. Winter in a letter to Mr. Baxter, as the associated Ministers of Christ in Ireland. — (Baxter's own Life, part i. p. 107.) Mr. Jenner also was pastor of a church in Tredagh. — (Ibid.) These few particulars may perhaps induce some, whose information is more extensive than mine, to pursue the subject, and communicate the results.

THE EARLY STATE OF INDEPENDENCY IN SCOTLAND, P 137.

In the year 1584, Robert Brown, from whom the first Independents derived their designation, came out of the low countries into Scotland with a number of his followers. Having taken up his residence in the Cannongate of Edinburgh, he began to disseminate his peculiar opinions, and to circulate writings, in which all the reformed churches were stigmatized as unscriptural and Antichristian societies. The Court took this rigid sectary under their protection, and encouraged him, for no other conceivable reason than his exclaiming against the ministers, and calling into question their authority. On his return to England, Brown published a book into which he introduced various invectives against the ministers and government of the Church of Scotland. — (Calderwood, quoted by M'Crie in his Life of Melville, vol. i. p.;326.) King James, in his Basilicon Doron, alleges that Brown, Penry, and other Englishmen had, when in Scotland, "sown their popple," and that "certain brain-sick, and heady preachers" had imbibed their spirit. Although, adds Dr. M'Crie, he could not help but know that these rigid sectaries were unanimously opposed by the Scotch ministers, and that the only countenance which they received was from himself and his courtiers — (Ibid. vol ii. p. 163.)

In 1591, Penry, who afterwards suffered in England, retired to Scotland for safety, and continued there till 1693. From there he addressed two letters to Queen Elizabeth, not couched in very courtly terms, and also the petition for which he was executed. — (Brook's Lives, vol. ii. p. 50. — Paget's Heresiography, pp 271-275.)

487

The next account we have of Independents in Scotland, brings us down to about the year 1642.

"About this time there came in quietly to Aberdeen, one called Othro Ferrendail, an Irishman and a skinner by trade, favoured by Mr. Andrew Cant, and by his means admitted freeman. He was trapped for preaching at night, in some houses of the town before their families, with closed doors, nocturnal doctrine or Brownism." — (Spalding's History of the Troubles in Scotland, vol. ii pp 45, 46.)

Ferrendail was perhaps a disciple of Ainsworth's who, according to Hornbeck, — (Sum. Con. P. 740.) visited Ireland. Mr. Cant was one of the ministers of Aberdeen, and more favourable to innovation than some of his brethren. In the provincial assembly at Aberdeen, 1642, there was "great business about Brownism lately crept into Aberdeen and other parts." Besides Ferrendail, William Maxwell, Thomas Pont, Gilbert Gordon of Tilliefroskie, his wife, children, and servants, and hail family, and John Ross, minister of Birse, were complained of. Mr. John Oswald also, one of the ministers of Aberdeen, was thought not to dislike it. — (Strachan, vol. ii p. 52.) Ferrendail was convinced to abjure and subscribe the covenant, and was "received as a good Bairn" — (Ibid. 64.) The Presbytery, however, were not satisfied with Ferrendail's repentance, and referred him to the General Assembly. — (Ibid 68.) "Maxwell, who was also accused of Brownism, was a silly wheel-wright by trade; this man was sought for, and all men forbidden from the pulpit to receive him, which was done by our minister, Mr. William Sirachan, on Sunday the 5th of February." — (Ibid. p. 70.) Gordon, of Tilliefroskie, was afterwards taken on the streets of Edinburgh, and put in prison for maintaining some points of Brownism. — (Ibid, p 102.)

The General Assembly of 1647, passed an Act prohibiting the importation of all books and pamphlets containing Independency and Anabaptism, and forbidding the reading of them; or harbouring any persons infected with such errors. Presbyteries and Synods are enjoined to process those who offend against these injunctions; and civil magistrates are recommended to aid

and assist ministers in everything to that effect. (Acts of Assemblies from 1638 to, 649, printed in Edin., 1682.) These were the blessed days of Presbyterian supremacy; and such was the use which they made of their power.

The English army entering Scotland soon after this, prevented the execution of this unjust law, and imported Independency in such a way that it could not be resisted. Many of the officers and soldiers of the army were preachers, and ambulatory churches existed among the troops, in which Independency was both preached and exhibited. Nicholas Lockyer, who accompanied the English army, published a small work on Independency: "A little Stone out of the Mountain, or Church order briefly opened, printed at Leith, 1652." It has an Epistle dedicatory, dated from Dalkeith, April 22, 1652, by Joseph Caryl, John Oxenbridge, and Cuthbert Sydenham. It was answered by James Wood, professor of Theology in St. Andrews — "A little Stone, pretended to be out of the Mountain, tried and found to be a Counterfeit," 4to. Edin. 1654.

488

From Wood's work, it appears that some "ministers and others in Aberdeen," had forsaken the church, and adopted the principles of Independency. In 1653, "A Confession of Faith of the Baptist Churches in London," was printed at Leith, the preface to which is dated "Leith, the tenth of the first month, vulgarly called March, and signed by Thomas Spenser, Alex Holmes, Thomas Powell, John Brady, in the name and by the appointment of the Church of Christ, usually meeting at Leith and Edinburgh."

In July, 1652, the English Commissioners presented to the General Assembly, "A Declaration in favour of Congregational Discipline, purity of Communion, and Toleration;" to which the Assembly replied rather indignantly — (Whitelocke, pp. 514, 515.) A number of the protesting ministers seem to have been somewhat favourable to Independency; among the chief of whom was Mr. Patrick Gillespie. An Independent was settled in Kilbride, and another by the name of Charters in Kirkintilloch. — (Sewel's History of the Quakers, p, 94)

In 1659, the Presbytery of Edinburgh, published "A Testimony and Warning against a recent Petition." Its object was to procure the "abolishing of all civil sanctions establishing the doctrine, discipline, and government of this Church," p 4. This Warning produced "Some sober Criticisms to vindicate the Truth, and undeceive the Simple," 1659. From this pamphlet it appears that several persons, for dissenting from the Church Courts, had been very cruelly and iniquitously used. Christian Blyth, a Baptist, Mrs. Adair, Gordon of Tilliefroskie, Mr. Tayes, and Mr. Flint, are referred to as "excommunicated, imprisoned, banished, hunted from place to place, to the loss of all they had, and the making of their very lives bitter," pp 11, 12. Col. Strachan also, and Lord Swinton, Mr. Dundas, Major Abernethy, and Captain Griffin, were treated in much the same way according to this account, for no other crime than that of being reckoned sectaries. It is a very excellent pamphlet, and probably written by some of the persons who had been ill used.

These facts embrace almost everything known to me respecting the first appearances of Independency in Scotland. With the return of the army to England, and the Restoration, all traces of it disappeared. And the people of Scotland were soon called to encounter more terrible calamities, from a quarter from which they expected nothing but happiness. I offer no commentary on the facts brought forward. Every enlightened Christian will form a decided opinion respecting both parties, and what would have been the probable consequences of the establishment of Presbyterian uniformity in England.

OWEN'S SUCCESSORS IN COGGESHALL — p. 134.

His immediate successor was Constantine Jessop, son of Mr. John Jessop, minister of Pembroke, educated at Oxford. He did not remain long at Coggeshall, but was removed first to Wimborn, in Dorsetshire, and then to Tyfield, in Essex, where he died in 1660. — (Brook's Lives of the Puritans, vol. iii. p. 375.)

He was succeeded by Mr. John Sams, who had been educated in New England. The Act of Uniformity ejected him from the parish living, but he gathered a separate church in it, of those who approved of his ministry, of which he died pastor about 1675. — (Non-con. Mem. vol. ii. p. 191.) He was succeeded by Mr. Robert Gouge, of Christ College, Cambridge. He had preached and taught a school for some time at Maiden, in Essex. From there he moved to Ipswich, where he was silenced. He laboured at Coggeshall till he was laid aside by the decay of his intellects, but it is uncertain in what year this took place. Mr. Thomas Browning, of Rowell, was a member of this church in his time, and was encouraged by him to enter into the ministry. Owen gave very important advice to him, which he appears to have followed himself. “Study things, acceptable words will follow” — (Ibid. vol. iii. p. 271.) Edward Bently was pastor of the church in 1721, and died on the 9th of June, 1740, in the 60th year of his age. I do not know what year he entered into office in Coggeshall, or whether there was anyone between Mr. Gouge and him. Mr. John Farmer, brother to the celebrated Hugh Farmer, was ordained pastor, March 28th, 1739. His mother was daughter of Mr. Hugh Owen, one of the ejected ministers; and it is probable that, as his brother did, he received his classical education from Dr. Charles Owen, of Warrington, and prosecuted his academic studies afterwards under Dr. Doddridge. In 1730, he was chosen assistant to Mr. Rawlin, at Fetter lane, and continued in that situation till he moved to Coggeshall. He published a volume of Sermons in 1756, which possess some merit, but are now little known. In consequence of a mental derangement, he was rendered incapable of any stated ministerial service, and retired to London several years before his death. He is said to have been a very excellent Greek scholar. — (Life of Hugh Farmer, and Wilson’s Hist. of Diss. Churches, vol. iii. p. 457.)

It is uncertain in what year, Mr. Henry Petto succeeded Mr. Farmer; but he died in 1776 or 1777. Mr. Mordecai Andrews was ordained about 1774, and died at Southampton, in September, 1799. Mr. J. Fielding went to Coggeshall in 1797. In his time, a very unpleasant difference took place between the church and him, in consequence of which some pamphlets were published; — the church books were lost, which has prevented me from obtaining more particular information about the state of the church during the last century; and Mr. Fielding was finally necessitated to retire. Mr. Algernon Wells from Hoxton academy, went to Coggeshall in 1818, and was ordained to the pastoral office on the 7th of April, 1819. The church and congregation are again in a prosperous and promising state.

STATE OF OXFORD DURING THE EARLY PART OF LAST CENTURY, p. 180.

The testimony of Gibbon respecting the state of Oxford, which I quoted in a note, may appear to some to be very strong, and therefore requires support. The following passage from Archdeacon Blackburn’s Confessional, is sufficient evidence of the little attention paid to religious instruction both in Oxford and Cambridge. “At the universities, the point for the first four years is to qualify themselves for their first degree, which they may take with the utmost honour and credit, *without ever having seen the inside of a Bible.*” (Confessional, p. 391.) Dr. Busby offered to found two Catechistical lectures, with an endowment of £100 per annum each, for instructing undergraduates in the rudiments of the Christian religion, provided they should all be obliged to attend. *But this condition, and of course the lectures, were rejected by both universities.* (Ibid. p. 392.) Dean Prideaux used to declare that, “young men frequently came to the university *without any knowledge or tincture of religion at all*; and having little opportunity to improve themselves in it *while undergraduates*, they are usually admitted to their first degree of B. A., with the same ignorance, as to all sacred learning, as when first admitted into the university. And many of them, as soon as they have taken that degree, offering themselves for orders, are too often admitted as teachers in the church, when they are *only fit to be Catechumens.*” — (Life of Prideaux, prefixed to his Connections, p. 37. edit. 1808.)

While quoting these testimonies respecting the low state of religion and religious instruction in Oxford, justice requires that I should give the evidence on the other side, known to me. I have an opposite testimony to allege, and that is from no mean authority — BISHOP WARBURTON. Speaking of the reception which the first part of the Divine Legation had experienced, he thus eulogises the Universities —

“But the candid regard his book met with in the two universities, is his supreme honour. A writer, neglected or condemned by them, struggles but vainly to save himself from oblivion; while one they approve, is sure to rise superior above envy. Here science and true religion first started from their long slumber of six barbarous ages, and in a Bacon and a Wickliffe, they gave the earliest check to overbearing ignorance and superstition. What these two priests began, a second Bacon and a Newton, a Mede and a Chillingworth, all fostered in the bosoms of these two universities, pursued and perfected. These are their ancient honours. And animated with their former successes over ignorance and superstition, we now see them turn their arms with *unimpaired vigour against vice and profaneness*. We see them oppose themselves to a torrent of impiety: and we justly regard them as the last supports in a corrupt declining age.” — (Pref. to vol. ii. Div. Leg. 1744.)

491

I will not pledge myself that Warburton does not write ironically in the above passage. — All who know his spirit must be aware how he would have written, had the universities *opposed* his book. Whether he thought he had gone too far, or the universities changed their conduct, I cannot tell. But he did not prefix the preface from which I have taken the excerpt, to the following editions. I hope the religious state of Oxford is better than it was. But still, no suitable or adequate provision is made by the university for the religious or theological instruction of its clerical pupils. And it is well understood that the community at large derives no benefit from the universities, that is at all commensurate with the immense funds of these establishments, and the dignified leisure afforded to their numerous inhabitants. DRONE-HALL, which was once proposed to be erected, I fear would still have more professors and fellows, and be more numerously attended, than any other. ¹

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD OPEN TO ALL DURING THE COMMONWEALTH, p. 187.

The liberal principles on which the University of Oxford was conducted during the Commonwealth, afford a contrast to the exclusive system which has ever since been pursued. It was no less striking than that which is furnished by the state of religion and learning. Then, men of all professions occupied its chairs, and enjoyed the benefit of its funds and instruction. Ever since, it has furnished places for the men of one party alone, many of whom subscribe articles without believing them, and take oaths which they never mean to regard. To say nothing of the iniquity which such a system necessarily generates, there is gross injustice in thus appropriating the public funds, and the benefit of education, which ought to be common to all. Knowing that Dissenters are necessarily excluded from the English universities, it is somewhat ludicrous to hear Churchmen boasting, as they often do, of their superior learning and capacity for defending religion.

“An extensive erudition in Pagan, as well as Christian antiquity,” says Bishop Horsley, “joined with a critical understanding of the sacred text, is that which has so long enabled the clergy of the Church of England to take the lead among Protestants, as the apologists of the apostolic faith and discipline; and to baffle the united strength of their adversaries of all denominations.” — (Controversial Tracts, p. 78.)

To say nothing of the modesty of this declaration (modesty was not a virtue for which Bishop Horsley was distinguished), nor of the truth of it (which I by no means admit) — even if it were as the Bishop would have it — no great thanks are due to the clergy, when it is considered how amply

¹ In 1715, Dean Prideaux, sarcastically proposed that Fellows of twenty years' standing, who had not yet qualified for public service, be assigned to a charity house named “Drone Hall,” paid for by the universities that put out such worthless fellows and students. — *Oxford in the 18th Century*, A.D. Godley, 1908.

they are remunerated for their defences of religion. These defences come almost entirely from the dignified clergy, who may be said to do nothing else, as they do not belong to what Horsley calls “the labouring class of the priesthood.”

492

To afford the *otium cum dignitate*¹ to the few of them who can write, Paley admits that “leisure and opportunity must be afforded to great numbers.” I believe I speak moderately in asserting, therefore, that every defence of religion which comes from this quarter, costs the country some *hundred thousand pounds*. Whether they are usually worth this, I do not pronounce. It must be left to *others than Bishops*, to determine whether defences of Christianity and of Christian doctrine, that have been just as serviceable to the cause of truth and godliness, have not been produced by those whose education costs the country nothing, and their leisure as little. The man who could maintain and defend it after being contradicted — “That a genuine Calvinist is hardly to be found among Dissenters at present,” (Controversial Tracts, p. 448.) — is really not capable of forming a judgment, or pronouncing an opinion, on anything not belonging to his own party.

RACOVIAN CATECHISM, — p. 214.

The first edition of the Racovian Catechism was published in 1605 in the Polish language. A Latin version of this, by Moscorovius, appeared at Racow in 1609. This work was reprinted in London, in 18mo with the imprint of Racovia in 1651, with the life of Socinus, by Przipcovius, appended to it. In the following year, this book attracted the notice of Parliament which, on the 2d of April, 1652, passed a resolution requiring the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex to seize all the copies of the Catechism, and cause them to be burnt at the London exchange, and the palace-yard, Westminster, on the 6th and 8th of the same month — which was accordingly executed. An English translation of this work lies before me, which Dr. Toulmin, in his life of Socinus, p. 260, conjectures to have been made by Biddle.

“The Racovian Catechism, in which you have the substance of the confession of those churches which, in the kingdom of Poland, and the great dukedom of Lithuania, and other provinces appertaining to that kingdom, affirm that no other, save the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is that one God of Israel; and that the man Jesus of Nazareth, who was born of the Virgin, and no other besides or before him, is the only begotten Son of God. Printed at Amsterdam for Brooer Janzz. 1652.”

It is a small 18mo. of 176 pages. Prefixed to it is an anonymous address ‘to the Christian reader.’ But a much better translation has recently been laid before the public — “The Racovian Catechism, with notes and illustrations, translated from the Latin: to which is prefixed, a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism in Poland, and the adjacent countries. By Thomas Rees, F. S. A. Lond. 1818.” The historical introduction to this work is valuable, and reveals much research into the ecclesiastical history of Poland and Transylvania, and the early progress of Socinianism on the Continent. The Catechism and notes afford important Evidence of the gradually increasing deterioration of Unitarianism.

493

The first leaders of the party held many sentiments which the modern Socinians universally discard — such as *the existence of the Devil*. “Most modern Unitarians,” says Mr. Rees “have abandoned this belief, as a vulgar error, involving the most palpable inconsistencies, and wholly irreconcilable with the fundamental truths of natural and revealed religion.” Note p. 7. — *The pre-existence and superiority of Christ to men*. “This doctrine, however,” says Mr. Rees, “though formerly held by Dr. Lardner and some other eminent Unitarians, seems now to be rejected by all the public advocates of this system, as unsupported by adequate Scriptural authority.” p. 54. — *The worship of Christ* was strenuously contended for by Socinus himself, the Polish Socinians,

¹ *otium cum dignitate*: leisure with dignity.

and the old English Socinians. “The Unitarians in the present day, in this country,” Mr. Rees informs us, “universally concur in rejecting this system of subordinate worship altogether.” p. 198. Other things might also be noticed; but these may suffice to show the progressive march of Socinianism to infidelity. Indeed, I am at a loss to discover what it is of importance, that distinguishes them from a sect of moderate Deists; — unless it is their inconsistency and dishonesty in professing to believe the Bible to be a revelation from God, and rejecting its peculiar doctrines, and mangling its contents. I have been indebted for the particulars at the beginning of this note, to Mr. Rees’ introduction, along with Walchii Bib. Theol. tom. i. pp. 535-545, where many more facts will be found if the reader is inclined to follow out this subject. It is worthy of notice, that none of the modern Socinians seem to know anything of Owen’s *Vindiciae*. Toulmin, in his life of Biddle, pp. 111, 112, refers to it in such a way as to imply that he had never seen it. He says, “Neal has called it a learned and elaborate treatise.” Lindsay, in his “historical View of the state of Unitarian doctrine, from the Reformation to our own time,” though he eulogises Biddle, seems to be ignorant that he ever met with any answer, except burning his books, and imprisoning their author. Do these rational men read only on one side, or do they conceal what they know has been written on the other? The account given by Dr. Stock of his reading, *while a Socinian*, would incline us to think that the former is the case, at least on the part of bred or educated Socinians — (See his Letter to Mr. Rowe, New Evangelical Mag. 1817, p. 275.)

ON THE USE OF THE TERM INDEPENDENT, p. 229.

The unsuitableness, and indefinite nature of the designation *Independent*, as well as the fact that it was given as a term of reproach, are well stated in the following passages:

“Nor is Independency a fit name of the way of our churches. For in some respects, it is too strait, and in others, too large. It is too strait in that it confines us within ourselves, and presents us as independent from all others. Whereas, indeed, we profess dependence upon magistrates for civil government and protection; dependence upon Christ and his Word for the sovereign government and rule of our administrations;

494

dependence upon the counsel of other churches and synods, when our own variance or ignorance may stand in need of such help from them. And therefore, this title of *Independency* straitens us, and restrains us from our necessary duty and due liberty. Again, in other respects, *Independency* stretches itself too largely and more generally, than it can single us out. For it is compatible to a national church, as well as to a congregational. The national church of Scotland is independent from the government of the national church of England, and so is England independent from Scotland. Nor is there any sect at this day extant, but shrouds itself under the title of *Independency*. The Anti-pedobaptists, Antinomians, Familists,¹ yes, and the Seekers, too, all style themselves *Independents*. Indeed, even the Pope himself, who exalts himself above all civil and church power, even he also arrogates the title of *Independency*: — “*Prima sedes a nemine judicature*”² — The see of Rome is independent. Why then should *Independency* be appropriated to us, as a character of our way, which neither truly describes us, nor faithfully distinguishes us from many others? Therefore, if there must be some note of difference to decipher our state, and to distinguish our way from a national church way, I know none fitter than to denominate theirs *classical*, and ours *congregational*.” — (Cotton’s *Way of the Congregational Churches clarified*, p. 11.)

In reply to the abuse of William Prynne, Burton, his fellow-sufferer, says: —

“First, you quarrel with the title of *Independency*. Truly, brother, none of all those whom you thus entitle, at all glory in this name, so as to give you thanks for your so often styling them thus in one poor sheet of

¹ “The Family of Love” — an Antinomian/Perfectionist sect founded in Holland about 1540 by Hendrik Niclaes. They spread to England about 1580. They taught that true believers live in a natural state of Grace without Sin. Precursor to the Quakers.

² This is the first Canon in the Roman Catholic *De Fore Competente*. [Canon 1556]. “The First Seat [the Pope] has no final judge [he is not to be judged or commanded by any other human authority].”

paper: seeing they cannot imagine you do it *honoris gratia*, while everywhere you set it as a brand. Notwithstanding, we are not so ashamed of it as utterly to disclaim it; and that is for two reasons: first, for distinction's sake between us, and that which you call your *presbyterial government*. The second is, because this word *Independent*, is to signify that we hold all particular churches of Christ to be of equal authority, and none to have or exercise jurisdiction over another; but that each church is under Christ's government, as the sole Head, King, Lord, and Lawgiver of it. You mightily mistake the matter, when you interpret *Independency* as not needing both the *communion* and *assistance* of other persons, nations, or churches." — (Burton's Vindication of the Churches called Independent, p. 42.)

It is not worthwhile contending about a name; but it is necessary to explain its only correct application, in order to point out the misunderstanding which it has occasioned, and the misrepresentation which has been founded on that misunderstanding. Those who wish to ascertain the sentiments of the existing Independents on the subject of the union of Churches, will find them admirably stated and defended, in "The Scriptural Unity of the Churches of Christ illustrated and recommended — A Sermon, preached on occasion of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Congregational Union for Scotland: By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D." I beg leave to recommend that Sermon, with its valuable notes, to the candid perusal of both Presbyterians and Independents.

495

PRAYERS OF CROMWELL'S CHAPLAINS, — p. 250.

Those who make themselves merry with the prayers of Cromwell's ministers, and of other persons of that description during this period, are perhaps not sufficiently aware that the use of an uncouth and unseemly phraseology in addresses to God, was the vice of the *period*, not of the *men*. It was common to others, as well as to those who are stigmatized as the sectaries of the time. It is indeed impossible to produce the prayers of Churchmen, as their book allow neither for improvement nor deterioration from the changes of human society. But if we may judge what would have been their prayers from their sermons, it is not difficult to perceive that even the best of them did not rank high above the preachers of the Commonwealth. I am far from thinking that their prayers prove that their minds were as low and vulgar as the language which they employed would seem to indicate. They were men accustomed to pray much — in itself this gendered a kind of familiar habit. And as they were not surrounded by sentimental religionists, or fashionable clergymen, but by persons of their own spirit and sentiments, they expressed themselves without reserve.

High devotional ardour cannot always be restrained to measured phrases; but those who can make every allowance for poetic licence, and scientific enthusiasm, have no charity for any excess of feeling in which religion is concerned. The following expressions in Luther's prayers for Melancthon, when he was thought dying, are similar to the confidence and familiarity which were used respecting the dying Protector.

"We implore you, O Lord our God; we cast all our burden on you, and *will cry till You hear us*, pleading all the promises which can be found in the Holy Scripture respecting your hearing prayer, so that *You must indeed hear us*, to preserve at all future periods our entire confidence in your own promises.' After this, he seized hold of Melancthon's hand and, well knowing the extreme anxiety of his mind, and the troubled state of his conscience, said 'be of good courage, Philip, *you shall not die*.'" (Cox's Life of Melancthon, p. 406.)

Those who wish to see the language which even dignitaries of the Church used about the time of the Commonwealth, will find some specimens in Robinson's translation of Claude's Essay; and if the prayers of a lay fanatic may be referred to, the reader will find in Milton's prose works specimens of addresses to God, to which there is nothing superior — I was about to say, nothing equal in the English Liturgy. In the following passage of one of them, he seems to hint at the future production of his immortal poem:

“And he that now for haste snatches up a plain ungarnished present, as a thank-offering to You, which could not be deferred in regard of your so many recent deliverances, *may then perhaps take up a harp and sing You an elaborate song to generations.*”

496

In that day it shall no more be said, as in scorn, this or that was never held so till this present age, when men have better learned that the times and seasons pass along under your feet, to go and come at your bidding; and as You dignified our Fathers’ days with many revelations above all the foregoing ages since You took the flesh; so You can grant to us, though unworthy, as large a portion of your Spirit as You please: for who shall prejudice your all-governing will? seeing the power of your grace has not passed away with the primitive times, as fond and faithless men imagine; but your kingdom is now at hand, and You standing at the door. Come forth out of your Royal Chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth, put on the visible robes of your imperial majesty, take up that unlimited sceptre which your Almighty Father has bequeathed You; for now the voice of your Bride calls you, and all creatures sigh to be renewed!” — Milton’s Prose Works, Edit. 1697, pp. 312, 313. ¹

THE ALLEGED SCHISMATIC NATURE OF INDEPENDENCY, p. 265.

On no one point have Independents been more furiously assailed than on the schismatical, or separating nature of the constitution of their churches. On this subject, the following passage deserves attention. It is from a work of Lord Brooke, one of the early supporters of this body— a great sufferer for his principles, and a member of the Westminster Assembly. It shows, what has been glanced at on page 229, that the dispute between Independents and others on this point, chiefly respects the *ultimate* appeal. If that is not in each congregation, it is yet to be explained why it should stop short of a general council.

“The other grand heresy, which men so much cry against in separation, is the *Independency* of their congregations. But why should the Independence of one Assembly on a province or nation, be more schismatic than that of a province or nation on the whole world? Why may *Geneva* not be as independent on France, as France may be on the other parts of *Europe*? In Geneva, why may one congregation not be as independent on all Geneva, as Geneva is on all France beside? Does such a wall, or river, or sea, so limit and bound the church within it, that it may be independent on any church without it; and may not the congregation within this river be as well independent on all other Assemblies within the same river or sea? Once we give way to the *dependence* of churches, must not the Church of England depend on the *Dutch* church; or the *Dutch* on England — as much as one church depends on a provincial church of *Canterbury*, or the *national* church of all England? And if the English Church must depend on the Dutch, or the Dutch on the English, which will be inferior? This, or that? By this dispute of precedence, we shall at length cast all churches into such a confusion, as some of our Bishops’ sees were up to now. *Pompeius non admittit superiorem, Caesar non parem.*² And if Geneva depends on France, then why not France on Spain? Spain on Italy? Italy on Rome? Rome on the Pope? And had I begun a great deal lower, I should have come up higher, to *this* Head.” A Discourse on the nature of Episcopacy, by Robert, Lord Brooke, pp. 104, 108.

497

THE EARLY INDEPENDENTS OBSERVED THE LORD’S SUPPER WEEKLY, p. 308.

Owen’s answer to the question, “How often is the Lord’s Supper to be administered?” clearly ascertains his sentiments on this subject. What his practice was, is not so easily determined. That the Lord’s Supper was observed very frequently in his church (often within *a fortnight*), is evident from the dates prefixed to his printed addresses on those occasions, which are noted on page 502 of this volume. That the early Independent Churches observed the Lord’s Supper every first day of the week, seems to me undoubted. The following account is given of the public worship of the

¹ Though it is Milton, and “poetic,” it is *prose* and not *rhyme*; so I modernized his *thee*’s and *thou*’s. I did the same with Luther’s prayer above, since he said it in German, and not in middle-English. — WHG

² “Pompey does not admit a superior; Caesar has no equal.”

church in Deadman's Place, London. They were visited on a Lord's Day morning by several Peers for the purpose of observing their practice.

"The people went on in their *usual method*, having two sermons; in both of which they treated those principles for which they had been accused, grounding their discourses on the words of our Saviour, 'All power is given to me in heaven and in earth,' Mat. 28.18. After this, *they received the Lord's Supper*, and then made a collection for the *poor*, to which the Lords contributed liberally with them; and at their departure, they signified their satisfaction in what they had heard and seen, and their inclination to come again." — (Crosby's Hist, of the Baptists, vol. i. p. 163.)

With this statement, the account which Messrs. Goodwin, Nye, Simpson, Burroughes, and Bridge, give of their stated public practice, is in full accordance.

"Now, for the way and practice of our churches, we give this brief and general account. Our *public worship* was made up of no other parts than the worship of all other reformed churches consists of: such as public and solemn prayer for kings, and all in authority, etc.; the reading the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; exposition of them, as there was occasion, and constant preaching-of the word; the administration of the two sacraments, baptism to infants, and the Lord's Supper; singing of psalms; a collection for the poor, etc., *every Lord's day*." — (Apologetical Narration, etc. p. 8.)

Baillie charges the Brownists with teaching, "that the Lord's Supper should be celebrated every Lord's day;" and quotes Johnson's plea as his authority — (Dissuasive, pp. 29, 47.) Speaking of the Independents afterwards, he says,

"For the manner of their celebration, those who have seen it profess it to be in a very dead and comfortless way. It is not as in New England, once a month, but as at Amsterdam, *once every Lord's day* — which makes the action much less solemn than in any other of the reformed churches; and in this, it is too much like the daily masses of the Church of Rome." (Ibid. p. 121.)

In the replies made to Baillie, I have not observed that this statement is ever contradicted. I therefore suppose that it was generally admitted. I am unable to say when the practice of observing it monthly came to be adopted — nor am I at present inquiring *which* is the scriptural practice. My business is merely to ascertain a fact, which proves nothing on either side.

498

PERSECUTIONS IN NEW ENGLAND, — p. 336.

"It was with the utmost complacency that men, passionately attached to their own notions, and who had long been restrained from avowing them, employed themselves in framing the model of a pure church. But in the first moment that they began to taste Christian liberty themselves, they forgot that other men had an equal title to enjoy it. Some of their number, retaining a high veneration for the ritual of the English Church, were so offended at the total abolition of it, that they withdrew from communion with the newly instituted church, and assembled separately for the public worship of God. With an inconsistency of which there are such flagrant instances among Christians of every denomination, it cannot be imputed as a reproach to any particular sect, that the very men who had fled from persecution, became persecutors. And in order to enforce their own opinions, they made recourse to the same unhallowed weapons against the employment of which they had recently remonstrated with such violence. Endicott¹ summoned the two chief malcontents before him; and though they were men of note, and among the number of the original patentees, he expelled them from the society, and sent them home in the ships which were returning to England." — (Robertson's *America*, Book x.)

Such is the account which the learned historian of America gives of the conduct of the New England Congregationalists. In several particulars, it is far from correct and unsupported by the authorities to which he refers. It was not "in the first moment" of their tasting Christian liberty that they began to persecute others; but many years after the first settlement was formed. The

¹ John Endecott (1588-1665) — one of the founding Fathers of New England; the longest-serving Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which became the State of Massachusetts.

emigration of the Brownists was in 1620. The transaction referred to by Dr. Robertson took place in 1630. It was not by the first settlers that these things were done, but by those who followed, and who were chiefly under the direction of Governor Endicott who, though a worthy man, was “of a hot temper, and not possessed of the greatest prudence.” — (Hutchinson’s *Massachusetts*, vol. i. p. 17; Gordon’s *America*, vol. i. p. 26.) Robertson omits that the two Gentlemen had come from England with the strongest prejudices against the New England Separatists; that they not only set up a church of their own, but brought “railing accusations against the ministers.” And for “endeavouring to raise a mutiny among the people,” they were sent back to England by Governor Endicott, to prevent the injury of the colony in its infant state (Neal, vol. i. p. 129, 150) When it is further stated that Endicott himself, when he left England, was inclined to Episcopacy, and approved of civil establishments of Christianity; that it was only after he arrived in America, that he professed to fall in with Independency; and that this occurred the year after his arrival, it will not appear very fair to make Independents accountable for all his conduct. — (Morton’s *New England’s Mem.* p. 73, 77. — Gordon, vol. i. p. 25.)

499

We need not wonder at the colonists being afraid of the propagation of High Church principles. They had suffered much from them at home. And as they considered them part of a system of political as well as ecclesiastical despotism, they were afraid lest the Court of England afford its support to the efforts of such men, to crush the liberties for which they had relinquished their native land. The subsequent religious oppressions may all be traced to one law, which was passed the second General Court after Endicott’s arrival: that, “for the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, except those who are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same.” — (Gordon vol. i. 30.) This law was quite inconsistent with the great principles of the original Colonists, and it was calculated to involve them in terrible evils. But as it does not belong to Dissenters, but to the system from which they dissent, the evils resulting from it ought to be charged to that system. Making some allowance on the score of ignorance and early misconduct, it cannot be doubted that America owes everything she now enjoys of civil and religious liberty, to the principles of the Congregationalists. The strength and excellence of their grand principles survived every danger, and surmounted every difficulty. They planted the germ of freedom, which gradually arrived at maturity, and is now covered with foliage and with fruit. *Esto perpetua.* [*May it be eternal.*]

OWEN’S SUCCESSORS IN BURY STREET, — p. 397.

The Doctor’s immediate successor was his colleague, Mr. Clarkson, who died in 1687. Isaac Loeffs, who had been colleague for some time with Mr. Clarkson, succeeded him as sole pastor, and died in 1689. We have already given some account of both these excellent men. The next pastor was Isaac Chauncey, eldest son of the venerable President of Harvard College, in New England. In his time, the Church fell off exceedingly, owing to his lack of popularity as a preacher, and his often preaching on the subject of Church Order. He resigned his office in the Church in 1701, and was soon after appointed Tutor of the Independent Academy. This still exists at Homerton, and it has numbered among its Tutors and Pupils, some of the most learned of the English Dissenters. Dr. Chauncey remained in this situation till his death. He edited some of Owen’s posthumous writings, and published several things of his own.

His successor was Dr. Isaac Watts, whose history requires no illustration, and whose name needs no eulogy from me. Mr. Edward Terry had been assistant for a time to Dr. Chauncey. Before Dr. Watts had been in the ministry long, he was attacked by a painful and lingering illness, which rendered assistance absolutely necessary. Mr. Samuel Price was therefore chosen to this office; and acted as assistant and co-pastor for more than forty years. Dr. Watts died in 1748, and Mr. Price in 1756. It is praise enough to say that he was worthy of being united in office with Watts.

During the latter years of his life, Mr. Price was assisted by Meredith Townshend; and he was succeeded by Samuel Morton Savage, D.D., a man of learning and high respectability, but not very successful as a preacher. For many years, he was Tutor of the Academy formerly at Hoxton, and now removed to Wymondley. He preached only in the mornings at Bury Street, and was assisted in the afternoons, first by Mr. Thomas Porter, and afterwards by Mr. Josiah Thompson. The Congregation in 1782 was reduced to a very low state, when it invited Mr. Beck, the present Minister to succeed Dr. Savage. There is a good endowment belonging to the Church; but it still continues low, notwithstanding the attempts which have been made to revive it. — (Wilson's Hist, of the Diss. Churches, vol. i. pp. 251, 328.) In referring to this work, I beg here to acknowledge my occasional obligations to it. While I bear testimony to the intricate and interesting information which it contains, I cannot help expressing my astonishment at the little support it has received from the body on whose history it has bestowed so much labour. And my hope that the respectable author will yet be encouraged to lay the fifth volume before the public, which I understand has long since been fully prepared.

POSTHUMOUS WRITINGS, — p. 443.

About the time of the Doctor's death, a small manuscript was handed around, containing twelve arguments against conformity to worship that is not of Divine institution. The leading object of these arguments is to point out the unlawfulness of those who had separated from the Church of England, [subsequently] uniting in its public services — as those services are of a very different nature from the worship which Christ has appointed. This MS. occasioned a very violent discussion. It was sent to Baxter as that which had satisfied many about the impropriety of joining in the Liturgy. "I hastily answered them," he says, "but found after, that it would have been most prudent to have omitted his name; for on that account, a swarm of revilers in the city, poured out their keenest censures, and three or four wrote against me, whom I answered." It is no wonder that Owen's friends were displeased, as he was scarcely in his grave when this attempt was made by Baxter, to convict him of no less than forty-two errors in the space of ten pages! It reminds us of the controversy between Erasmus and Natalis Bedda. The latter extracted from the writings of Erasmus, two hundred erroneous propositions. Erasmus revenged himself in the same way, by calculating that Bedda had been guilty of a hundred and eighty-one lies, three hundred and ten calumnies, and forty-seven blasphemies! — (Jortin's Erasmus, vol. ii. 245.) Owen's Twelve Arguments are printed in the octavo edition of his Sermons, published in 1720. Baxter's Reply is in his "Defence of Catholic Communion." The occasional conformity controversy gave a great deal of trouble to the Dissenters, both then and afterwards, to which Baxter's conduct and writings very largely contributed. Owen's Tract is one of the best things on the other side.

"A Treatise on the Dominion of Sin and Grace, 1688." This small work was published by the Doctor's widow, and edited by Mr. Chauncey, who assures us it was left by the author in a state of preparation for the press. It is the substance of a few sermons from Rom. 6.14. He endeavours to ascertain in whom the reign of sin exists, how the law supports it, and how grace delivers from it, by setting up its dominion in the heart. It reveals the same experiential acquaintance with the state of nature and of grace, which appears in the other productions of the author, on similar subjects. There is nothing of barren speculation in it; rather, the most accurate knowledge of the theory of Christianity, combined with its application to the heart and conduct. It is well-fitted to promote that practical godliness which is the grand end of the dispensation of mercy.

In speaking of this work, I must take the opportunity to note another of a similar nature, which (by an oversight) is not introduced in its proper place. — "Of Temptation; the nature and power of it; the danger of entering into it, and the means of preventing that danger," etc. 12mo. This work

should have been introduced under the busy year 1658. It is so remarkably similar to the works on Indwelling sin, and the Mortification of sin, that the remarks made on them are equally applicable to this. It is the substance of some sermons on Mat. 26.41. — “Watch and pray that you do not enter into temptation.” Like all his experiential writings, it seems to have been called forth by his observation of the state of the times. He refers in his preface, to the awful providences of which the country still continued to be the subject; the spirit of error which had spread so widely; the divisions and contentions which so extensively prevailed; the temptations which had overthrown the faith of many, and the general backsliding from early zeal and holiness which had taken place. The treatise, however, has nothing local or temporary in its composition; but must continue to be suitable and useful so long as temptations continue, and Christians are exposed to danger from them.

In 1693 appeared the last part of his work on the Spirit: “Two discourses concerning the Holy Spirit, and his work. The one, of the Spirit as a comforter; the other, as he is the author of spiritual gifts.” There is a preface to it by Nathaniel Mather, the son of Richard Mather, President of Harvard College, Pastor of the Independent Church in Lime Street.

“As God gave Dr. Owen transcendent abilities,” he says, “so he also gave him a boundless enlargement of heart, and an insatiable desire to do service to Christ and his church, insomuch as he was thereby carried on through great bodily weakness, languishing, and pains, besides many other trials and discouragements, to bring out of his treasury, like a scribe well-instructed in the kingdom of heaven, many useful and excellent fruits of his studies, much beyond the expectation and hope of those who saw how often and how long he was near the grave.”

“The Gospel Grounds and Evidences of the Faith of God’s Elect,” was published in 1695. The preface is written by Isaac Chauncey. The leading object of the treatise is to inquire into the nature of saving faith; and into the evidence which a Christian ought to have that his belief is genuine or sincere.

502

Had the Tract been entitled “Evidences of genuine religion,” or something similar, the subject of it would have been more accurately defined — for what it contains is no more connected with faith, than with other Christian principles. It furnishes some valuable illustration of that state of mind and conduct which every Christian who desires to make his calling and election sure, ought to cultivate.

In 1721, a folio volume appeared entitled, “A complete Collection of the Sermons of the Rev. and Learned John Owen, D.D., formerly published: with an addition of many others never before printed. Also, several valuable Tracts, now first published from MS., and some others which were very scarce.” There is prefixed to it, *Memoirs of the Doctor*, drawn up by Mr. Asty, pastor of the Church in Rope-Maker’s Alley, assisted by Sir John Hartopp, to whom the volume is dedicated. There is also a preface written by John Nesbitt, Matthew Clarke, Thomas Ridgley, D.D., and Thomas Bradbury, Independent ministers in London, and all men of note in their day. I have often referred to this volume, in the body of this work. It is sometimes quoted under the title of *fol. Works*, and at other times, *Sermons and Tracts*. Besides those things which we noted in the order in which they appeared, it contains a Funeral Sermon for the Doctor, by Mr. Clarkson, which is remarkably barren of information about its object. There are twenty-nine Sermons never before published; also fourteen short Discourses resolving various cases of conscience, delivered at Church meetings between 1672 and 1680. A Tract about Marrying after Divorce on account of Adultery, the lawfulness of which he maintains. Another about Infant Baptism and Dipping, in which he argues in support of the former, and in opposition to the latter. The rest of the Tracts have been noted already.

In 1756, “Thirteen Sermons, preached on various occasions, by John Owen, D.D.” were published by Mrs. Cooke, of Stoke-Newington, grand-daughter to Sir John Hartopp. Several of them were

preached at ordinations, and a few of them at Stadham in Oxfordshire. They were all preached between 1669 and 1682; and they appear to have been taken down in short-hand, by Sir John Hartopp, from whose papers they were selected.

In 1760, "Twenty-five Discourses, suitable to the Lord's Supper, delivered by Dr. Owen, just before the administration of that sacred ordinance," were published by Richard Winter, minister of the Church in New Court, Carey Street. They were furnished from the same source with the former volume, and are dedicated to Mrs. Cooke. They too were delivered between 1669 and 1682. From the dates, which are regularly prefixed to them, it appears that the Lord's Supper was very frequently observed in the Doctor's Church, often at the interval of a fortnight. For instance. Discourse iv. was delivered Dec. 24, 1669, — Discourse v. Jan. 7, 1670. What the Doctor's belief was respecting the frequency of observing the Lord's Supper, appears from his Catechism, as quoted, page 308. The Independent Churches in England, at the beginning, observed the Lord's Supper every first day of the week. I am unable to say when their present practice came to be generally adopted.

503

Anthony Wood ascribes some other works to Owen, which he acknowledges he had not seen; and which I am satisfied were either not his, or were other things of Owens whose titles were mistaken by Wood.

1. "A Thanksgiving Sermon, before Parliament the 25th of August, 1653." This was a day of thanksgiving for a victory over the Dutch. Whitelocke mentions it, but takes no notice of the preachers. Owen might be one of them, but I suspect the sermon as not published.

2. "A Sermon on 1John 1.3, 1658. This, I suppose, is the Doctors work on Communion which was published about this time, and is founded on the above passage.

3. "A pamphlet called *Mene Tekel*." Wood refers to the Oxford Decree as attributing this work to Owen. That Decree, indeed, refers to Mene Tekel; but it does not speak of Owen as its author. The full title of the pamphlet, which I have examined, is "Mene Tekel; or the Downfall of Tyranny. A treatise in which liberty and equity are vindicated, and tyranny condemned by the law of God and right reason: and the people's power and duty to execute justice, without, and upon wicked Governors, asserted by *Laophilus Mysotyrannus*, 4to. 1663." It is a very bold republican Tract, but it is only necessary to look into it to be satisfied that neither the style nor the sentiments are Owen's.

"A Discourse concerning Liturgies, and their imposition, 4to. 1662," is also ascribed to Dr. Owen by Wood, and is inserted in the list of his works, annexed to his memoirs, 1721. but in the second edition of the Athen. Ox., Wood quotes an expression of Bishop Barlow's intimating his doubts about Owen being the author. I have not seen the work, but I believe it is not Owen's. As his colleague, Mr. Clarkson, published one with this very title, it has thus perhaps been ascribed by mistake to Owen. He is also represented as one of the continuators of Matthew Poole's *English Annotations on the Bible*; but he had no hand in that work. "The Puritan turned Jesuit," 4to. 1643, is sometimes stupidly inserted in the list of his works — the very title of which is enough to show that Owen could not have written it.

PREFACES TO THE WORKS OF OTHERS, — p. 443.

BESIDES his own numerous writings, Dr. Owen ushered into the world, along with Prefaces, or recommendatory Epistles, a great number of works by other authors. Of these, as far as they are known to me, I shall now proceed to give some account in the order in which they appeared.

"A Collection of the works of Dr. Thomas Taylor," one of the early Puritans, was published in a folio volume in 1653 — to which was prefixed his Life, by Joseph Caryl, and a Preface by Goodwin and Owen.

The volume contains Tracts and Discourses on a variety of subjects; some of them with very quaint titles — Catechistical Exercises — The Jailor's Conversion — Famine of the Word — Peter's Repentance — The Owle of the Gospel — The Stranger at home, etc. etc. etc. The author, Dr. Taylor, was a man of eminent piety, who suffered much for his principles and his zeal. His works are now little known, but were formerly much esteemed. He died in 1632.

“Justification without conditions, by W. Eyre, Minister of the Gospel, and pastor of a church in the city of New Sarum, 8vo. 1653.” To this volume, a Preface is prefixed by Dr. Owen, dated Westminster, November 7th, 1653. It does not appear that he had previously read the work, as he speaks of but “a minute of time given him,” to express his opinion. It therefore refers entirely to the subject, and to the general opinion which he had formed about the writer's sentiments and character. How far he was justified in sending into the world a production which he had not read, is doubtful. I question whether he would have given it his sanction after he perused it. The second edition, published in 1695, omits the Doctor's Preface. Many of the sentiments in the work, such as justification before faith — the denial that faith is the means of justification — and his views of election, and of some other subjects, are such that Owen could not approve of. It is decidedly antinomian in its statements and tendency, and it was designed for an answer to Messrs. Woodbridge, Cranford, and Baxter. The last of whom replied to it the same year, in “An Admonition to Mr. William Eyre.” The author was ejected from St. Edmund's church in Salisbury.

“The private Christian's *Non ultra*, or a Plea for the Layman's interpreting the Scriptures, by Philolaoclerus, 1656.” In his Preface to this pamphlet, the Doctor tells us, the author was unknown to him, and “he does not build his theses on those principles which, in church affairs, he owned as the mind of God; but he hoped that what he had brought forward would be considered by some who were interested to own it, before they gave in their account.” The object of it is much the same as that of the Doctor's work, on the duty of pastors and people. The author endeavours to show that it is the duty and privilege of Christians to meet together to instruct and exhort one another — a practice which has generally characterised the best times of the church, and which, when conducted with prudence and piety, is fitted to be of considerable service.

“A Defence of Mr. John Cotton, from the imputation of self-contradiction charged on him by Mr. Dan. Cawdry. 12mo. 1658.” We have spoken repeatedly of this little work in the text. Owen's Preface is as large as the book itself, and is a defence of his own work on Schism, against Cawdry's attack on it.

“The true idea of Jansenism, both historic and dogmatic, by Theophilus Gale. 12mo. 1669.” The object of this small work is to explain the nature, origin, and progress of those disputes between the Jansenists and Jesuits; which had so long agitated France — disputes relating to the same points — grace, predestination, and free will — which disturbed the Protestant churches. Mr. Gale, during a residence on the continent, had enjoyed unique opportunities to collect information on the subject, and this volume affords a condensed and correct view of what had been going on.

The object of Dr. Owen's preface, which is long, is to show from the evidence of this work, that the boasted unity of the Church of Rome, is an empty and false assumption; and that it would be easy to prove that there is scarcely one point in which Papists differ from Protestants, on which they are agreed among themselves. He exposes the iniquitous policy and practice of the Romish Church in a very masterly manner, and points out the insidious methods which it employed to crush the Jansenists. The sentiments of that party were nearly allied, on doctrinal subjects, to those of the Protestants — which no doubt was the chief reason for the ill treatment they received from Rome. Everything from the pen of the author of the Court of the Gentiles, is worth reading; but most of his other pieces are now remarkably scarce. Among these are “Theophilie; or the Saints' amity

with God, 1671.” “The Anatomy of Infidelity, 1672.” “A Discourse of the coming of Christ, 1673.” “Idea Theologiae, tam contemplativae quam activae, 1673.” “Philosophia Generalis, in duas partes, etc. 1676.” “A summary of the two Covenants, 1678.”

“*Clavis Cantici*, or an Exposition of the Song of Solomon, by James Durham, late minister at Glasgow,” 4to. 1669. Wood says Owen wrote the preface to this work, which was printed after the death of the worthy author. I am doubtful of this, HOWEVER, as the preface is anonymous, does not appear to be Owen’s style, and as he wrote a preface to another work by Durham, which will be noted immediately, it is probable that Wood mistook the one for the other. The *Clavis* of Mr. Durham is still a popular book among that class of persons who study the mystical design of the Song, and who are fond of allegorical interpretation; but those who adhere to the rigid principles of Biblical criticism, will not be satisfied with many parts of this exposition.

“An introduction to the Holy Scriptures, etc. by Henry Lukin, 1669, 12mo.” The author of this small work was a minister in Essex, before the Act of Uniformity, which threw him among the Dissenters. He was the writer of several small practical works, which reveal an excellent spirit. The “Introduction” contains many useful things for understanding the Scriptures, but has long since been superseded. The substance of it, indeed, is a translation and abridgment of part of the *Philologia Sacra* of Glassius, to which Mr. Lukin acknowledges his obligations. I may take this opportunity to recommend that valuable work to the theological inquirer, as containing a treasure of Biblical criticism. The last edition accommodated by Dathe to the present state of Hebrew literature, ought to be possessed by every student of the word of God. Dr. Owen expresses his high approval of Lukin’s Introduction, and the great satisfaction which he derived from the perusal of it. “If other readers find the same satisfaction as myself, as to the order, method, perspicuity, and sound judgment in them all, that the author has employed and exercised in the whole, they will conclude that he has acquitted himself as a workman that need not be ashamed.” Mr. Lukin died in 1719, at the advanced age of 92.

506

In 1671, a preface signed J. O. appeared to, “The freeness of the grace and love of God to believers by W. Bridge.” The treatise is the substance of seven sermons, the sentiments of which are good, but the language is quaint, and sometimes low. The preface glances at the attempt to make the author ridiculous, by satirising his homely phraseology. This roused the indignation of Dr. John Echard, who in a letter to Dr. Owen, treats the Doctor with contempt, and Mr. Bridge with scurrility.¹ “As I always looked upon Mr. B., he says, to be very sickly and crazy, so I think you are stark mad for being an occasion that any such sermons as these should be sent into the world.” It so happened, however, that Dr. Owen was not the writer of this preface; for in his epistle to Caryl’s sermons, he declares that he would have known nothing of the book if his accuser had not pointed it out to him. In consequence, Dr Echard left out of the next edition of his work, the letter to J. O. Mr. Bridge was one of the Independent brethren of the assembly, and minister of a congregation at Yarmouth, where he died in 1670. The other writings of the author show that he was capable of producing something of more value, both in matter and form, than those sermons.

“Sermons on the whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians, by Mr. Daille, translated into English by F. S. with Dr. Thomas Goodwin’s, and Dr. John Owen’s Epistles recommendatory, 1672. fol.” The author of this work was minister of the Reformed Church at Paris, and is now known chiefly as the author of a work on the “Right use of the Fathers,” which is one of the ablest treatises on the Popish controversy, and gave the church of Rome more trouble than most books of the period. Bishop Warburton, who was no mean judge on such a subject, affirms of this work, “It may truly be said to be the storehouse from where all who have since written popularly on the character of the Fathers, have derived their materials.” — (Introduction to Julian. vii.). Daille wrote a series of

¹ *Scurrility*: foul-mouthed or obscene abuse.

discourses on the 3d chapter of John, and on the 10th chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians — besides this series on the Epistle to the Colossians, which is the only portion of his sermons rendered into English. Both Goodwin and Owen express their favourable opinion of the sentiments and useful tendency of the work.

In 1673, Owen introduced, with a preface, an edition of Vavasor Powell's "New and useful Concordance to the Holy Bible." This edition contained about 9000 Scriptures omitted in the former editions. It is but a small work, and furnishes only the principal word in the sentence. It is not necessary to speak of the usefulness of such works. All former concordances in English have been so long set aside by the invaluable work of Cruden, that former labourers in this department of knowledge are now almost forgotten. Powell was a laborious Baptist minister in Wales, where he suffered much on account of his sentiments. He died in 1670, in the eleventh year of his imprisonment, and the fifty third of his age — (Crosby, vol. i. p. 373.) Owen was very much offended to find that no sooner had he produced the preface, than it was published that he had completed the work, whereas he declares he neither added nor altered a syllable of it. (Preface to Caryl's Sermons.)

507

"The Divine Will, considered in its eternal decrees, and holy execution of them, by Edward Polhill, 8vo. 1673." I expected to have been able to furnish some account of this excellent person, but all my inquiries respecting him have failed.

"He was a very learned gentleman, and a justice of the peace, of very great esteem among all men in his own county, where he lived in full and constant communion with the church of England — He was zealously concerned for truth and serious religion, not for a party. On all occasions he showed himself to be of a truly Christian, that is of a catholic temper, and was a sincere lover of all good men." — (Address to the reader prefixed to his posthumous discourse on schism.)

This work was published in 1694; so that he must have died before that. In a preface to the work on the Divine will, by Dr. Lazarus Seaman, Mr. Polhill is represented as one of the sages of the law, and an oracle in the country where he lives; as conformable himself, yet minding the power of Godliness, more than the form of it; and as eminent for his domestic piety, and exemplary conduct.

From Owen's preface, it appears that he was unacquainted with Polhill when he wrote it. He expresses his great respect for the author, though "otherwise utterly unknown to him;" a respect which "was increased when he found he was no minister or churchman; but a gentleman actuated by a voluntary concern for truth and piety." "The argumentative part of the book, he says, "is generally suited to the genius of the past age, in which accuracy and strictness of reason bore sway, and the language of it to this [end]." Before his death, the author had lost his sight, as appears from a very excellent letter dictated by him to a friend, inserted in the Congregational Magazine, for 1819 — p. 693. The work to which Owen writes a preface, seems to have been the first production of Mr. Polhill's pen. His next work was his "Answer to Sherlock," on the Communion controversy, and in defence of Owen, 1675. The same year he produced "Precious faith considered in its nature, working and growth. 8vo." In 1678, appeared "*Speculum Theologiae in Christo*: or a view of some Divine truths, etc. 4to." He published "*Christus in Corde*: or the mystical union between Christ and Believers, 8vo. 1680." In 1682, he produced "*Armatura Dei*: or preparation for suffering, 8vo." This is an excellent and well written practical treatise, and the last which the author lived to publish. The work on the Decrees, which Owen prefaced, shows how far Polhill entered into the Calvinistic views of Christian doctrine; and reveals more than ordinary ability in defending them. It was highly esteemed by the late Dr. Williams of Rotherham, with whose sentiments on various points, it nearly accords. All Polhill's works are valuable, and deserve a place in every theological library.

“The nature and principles of love as the end of the commandment; declared in some of the last sermons of Mr. Joseph Caryl; with an epistle prefixed by John Owen. D.D. 12mo. 1673.” These discourses were taken down from the mouth of Mr. Caryl by a hearer, and therefore appear with more than the ordinary disadvantages of posthumous writings. The prefatory epistle of Dr. Owen is chiefly occupied in defending himself against some of the many slanders which were then propagated against him. Some notice has been taken of these, and of the Doctor’s answers to them in other parts of this work.

In 1671, he wrote a preface to the eleventh edition of Scudder’s “Christian’s Daily Walk.” The Author was sometime pastor of a Church in Collingborn-ducis, in Wiltshire; and the work was one of the most popular practical treatises among the Non-conformists of the seventeenth century. Dr. Owen states that he had first read it over thirty years before, and that the impressions made upon him in his youth continued in grateful remembrance upon his mind. There is also a prefatory recommendation by Baxter, who speaks of it in still stronger terms of eulogy. The book is still known and esteemed by pious persons of the old school. And if the sentiments and precepts with which it abounds were more attended to, the interests of pure and undefiled religion would be promoted. This work was translated into Dutch, by Theodore Haak.

“The difference between the Old and New Covenant, stated and explained: by Samuel Petto, Minister of the Gospel, 12mo. 1674.” This is a very excellent little work, which the Doctor, in a pretty long preface, warmly recommends to the attentive perusal of the reader. Much perplexing and meaningless language has been used about the Covenants of God; and though Mr. Petto’s treatise is not altogether free from it, its leading views are scriptural and consolatory. The author was ejected from the living of Sandcroft, in Suffolk, and afterwards became pastor of a Congregation at Sudbury. His grandson was minister of the Church in Coggeshall, which Owen founded.

“The Surest and Safest way of Thriving, by Thos. Gouge, 1674.” This little but valuable work, has no less than four prefaces, by Owen, Manton, Baxter, and Bates. It contains many excellent things on the nature and good effects of Christian liberality, with illustrations of its beneficial results even in this world, to those who exercise it. The respectable author, who was one of the ejected ministers, was an eminent example of the virtue he recommended to others. He devoted his personal property, which was originally considerable, almost entirely to works of benevolence and mercy. Archbishop Tillotson preached his funeral sermon, and gave him the highest commendation. The four prefacers all speak of the author and the work in the strongest manner; and Dr. Watts celebrated the memory of Mr. Gouge, after his death, in one of his most beautiful lyrics.

No vulgar mortal died
When he resigned his breath.
The muse that mourns a nation’s fall.
Should wait at Gouge’s funeral.

Should mingle majesty and groans,
Such as she sings to sinking thrones,
And in deep sounding numbers tell
How Sion trembl’d when this pillar fell.

“The Best Treasure, or the way to be made truly rich, by Bartholomew Ashwood, 167_.” I do not know the year in which the first edition appeared, with Owen’s Preface. It is a discourse on Ephesians 3.8, in which the unsearchable riches of Christ are explained and recommended to saints and sinners, as the best treasure to all who would be happy here and hereafter. The Doctor

says, “the most learned will find nothing in it to be despised, and most believers will meet with that which will be to their use and advantage.” Mr. Ashwood was ejected from Axminster, in Devonshire; and is represented by Calamy as a judicious, godly, and laborious Divine.

“The Law Unsealed, or a Practical Exposition of the Ten Commandments. By James Durham, late Minister of the Gospel at Glasgow. 8vo. Edin. 1676.” This is the third edition of the work, to which prefaces by Mr. Jenkyn and Dr. Owen are prefixed, for the first time. It is a more satisfactory book than the one on Solomon’s Song — as the ground on which its author treads is more solid, and the practical tendency of the exposition more evident. Owen praises the work for its plainness, for its general adaptation to the circumstances of Christians, and for the constant attention which the author pays to the inward principle as well as to the outward conduct. It reveals much knowledge of the word of God, and of the character and state of man. Mr. Durham was a useful and highly respectable minister in his day.

“The Ark of the Covenant Opened; or a treatise of the Covenant of Redemption, between God and Christ, as the foundation of the Covenant of Grace, etc. By a Minister of the New Testament, 4to. 1677.” The author of this work was Mr. Patrick Gillespie, one of the Ministers of Glasgow, and Principal of the University during the Commonwealth. Wodrow says,

“he was blamed for his compliances with the Usurper, and there is no doubt he was the minister in Scotland who had the greatest sway with the English when they ruled here, indeed, almost the only Presbyterian minister who was in with them.” — (Hist. of the Church of Scotland, vol. i. p. 76.)

It is probable that Owen and he had first become acquainted on this account. In his preface, the Doctor speaks of “his long Christian acquaintance and friendship with the author;” who was dead before this work appeared. It is only a small part of the design which he had formed, and indeed prepared, for the press. The work, though scarcely known, contains a large portion of scriptural knowledge and good sense; it is fully entitled to all the commendation which Owen bestows on it.

510

“A Practical Discourse of God’s Sovereignty, with other material points,” etc. by Elisha Coles, 1678. This is the production of a person who never enjoyed the benefit of a learned education, and who had no knowledge of any language but English. He appears to have been the friend of Dr. Goodwin who, in a preface, bears testimony to the character of the author, founded on a knowledge of him for twenty-eight years. The other preface is subscribed by Dr. Owen and Sam. Annesley. It must have exceedingly galled John Wesley to perceive that his grandfather, for whom he had a very high respect, was the patron of one of the most Calvinistic books ever published. The reading of this work, Dr. Kippis ¹ says, occasioned his first renunciation of Calvinism (Biog. Brit, vol. iv. p. 3.) I have no doubt the substance of the work is scriptural; but it is neither an accurate nor a guarded book, and by no means is it fit to be put into the hands of an inquirer. He does not sufficiently limit sovereignty to the exercise of benevolence; and thus he leaves it exposed to very formidable objections. An enlightened Christian, however, may derive much comfort and instruction from it. Those who would wish to see the subject stated in the best and most delightful manner will be amply gratified by consulting a sermon, entitled “Spiritual Blessings,” etc. 1814, by Mr. Fletcher, of Blackburn.

“The **Glory** of Free Grace Displayed,” by Stephen Lob, 12mo. 1 680. A preface to this Treatise was written by Dr. Owen, at the request of Mr. Lob, to vindicate the Independents from the charge of Antinomianism, and from being supporters of Crisp’s errors, which about this time were making sad havoc among the dissenters. The preface, however, says little on the subject, further than

¹ Andrew Kippis (1725-1795) was a leading Presbyterian minister, scholar and biographer. He taught for many years at the Hoxton Academy, and later, at New College in Hackney. A noted champion of Dissenters' rights and religious liberty, Kippis played a key role in the campaign that led to the Dissenters' Relief Act of 1779, which exempted Nonconformist ministers from subscription to the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles.

expressing the Doctor's opinion of the work, and his approval of Mr. Lob's character and ministry. The performance itself is, on the whole, a judicious one, very far removed from Antinomianism. And it points out very plainly some of Dr. Crisp's most pernicious mistakes respecting sin, grace, election, imputation, etc.; but the modern Antinomians go on fearlessly to repeat it, with an equal disregard of Scripture, common sense, and all that has been previously written. The sentiments of Owen were certainly widely different from Antinomianism; but I do regret that he should have lent his name to certain productions, whose tendency that way is by no means obscure.

"The Holy Bible, with Annotations and Parallel Scriptures, etc. by Samuel Clark, fol. 1690." There is a preface by Dr. Owen, dated Feb. 14th, 1683. Another by Baxter, and a joint preface by Bates and Howe. The author was a man of learning, piety, and diligence; and all the prefacers speak highly of the Annotations. They are exceedingly short, but for the most part very judicious. The Parallel Scriptures are selected with much care; and if it were not superseded by more extensive works, this Bible might still be useful.

Besides these published prefaces, the Doctor wrote a commendatory preface to Ness's *Antidote to Arminianism*. The author speaks of it, though he does not give it. Augustine Plumsted, an ejected minister, and afterwards pastor of the Congregational Church at Wrentham, in Suffolk, with great labour, compiled a double Concordance containing the English and also the Hebrew and Greek words of the Bible.

511

A prospectus and specimen were published, and an attestation to the merits of the work was annexed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other distinguished persons. Dr. Owen also wrote an epistle to be prefixed to it; but the work never appeared, either from lack of patronage, or from the death of the author. — (Calamy's Cont. vol. ii pp. 806, 809.)

LETTERS FROM DR. OWEN TO VARIOUS PERSONS.

Among the young men, who were placed under his eye while at the university, was a son of Judge Puleston, whose lady was a relation of the Doctor. Mr. Philip Henry lived with this family for some time as chaplain and tutor. He speaks of Lady Puleston as the best friend he had on earth; and as a woman in piety inferior to few, and in learning superior to most of her sex. She appears to have been a very excellent Christian, and died of a painful complaint, on the 29th Sept. 1658 (Memoirs of Philip Henry, pp. 21—47.) The two following letters were kindly furnished to me by the Rev. Thomas Stedman, Rector of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury. And though they contain nothing of importance, as they are originals and illustrate a little the connexions of Owen, they are entitled to a place.

Madam,

While I was hoping to have waited upon you and your worthy husband, at your own house, I reserved begging your pardon that I had not acknowledged your favour in owning and minding a kindred relation, and sundry other respects, till that season. Being prevented by the providence of God as to those resolutions, I am led to lay hold on this opportunity of returning my hearty thanks for your kind remembrances of him who is in no way able to deserve your respects — though he will at all times have as hearty and entire an honor and regard to your ladyship, and your noble husband, as any person living. I hope you both are in health, along with my cousins, your sons, and I am resolved (if the Lord pleases) to see you in the [beginning] of this spring. My wife presents her faithful service and respects to your ladyship, and is glad to hear of your name. For my part, it is some contentment to me, that while I am in this place, I have some little opportunity to express a regard to that relation you are pleased to allow me the honor of, by taking the best care I can of him who bears the name of your family, my young cousin Puleston — I humbly beg your pardon for this trouble, and leave to subscribe myself,

MADAM,

My most humble service of respects,
with many thanks for his kind invitation,
to your worthy husband.

Your most humble Servant,
and affectionate kinsman,
JOHN OWEN.

Ox: Ch: Ch: Coll:
Jan. 26th, 1657

For the truly noble and virtuous Lady
Puleston, his honoured friend and
kinswoman — THESE.

512.

*From Lady Puleston to Dr. Owen, from a copy in the
hand-writing of Mr. Philip Henry. (No date.)*

MY MUCH HONORED COUSIN,

I was in hopes that I should have seen you here, as you proposed, last spring, and am very sorry it fell out otherwise. It has pleased the Lord to lay me low under his hand by much pain and many months' sickness from a cancer in my breast, and I am waiting every day till my change comes; but if we meet no more on earth, I hope we shall in the arms of Jesus Christ. There is a friend of mine, whose name is Edward Thomas, of Wrexham, who brings his son to your college, and I request you to countenance him with your favour. The youth is very hopeful, both in learning and grace, and his father an ancient professor of Godliness in these parts, and one of approved integrity; and I know Sir, that such and what concerns them lie near your heart upon far greater and other interests than mine; and I persuade myself, what your opportunities will permit you to do in his behalf, you will receive a full recompense of reward for, from him who has promised to requite even a cup of cold water given to a disciple in the name of a disciple.

Mr. Henry is here with me, much my comfort in my present affliction; what my husband intends concerning him is not yet settled, but I hope it will be shortly. In the meantime, I am loth he should lose a certainty in the College, for an uncertainty here; and I do, therefore, desire you to continue his place to him for a while longer, that seeing the Lord has made him willing to lay himself out in the work of the gospel, so far remote from his friends in this poor lost corner of the land, he may not in anything be

prejudiced for our sakes, who esteem him highly in love, and desire to do it yet more and more. My husband is at London, or on his way home. We and ours are much indebted to you for your love, and I should have been very glad, if it might have fallen within the compass of my abilities, to make known other than by words, my sense of your many kindnesses. But it is the Lord's will that I should be your debtor. With my unfeigned respects and service to your Lady and self,

I rest, your affectionate Cousin and Friend,
E. P.

Mr. Henry was presented to the parish of Worthenbury, where they resided, by the Puleston family, and remained in it till he was ejected in 1662. Another very excellent letter, from Lady Puleston to Mr. Henry, is inserted in his Memoirs, pp. 24, 25.

To Lady Hartopp.

DEAR MADAM,

Every work of God is good; the Holy One in the midst of us, will do no iniquity; and all things shall work together for good to those who love him; even those things which at present are not joyous, but grievous; only his time is to be waited for, and his way submitted to, that we not seem to be displeased in our hearts, that he is Lord over us.

513

Your dear infant is in the eternal enjoyment of the fruits of all our prayers; for the covenant of God is ordered in all things, and sure: we shall go to her, she shall not return to us. Happy she was in this, above us, that she had so speedy an issue of sin and misery, being born only to exercise your faith and patience, and to glorify God's grace in her eternal blessedness. My trouble would be great on account of my absence at this time from you both; except that this also is the Lord's doing; and I know my own uselessness, wherever I am. But this I will beg of God for you both: that you may not faint in this day of trial; that you may have a clear view of those spiritual and temporal mercies with which you are yet entrusted, all undeserved; that the sorrow of the world may not so overtake your hearts as to disenable you to any duties, so as to grieve the Spirit, or to prejudice your lives; for it tends to death. God in Christ will be better to you than ten children, and will so preserve your remnant, and so add to them, as shall be for His glory and your comfort. Only consider that sorrow, in this case, is no duty; it is an effect of sin, whose cure by grace we should endeavor. Shall I say, be cheerful? I know I may. God help you to honour grace and mercy, in compliance with that. My heart is with you, my prayers shall be for you, and I am, etc.

To Mrs. Polhill.

DEAR MADAM,

The trouble expressed in yours, is a great addition to mine: the sovereignty of divine grace and wisdom is all that I have at this day to retreat to. God direct you there also, and you will find rest and peace. It adds to my trouble that I cannot possibly come down to you this week; nothing but engaged duty could keep me from you one hour; yet I am conscious how little I can contribute to your guidance in this storm, or your satisfaction. Christ is your Pilot, and however the vessel is tossed while he seems to sleep, he will arise and rebuke these winds and waves in his own time. I have done it, and yet I will further wrestle with God concerning you, according to the strength he is pleased to communicate. Little it is which at this distance I can mind you of; yet some few things are necessary. — Sorrow not too much for the dead; she has entered into rest, and is taken away from the evil to come. — Take heed, lest, by too much grief, you too much grieve that Holy Spirit, who is infinitely more to us than all natural relations. I do not blame you that you so far attend to the call of God in this dispensation, as to search yourself, to judge and condemn yourself. Grace can make it an evidence to you, that you shall not be judged or condemned by the Lord. I dare not say that this chastisement was not needful. We are not in heaviness, unless need be; but if God is pleased to give you a discovery of the wisdom and care that is in it, and how needful it was, to awaken and restore your soul in anything — perhaps in many things — in due time you will see grace and love in it also.

514

I truly believe God in this dealing with you, would have you judge yourself, your sins, and your decays — but He would not have you *misjudge* your condition. But we are like froward children: when they are rebuked and corrected, they neglect other things, and only cry that their parents hate and reject them. — You are apt to fear, to think, and to say that you are one whom God does not regard, who are none of his; and that is for various reasons which you suppose you can plead. But, says God, this is *not* the business; this is a part of your forwardness. I call you to quicken your grace, to amend your own ways — and *you* think you have nothing to do, but to question my love. Pray, Madam, my dear sister, child and care, beware that you not lose the advantage of this dispensation. You will do so, if you use it only for afflictive sorrows, or questioning the love of God, or of your interest in Christ. — The time will be spent in these things, which should be taken up in earnest endeavours to comply with God's will, quickenings of grace, returns after backsliding — mortification of sin, and of the love of the world, until the sense of it passes away. Labour vigorously to bring your soul to this two-fold resolution. (1.) That the will of God is the best rule for all things, and their circumstances. (2.) That you will bring yourself into a fresh engagement to live more to Him; and then you will find the remainder of your work easy, for it is part of the yoke of Christ. I will trouble you no further, except to give you the assurance that you are in my heart continually, which is nothing; but it helps to persuade me that you are in the heart of Christ, which is all. I am, etc.

To his Church, when he was sick, at Lord Wharton's.

Beloved in the Lord,

Mercy, grace, and peace, be multiplied to you from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, by the communication of the Holy Ghost. I thought and hoped that by this time I might have been present with you, according to my desire and resolution; but it has pleased our holy and gracious Father to dispose of me otherwise, at least for a season. The continuance of my painful infirmities, and the increase of my weaknesses, will not allow me at present to hope that I should be able to bear the journey. How great an exercise this is to me, considering the season, He knows — to whose will I would cheerfully submit myself in all things. But although I am absent from you in body, I am in mind, affection and spirit present with you, and in your assemblies; for I hope you will be found my crown and rejoicing in the day of the Lord. And my prayer for you night and day is that you may stand fast in the whole will of God, and maintain the beginning of your confidence without wavering, firm to the end. I know it is needless for me at this distance to write to you about what concerns you in point of duty at this season — that work being well supplied by my brother in the ministry. You will give me leave out of my abundant affections towards you, to bring a few things to your remembrance as my weakness will permit.

515

In the first place, I pray God that it may be rooted and fixed in our minds, that the shame and loss we may undergo for the sake of Christ and the profession of the gospel, is the greatest honour which we can be made partakers of in this life. So it was esteemed by the apostles; they rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name's sake. It is a privilege superadded to the grace of faith, which all are not made partakers of. Hence it is reckoned to the Philippians in a special manner, that it was given to them not only to believe in Christ but also to suffer for him: that it is far more honourable to suffer with Christ, than to reign with the greatest of his enemies. If this is fixed by faith in our minds, it will tend greatly to our encouragement. I only mention these things, knowing that they are more at large pressed on you.

The next thing I would recommend to you at this season is the increase of mutual love among yourselves. For every trial of our faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, is also a trial of our love towards the brethren. This is what the Lord Christ expects from us: namely, that when the hatred of the world openly manifests and acts against us all, we should evidence an active love among ourselves. If there have been any decays, any coldness in it, if they are not recovered and healed in such a season, then it can never be expected. I pray God, therefore, that your mutual love may abound more and more in all the effects and fruits of it towards the whole society, and every member of it. You may justly measure the fruit of your present trial by the increase of this grace among you. In particular, have a due regard toward the weak and the tempted, that what is lame may not be turned away, but rather let it be healed.

Furthermore, brethren, I beseech you, hear a word of advice in case the persecution increases, which it is likely to do for a season. I could wish that because you have no ruling elders, and your teachers cannot walk about publicly with safety, that you would appoint some among yourselves who may continually, as

occasions allow, go up and down, from house to house, and apply themselves especially to the weak, the tempted, the fearful, those who are ready to despond, or to halt — and to encourage them in the Lord. Choose those to this end who are endued with a spirit of courage and fortitude; and let them know that they are happy whom Christ will honour with this blessed work. And I desire that the persons who may be of this number, are faithful men, and know the state of the Church. By this you will know the frame of the *members* of the Church, which will be a great direction to you, even in your prayers. Watch now, brethren, that if it is the will of God, not one soul may be lost from under your care; let no one be overlooked or neglected; consider all their conditions, and apply yourselves to all their circumstances.

516

Finally, brethren, so that I will not at present be further troublesome to you, examine yourselves as to your spiritual benefit which you have received or do receive — by your present fears and dangers, which alone will give you the true measure of your condition. For if this tends to the exercise of your faith, and of love, and holiness, if this increases your valuation of the privileges of the Gospel, then it will be an undoubted token of the blessed result which the Lord Christ will give for your troubles. Pray for me as you do, that if it is the will of God, I may be restored to you; and if not, then rather a blessed entrance may be given to me into the kingdom of God and glory. Salute all the Church in my name. I take the boldness in the Lord to subscribe myself,

Your unworthy Pastor, etc.

J. OWEN,

To Charles Fleetwood, Esq.

DEAR SIR,

I received yours, and am glad to hear of your welfare; there is more than ordinary mercy in every day's preservation. My wife, I bless God, is much revived, so that I do not despair of her recovery: but for myself. I have been under the power of various distempers for fourteen days past, and yet continue so. God is fastening his instruction concerning the approach of that season, in which I must lay down this tabernacle. I think my mind has been too intent on some things which I looked on as services for the Church; but God would have us know that He has no need of me or them, and is therefore calling me off from them. Help me with your prayers, that I may through the riches of his grace in Christ, be in some measure ready for my account. The truth is, we cannot see the latter rain in its season, as we have seen the former, and a latter spring thereon: death, that will turn in the streams of glory upon our poor withering souls, is the best relief. I begin to fear that we shall die in this wilderness; yet we should labour and pray continually, that the heavens would drop down from above, and the skies pour down righteousness, that the earth may open and bring forth salvation, and that righteousness may spring up together. If ever I return to you in this world, I beseech you to contend yet more earnestly than I have ever done — with God, with my own heart, with the Church — to labour after spiritual revivals. Our affectionate service to your Lady, and to all your family that are of the household of God. I am, etc.

517

To the same.

Dear Sir,

The bearer has stayed long enough with us to save you the trouble of reading an account of me in my own scribbling; a longer stay I could not prevail with him for, tho' his company was a great refreshment to me. Both you and your whole family, in all their occasions and circumstances, are daily in my thoughts; and when I am able to pray, I mention you all without ceasing. I find you and I are much in complaining. For my part I must say, and is there not a cause? So much deadness; so much unspirituality; so much weakness in faith, coldness in love, instability in holy meditations — as I find *in myself* — is sufficient cause for complaints. But is there not also cause for thanksgiving and joy in the Lord? Are there not reasons for *them*? When I begin to think of them, I am overwhelmed — they are great, they are glorious, they are inexpressible. Shall I now invite you to this great duty of rejoicing more in the Lord? Pray for me that I may do so — for the near approach of my dissolution calls for it earnestly. My heart is done with this world, even in the best and most desirable of its refreshments. If the joy of the Lord is not now strength for it, it will fail. But I must be done. Unless God is pleased to affect some

person, or persons, with a deep sense of our declining condition, of the temptations and dangers of the day, filling them with compassion for the souls of men, making them fervent in spirit in their work, it will go but ill with us. It may be that these thoughts spring from causeless fears; it may be that none among us has an evil, barren heart but myself. But bear with me in this, my folly; I cannot lay down these thoughts until I die; nor do I mention them at present, as tho' I should not esteem it a great mercy to have so able a supply as Mr. C. but I am groaning after deliverance. And being near the centre, I hope I feel the drawing of the love of Christ with more earnestness than formerly. But my naughty heart is backward in these compliances. My affectionate service to Sir John Hartopp and his Lady, and to the rest of your family when God returns them to you. I am, etc.

The five preceding Letters are from the Appendix to Asty's Memoirs of Dr. Owen. 1721.

To Sir John Hartopp.

— My duty, my obligations, and my inclinations, all concur in the esteem I have for you both; and I mention you daily in my poor supplications — and that is with particular respect to the present condition of your Lady: That God, who has revealed himself to us, as the God who hears prayer, will yet glorify His name, and be a present help to her in the time of trouble. In the meantime, let her, and you, and me, strive to love Christ more, to abide with him more, and to be less in ourselves. He is our best friend. I pray God with all my heart that I may be weary of everything else, but converse and communion with Him. Indeed, weary of the best of my mercies, so far as they may at any time be hindrances of it. My wife presents her humble service to your Lady and yourself, as does also, Sir, etc.

518

Dr. Owen to a Friend.

SIR,

I am very sorry to find that a difference has arisen between Mr. C and yourself. Since the receipt of yours, I received one from him, with an account of the difference, and his thoughts upon it at large. I do not therefore judge it fitting to write anything at present about it, until I am ready to give to you both an account of my thoughts, which — because of many avocations — I cannot do now. Therefore, all I will say at present, is that without mutual love, and condescension, no interposition of advice will issue the business to the glory of Christ and the Gospel. I pray God to guide you both by that Spirit which is promised to lead us into all truth. Upon the first opportunity, you will have a further account of his sense, who is, etc.

January 2d, 1679.

The last two Letters are given from Dr. Williams' account of Dr. Owen, prefixed to his Abridgement of the Exposition of the Hebrews, by whom they were first published.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE WORKS OF OWEN,

WITH REFERENCES TO THE PAGES OF THIS VOLUME IN WHICH AN ACCOUNT IS GIVEN OF THEM.

PAGES.

| | | |
|---|-------|---------|
| 1642 Display of Arminianism, | 4to. | 29-35 |
| 1643 The Duty of Pastors and People distinguished, | 4to. | 47-50 |
| 1645 The principles of the Doctrine of Christ, in two Catechisms, | 12mo. | 52-54 |
| 1646 A Vision of Unchangeable Mercy, a Sermon, | 4to. | 54-56 |
| 1647 Eshcol: or Rules for Church fellowship, | 12mo | 78-79 |
| 1648 Salus Electorum, a Treatise on Redemption, | 4to. | 79-84 |
| 1648 Memorial of the deliverance of Essex: two Sermons | 4to. | 85-87 |
| 1649 Righteous Zeal: a Sermon, and Essay on Toleration, | 4to. | 89-97 |
| 1649 The Shaking and Translating of Heaven and Earth: a Sermon, | 4to. | 111-112 |
| 1649 Human Power Defeated: a Sermon, | 4to. | 115. |
| 1650 Of the Death of Christ, in answer to Baxter, | 4to. | 119-121 |
| 1650 The Steadfastness of Promises: a Sermon, | 4to. | 122 |
| 1650 The Branch of the Lord; two Sermons, | 4to. | 125-126 |
| 1651 The Advantage of the Kingdom of Christ: a Sermon, | 4to. | 137-139 |
| 1652 The Labouring Saint's Dismission: a Sermon, | 4to. | 139-140 |
| 1652 Christ's Kingdom and the Magistrate's Power: a Sermon | 4to. | 141 |
| 1653 De Divina Justitia: Translated 1794, | 12mo. | 201-204 |
| 1654 The Doctrine of the Saints' Perseverance, | Fol. | 205-210 |
| 1655 Vindiciae Evangelicae: Reply to Biddle, | 4to. | 213-218 |
| 1656 On the Mortification of Sin, | 8vo. | 219-220 |
| 1656 Review of the Annotations of Grotius, | 4to. | 222-223 |
| 1656 Gods Work in Founding Zion; a Sermon, | 4to. | 160-161 |
| 1656 God's Presence with his People; a Sermon, | 4to. | 162-163 |
| 1657 On Communion with God, | 4to. | 252-256 |
| 1657 A Discovery of the true nature of Schism, | 12mo. | 257-259 |
| 1657 A Review of the True Nature of Schism, | 12mo. | 262-263 |
| 1658 Answer to Cawdry about Schism, | 12mo. | 264 |
| 1658 Of the Nature and power of Temptation, | 12mo. | 501 |
| 1659 The Divine Original of the Scriptures, | 12mo. | 265-267 |
| 1659 Vindication of the Hebrew and Greek Texts, | 12mo. | 267-272 |
| 1659 Exercitationes ad versus Fanaticos, | 12mo. | 273-275 |
| 1659 The glory of Nations professing the Gospel: a Sermon, | 4to. | 276 |
| 1659 On the Power of the Magistrate about Religion, | 4to. | 293 |
| 1660 A Primer for Children, | 12mo, | 293 |
| 1661 Theologoumena, | 4to. | 293-296 |
| 1662 Criticisms on Fiat Lux, | 12mo. | 297 |
| 1664; Vindication of the Criticisms, | 8vo. | 297-299 |
| 1667 Indulgence and Toleration considered | 4to. | 305 |
| 1667 A Peace Offering, or Plea for Indulgence, | 4to. | 305 |
| 1667 Brief Instruction in the Worship of God: a Catechism, | 12mo. | 306-309 |
| 1668 On Indwelling Sin, | 8vo. | 315-316 |
| 1668 Exposition of the 130th Psalm, | 4to. | 316-321 |
| 1668 Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, void. | Fol. | 321-334 |
| 1639 Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, | 12mo. | 338 |
| 1669 Truth and Innocence Vindicated, | 8vo. | 339-342 |

| | | |
|---|-------|---------|
| 1671 On the Divine Institution of the Lord's Day, | 8vo. | 349-355 |
| 1672 On Evangelical Love, | 8vo. | 360-361 |
| 1674 Vindication of the Work on Communion, | 12mo. | 379-381 |
| 1674 Discourse on the Holy Spirit, | Fol. | 381-390 |
| 1674 Exposition of the Hebrews, vol. ii. | Fol. | 321-334 |
| 1674 How we may bring our hearts to bear reproof, | 4to. | 359 |
| 1676 On the Nature of Apostasy, | 8vo. | 390-391 |
| 1677 The Reason of Faith, | 8vo. | 382-390 |
| 1678 On the Doctrine of Justification, | 4to. | 401-408 |
| 1678 The Ways and Means of Understanding the Mind of God, | 8vo. | 382-390 |
| 1679 Christologia, or the Person Christ, | 4to. | 409-412 |
| 1679 The Church of Rome no Safe Guide, | 4to. | 412-413 |
| 1680 On Union among Protestants, | 4to. | 414-415 |
| 1680 Vindication of the Non-conformists | 4to. | 415-417 |
| 1680 Exposition of the Hebrews, vol. iii. | Fol. | 321-334 |
| 1681 Defence of the Vindication, | 4to. | 419 |
| 1681 Inquiry into Evangelical Churches, | 4to. | 422-438 |
| 1681 Humble Testimony, | 8vo. | 438-439 |
| 1681 On Spiritual Mindedness, | 4to. | 439-441 |
| 1682 The Work of the Holy Spirit in Prayer, | 4to. | 382-390 |
| 1682 The Chambers of Imagery | 4to. | 359 |
| 1683 An Account of the Protestant Religion, | 4to. | 441 |
| 1684 Meditations on the Glory of Christ, Part I. | 8vo. | 442-443 |
| 1684 Exposition of the Hebrews, vol. iv. | Fol. | 321-334 |
| 1688 Of the Dominion of Sin and Grace, | 8vo. | 500-501 |
| 1689 True Nature of a Gospel Church, | 4to. | 422-438 |
| 1691 Meditations on the Glory of Christ, Part II | 8vo. | 442-443 |
| 1693 Two Discourses on the Work of the Spirit, | 8vo. | 382-390 |
| 1695 Evidences of the Faith of God's Elect, | 8vo. | 501-502 |
| 1720 Seventeen Sermons, with the original Dedications," etc. to which are added "Manuscripts of the Doctor's, never before printed." The amount of these MSS. is "An Answer to two Questions, with twelve Arguments against any Conformity to Worship not of Divine Institution," 2 vols. | 8vo. | 500 |
| 1721 Sermons and Tracts, | Fol. | 502 |
| 1756 Thirteen Sermons, | 8vo. | 502 |
| 1760 Twenty-five Discourses at the Lord's Supper, | 12mo. | 502 |

INDEX.

A

Abney, Sir Thomas and Lady, 363
Alleine, Joseph, 186
Alsop, Vincent, 347, 417
Ames, Dr William, 69
Anglesea, Earl of, 373
Angier, Samuel, 395
Andrews, Mordecai, 489
Arminianism, progress of, 30-34
Army, Parliamentary, 116, 117
Arnold, Nicholas, 213
Assembly, Westminster, 71-75, 478
Ashwood's best Treasure, 509
Asty's Memoirs of Owen, 3

B

Bagshaw, Edward, 184
Baillie's account of Independency, 74
Barlow, Bishop, 12, 179, 397, 400
Baron, James, 176
Barret, Mr., 417
Baxter, Richard, his character, 119
 His Controversies with Owen, 119-122
 His attempts at union with Independents, 309
 His character of Owen, 471
Bendish, Mrs., 371
Berkely, Earl of, 376
Berry, Maj. Gen 365
Biddle, John, 210
Binning, Hugh, 127
Blackburn, Archdeacon, 490
Boyle, Hon. Robert, 179
Bridge's Sermons, 506
Brooke, Lord, 496
Brown, Robert, 65, 486
Browning, Thomas, 489
Brownists, 66, 67
Bunyan, John, 398
Burton, Henry, 100, 494
Burnet, Bishop, quoted, 130, 182
Busby, Dr., 490
Busher, Leonard, 99
Button, Ralph, 176

C

Calamy, Edmund, 27
Cane, J. V., 296
Carstairs, William, 445
Caryl on Job, 333
 His Sermons, 507
 His death and character, 362
Casaubon. Meric, 193
Cawdry, Daniel, 146, 189
 His Controversy with Owen, 260-265
Cawton, Thomas, 184
Charles I. his death unjustly ascribed to the
 Independents 89-93
Charles II. his character, 287
 Converses with Owen, 377
Charnock, Stephen, 175, 484

Chauncey, Charles, 347
 Isaac, 499
Cheynel, Francis, 212
Christ Church, account of, 134
 Owen appointed Dean of, 132-135
Christian's, the, Non Ultra, 504
Clagett, William, attacks Owen's work on the Spirit,
 387
Clarendon, Lord, intercourse between him and Owen,
 290, 299
Clarke, Samuel, 179
Clark's, Samuel, Annotations, 510
Clarkson, David, 395-397
Claude, Monsieur, 420
Cole, Thomas, 176
Coles, Elisha, on Sovereignty, 509
Commonwealth, state of Religion during the, 242
Compton, Bishop, 182
Conventicle Act, 344
Cook, Dr., quoted, 107
Cotton, John, 264
 Defence of, against Cawdry, 504
Crew, Bishop, 182
Cromwell, Oliver,
 Owen's first interview with, 112
 His Character, 114
 Ambition, 163-165
 Owen's Eulogy on, 198
 His Death and Character, 241
Cromwell, Richard, 198
 Succeeds his Father, 275
 His Fall, 276-280
Crooke, Unton, 158-159
Cumberland, Bishop, 183

D

Daille, John, on the Colossians, 506
Degrees, Theological, disapproved of by many of the
 Reformers, and by Owen, 144-146
Desborough, Col. 368
Dickson, David, 323
Dissenters, sufferings of, 303
Downham, Bishop, 323
Dort, synod of, 31, 477
Dublin, Owen's labours in, 118
 University of, revived, 123
Dunstar, Henry, 348
Duppa, Bishop, 11
Durham, on Solomon's Song, 505
 on the Commandments, 509

E

Eaton, Nathaniel, 348
Edward's John, against Toleration, 43
 Jonathan, quoted, 244
Elliot, John, 352
Endicott, Governor, 302
Estwick, Nicholas, 212
Evelyne, quoted, 196
Eyre, Joseph, 486

William, 504

F

Fairfax, Lord, 85
Farmer, John, 489
Ferguson, Robert, 393-394
Fielding, John, 489
Fifth Monarchy People, 288
Firmin, Giles, 260
Fisher, Samuel, 274
Fleetwood, Charles, 363-365

G

Gale, Theophilus, 176, 504-505
Gataker, William, 224
Gibbon's account of Oxford, 180
Gilbert, Claudius, 486
Thomas, 204
Gillespie, Patrick, 488, 509
Goddard, Dr., 176
Goodwin, John, 206
Thomas, D.D., 144, 175, 413
Gouge, Robert, 489
Thomas, 508
William, 323
Government, Cromwell's Instrument of, debate
 respecting, 148-152
Greenwood, Dr. Daniel, 177
Grey, Dr. quoted, 95
Grotius, 220-222

H

Hammond, Dr., 220-225, 259
Harris, Dr, 178
Harrison, Dr., 484
Harmar, Dr., 178
Hartcliffe, John, 8
Hartopp, Sir John and Lady, 366, 512
Harvard, John, 348
Harvard College, 348, 349
Haversham, Lord and Lady, 370-371
Henry, Philip, 185
Hervey's classification of the Puritan writers, 475
Hoar, Dr., 349
Hood, Dr., 179
Hooke, Robert, 179
Hopkins, Bishop, 182
Horne, John, 84
Horsley, Bishop, 491
Hotchkis, Thomas, 381, 408
Howe, John, 177, 417
Howel, Francis, 176
Hoyle, Dr., 179
Hume, David, quoted, 106
Humfrey, John, 388, 408, 420, 470
Hyde, Dr., 179

I

Independency, the principles of, 63, 64
 Rise and progress of, 65-75
 Cromwell's influence on, 246-249
 Early state of in Ireland, 484-486

 Early state of in Scotland, 486-488
 Alleged schismatical nature of, 496
Independents, account of their dress, 197
 Their Confession of Faith, 229-230
 Meet at the Savoy for this purpose, 231-232
 View of the declaration of Faith there agreed to,
 232-238
 Baxter's hostility to it, 238
 Forbes's testimony in its favour, 238-239
 Not much known, 240-241
 Their anxiety to secure their liberty, 282-284
Independent, on the use of the term, 493
Indulgence, declaration of, 355
 Dissenters address the King on the subject of, 357
Ireton, Henry, 139, 140
Ireland, state of religion in, 122, 124, 484

J

Jackson, Mr., 27
Jacob, Henry, 68
James I. his character and conduct toward the
 Puritans, 7-8
Jenner, Mr., 486
Jessop, Constantine, 480
Jews, conference respecting, 159
Jones, William, 323
Johnson, Francis, 177
Jortin, Dr., quoted, 243

K

Kendall, Dr 210
Kinaston, Roger, an impostor, 191
Kirkton, James, quoted, 131, 132

L

Laing's account of Independent, 74, 481
Lamb, Thomas, 210
Lampe on John, 334
Langbain, Dr. 179
Langley, Dr. Henry, 178
Laud, Archbishop, 16, 17
Lawson, George, 324
Lee, Samuel, 175
Levellers, the, 115, 116
Lichfield, Leonard, 191
Lloyd, Bishop, 183, 191
Lob, Stephen, 420, 510
Locke, John, 106
Ludlow quoted, 280
Loeffs, Isaac, 394
Lukin, Henry, 505
Lushington, Thomas, 323

M

Maresius, 213
Marsh, Archbishop, 183
Marvell, Andrew, 342, 344
Massachusetts, General Court of, invites Dr. Owen to
 Boston, 300, 302
Mather, Cotton, quoted, 3
 Nathanael, 501
 Samuel, 484

- Milton, 46, 105, 137, 495
 Monk, General, 282, 283
 More, Thomas, 83
 Morning Exercise, 359
 Morton, Charles, 186
 Mosheim quoted, 73, 92, 93
 Moulin, Lewis du, 176
 Murcot, John, 485
- N
- Ness's Antidote to Arminianism, 510
 New England Congregationalists,
 improper conduct of, 335
 Remonstrated with, by their brethren in England,
 337
 Further remarks on, 493
 Nicholas, Sir Edward, 298
- O
- Orrery, Earl of, 373
 Owen, Lewis, 3
 Griffith, 3
 Henry, Father of Dr. Owen, 3-5
 Henry, son of the above, 8
 William, son of do. 8, 447
 Martin, 314
 Mrs., first wife of the Doctor, 36, 37
 Mrs., his second wife, 392
 Thankful, 175
 Oxford, state of the University during the civil wars,
 167
 Owen's addresses to it, 169, 172, 199
 Persons of eminence who held office in it, 175-178
 Owen's account of his colleagues in it, 180
 Persons of distinction then educated in it, 181-187
 Royal Society then founded in it, 187
 Clarendon's account of the strife of it at the
 Restoration, 187
 Owen's management of the parties in it, 187
 Poetic addresses from it to Cromwell, 189, 191
 State of, the early part of last century, 490
- P
- Parker, Bishop, 182, 338, 341
 Parliament, the Long, 54-56
 Patient, Thomas, 435
 Payne, Thomas, 448
 Penn, William, 181, 480
 Penruddock's rising, 156-158
 Penry, John, 486
 Peters, Hugh, 484
 Petto, Henry, 489
 Samuel, 508
 Plumstead, Augustus, 510
 Pococke, Dr. 179
 Polhill, Edward, 380, 507
 Mrs., 371
 Poole, Matthew, 212
 Porter, George, 175
 Potter, Christopher, 11
 Powell, Vavasor, 506
 Prayers of Cromwell's Chaplains, 495
- Preaching of Officers of the army, 483
 Presbyterians, account of, 38-46
 Price, Samuel, 499
 Puleston, Lady, 511, 512
 Puritans, their sentiments and sufferings, 5-8
- Q
- Quakers, conduct of, 192, 195
 Quick, John, 186
- R
- Racovian Catechism, 214, 492
 Religious liberty, 97
 Origin and progress of, 99
 Advocates of, 104, 106, 480
 Pamphlets on, 479
 Restoration, the effects of, 277, 288
 Reynolds, Dr. 133
 Roberts, Dr. 178
 Robertson, Dr., quoted, 498
 Robinson, John, 68
 Rogers, John, 485
 Rule, Gilbert, 420
 Rutherford, Samuel, 129
- S
- Sams, John, 489
 Savage, Dr. Motion, 500
 Savoy Declaration of Faith, 227-240
 Schurmann, Anna Maria, 469
 Sedgwick, John and Obadiah, 62
 Scotland, Owen's journey to, 124
 His labours in, 125, 126
 State of religion in, 127-133
 Scudder's daily Walk, 503
 Selden, John, 225
 Shields, Alexander, 394
 Sherlock, Dr. 378, 380
 Singleton, John, 477
 Smith, Adam, quoted, 109
 Socinianism, progress of, 212-218
 South, Dr. 147, 181, 191
 Spirit, extravagant views of the, 385, 387
 Sprigge, Joshua, 84
 Staunton, Dr. 178
 Stillingfleet, Dr., 415, 422
 Stubb, Henry, 177
 Supper, Lord's, observed weekly by the first
 Independents, 497
 Sylvester, Edward, 9
- T
- Taylor, Bishop, Jeremy, 101, 102
 Thomas, Dr. 503
 Timothy, 486
 Thompson, Lady, 370, 371
 Tillotson, Archbishop, 249, 250, 251
 Tregrosse, Thomas, 186
 Trevor, Sir John, 377
 Trosse, George, 185
 Troughton, John, 186

Tryers, account of, 152, 156

V

Vane, Sir Henry, 104

Vernon's attack on Owen, 345

Vice-Chancellor, Owen's dress when, 195

Vitringa, 334

U

Uniformity, Act of, 291, 292

Usher, Archbishop, 225

W

Wales, state of religion in, 162, 163

Wall, Thomas, 419

Wallingford House party, 276, 280

Wallis, Dr. 178

Walton, Bishop, 263, 273

War, civil, causes of the, 22-26

Warburton, Bishop, 490

Ward, Bishop, 178

Warwick, Earl of, 79

Watts, Dr. Isaac, -----499

Wells, Algernon, 489

Wesley, John, 186

Wharton, Lord, 375, 444

Whitelocke's conversation with the Queen of Sweden,
483

Wilkins, Bishop, 178

Wilkinson, Dr. Henry, sen. 177

Wilkinson, Lady Vere, 371

Williams, Dr. Edward, 83, 333

Williams, Roger, 100

Williams, Joseph, 407

Willoughby, Lord, 374

Wilson, Dr. Thomas, 12

Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches
recommended, 500

Wolsley, Sir Charles, 408

Wood, Anthony, often quoted.

Wright's, Dr., edition of Owen on the Hebrews, 322,
332

Y

Young, Patrick, 452

Z

Zouch, Dr 179