Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis V
Redigunt Márta Font, G. Kiss,
Pécs, 2009. pp. 99–125.

Bálint RADÓ, PhD, Assistant Professor
radobalint@gmail.com
University of Pécs,
Faculty of Humanities,
Institute of History
Department of Medieval and Early Modern History,
H-7624 Pécs, Rókus u. 2.,
Hungary

BÁLINT RADÓ

The Interrelation of Politics and Confessionalism in a 17th-Century British Polemical Writing

Abstract: The study intends to investigate a political pamphlet written by the famous, nevertheless, in Hungary rather neglected Presbyterian minister and diplomat, Robert Baillie. In this work of his he tries to refute the ecclesiological tenets of the Independents also known as Congregationalists. The latter had a good share in shaping "the New England mind", i.e. they were very influential in 17th-century Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island. The author does not refrain from making fun of the "Canterburians", the "Faction" he blames throughout the polemical writing for all the "problems" arising with the new "sects". The study is meant to illustrate that theological and political issues were closely intertwined in the 17th century.

Key words: Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Anabaptism, Arminianism, political theology, political thinking

One can be amazed how many professing Christians simply dismiss the idea that the Church has an institutional right, what is more, sacred mission and duty to pronounce her opinion in political matters. If this is the standpoint of extreme liberals, it is no surprise at all. If, however, as in many cases, these liberals could in fact shake hands with active Christians, regularly practicing their religion, our amazement is justified at the ignorance of these Christian "*Schöngeister*". The very existence of the Holy Mother Church in itself is politics at work. In his prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, at the foot of the Mount of Olives, Jesus Christ did not pray to the Heavenly Father asking him to remove the believers from the world but deliver them from the evil.[1] For many centuries there was a general understanding among "mainstream" Christians, actually from the Church fathers down to the 18th century.

[1] John 17,15.

Christian thinkers, whether St. Augustine or St. Thomas of Aquinas, just to mention two of the greatest ones, notwithstanding the fact that they basically differed on the concept about the natural state of men as well as on the nature of the state, shared the common view and conviction that the political community was necessary. Fair enough, it was especially the Thomist and neo-Thomist strain of thought that underlined the importance of a though independent and naturally evolving entity, the state, as opposed to the supernaturally established Christian Church. Yet Thomism argues that Christians are members of both Church and state (the latter being the *communitas perfectissima* upon earth), hence it is evident that the supernatural mission of the Church overrules the natural mission of the state. Once the latter jeopardizes the transcendental aims of Christians, the Church must act and intervene, even if *in via ordinaria* only *mediante, ad finem spiritualem*. Also, it is an ancient ecumenical Christian maxim that Christians must show a deep interest in the matters of the political community, after all it is the community in which the "neighbours" live and act. It is impossible to imagine that Jesus Christ having been present at the Creation,[2] became flesh, taught his disciples and the people in general, suffered and even gave his life for humanity on the one hand and, on the other hand, shows a complete ignorance in how mankind lives on earth. It is a Marxist obsession that Christianity only deals with transcendental, therefore, for them obscure and, in fact, unreal matters. Quite on the contrary, Christianity is not identical with stupidity. It would namely be foolish and stupid to hand over everyday political affairs to non-Christians exclusively. True, many ardent opponents of Christianity would welcome the Church of Christ restricting herself to social care for the poor while remaining silent when a crucial political matter of any kind, be it economy, verily affecting especially the poor, are at stake. "And whosoever gives a glass of water […]"[3] "And render unto Caesar […]".[4]

As the title clearly indicates, this study intends to be an examination of a British polemical writing. Indeed, just to make it highly and extremely interesting, it was published in 1646, right in the very middle of the English Civil War. It bears the rather long title: "A Dissvasive from the Errors of the Time: Where in the Tennets of the principal Sects, especially the Independents, are drawn together in one Map, for the most part, in the words of their Author, and, their maine principles are examined by the Touch-stone of the Holy Scriptures. By Robert Baylie Minister at Glasgow.

[2] John 1,1–2
[3] Matthew 10,42
[4] Mark 12,17

Printed in London at Serpent 1646." I came across this polemical writing in Edinburgh, in the Early Books and Manuscripts Department of the National Library of Scotland, actually situated some hundred yards away from the Greyfriars Church where the Scottish Covenant was signed in 1638. As I was informed in the library, the cherished, printed text is one of the very few surviving copies of the polemical writing, and, more importantly, the most complete one. Shortly after its writing and printing the Congregationalists must either have confiscated or even annihilated most of the copies of the work, after all, it attacked them very sharply.

The author of the polemical writing was, as we could see, Robert Baillie, who was born in Glasgow in 1599 where he later studied philosophy and divinity. After his Episcopal ordination by the Scottish Archbishop of St. Andrews (a university city named after the major patron saint of Scotland, the apostle and martyr St. Andrew) Baillie became professor of philosophy at Glasgow University at the very early age of 23. As it can be expected, he was present at the General Assembly of the *Kirk* in the capital city of Edinburgh in February and March 1638, in those turbulent months when the centre of the happenings was the well-known Greyfriars church.[5] Needless to say, just like others, Baillie attended the General Assembly to protest against the service-book which both King Charles and Archbishop William Laud of Canterbury, ignoring the supplications and petitions[6] wanted to be introduced in Scotland. Later, from 1643 on we find Robert Baillie in London where he was a constant member of the Westminster Assembly convened by the Long Parliament.. He was one of the envoys to sail over to the United Provinces in 1649 to plead the heir to the throne to accept the Scottish Covenant and the Crown of Scotland. As it is generally known, in late spring 1660 King Charles II, son of the executed King Charles I returned to Britain, thereby inaugurating the Restoration Period. The diplomat, politician, and, first of all, Presbyterian minister Robert Baillie, himself a good example of the interrelation of political and confessional issues, died as the Principal of his beloved Glasgow University.

Robert Baillie starts his work with a Dedication and a Preface.[7] The work is dedicated to "the Right Honourable the Earl Lauderdaile Lord Metallane"[8]

---

[5] The cemetery of the church is the graveyard of the majority of celebrated and famous Scottish persons. It is situated in central Edinburgh.

[6] Cf. Walter MAKEY, *The Church of the Covenant 1637–1651. Revolution and Social Change in Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1979. p. 28.

[7] In order to avoid confusion I will refer to the points made by him here in these two parts in Roman numerals.

At the end of the Dedication: "Your Lordships in all Christian duty to be commended R. Baylie[9]. As a Scottish Covenanter, in fact, as one of the very first persons to sign the Presbyterian Scottish National Covenant, Baillie, as he himself altered the way of spelling his name later on (and thus became known under this name) was a great confident and partisan of a number of pro-Puritan Scottish lords (as opposed to some "surviving" pro-Catholic "Highlander" lords), especially the Marquis of Argyle, Lord Balmerino (Balmerinoch in the Scottish way) and Lord Lauderdale, a leading dynasty of the peerage of Scotland. It is Lord Lauderdale to whom he dedicates his work, following the common and general practice of his age.

Baillie makes the claim that for a rather long period of time he had not had the intention to write polemical works whatsoever. He resorts to the expression that soldiers are just as much vulnerable as the authors of the polemical writings.[10] Yet he gives an apt explanation why he felt compelled to change his mind and his attitude: "It seems that yet for some time the servants of God must earnestly contend for many pretious truths, which erroneous spirits due mightily impugne: for the help and encouragement of others in that warfare, I, though among the weakest of Christs soldiers, doe offer these my endeavours."[11]

He renders a clear manifestation of his purpose with this writing of his: it was his aim to find out, where the errors of the Independents and the Brownists come from.[12] Than he continues: "I believe this my method will not be displeasing to any. I know it was acceptable enough to many of the Congregational way when lately I did use it against the Canterburian faction […]".[13] The very expression "Canterburian faction" is a recurring element and notion, the target of his actual hatred in many of Baillie's works. He regularly finds an excuse for King Charles I but puts all the blame on William Laud, the executed Archbishop of Canterbury with undeniable "Arminian", "Popish-like" preferences, the most conspicuous of which is the "pushing" of the service-or prayer-book in Scotland. Laud and his circle form the Canterburians, or, in other words, the (Canterburian) faction. One must not overlook the important fact that the words "faction", "novation", "innovation", or "novelty" were veritable "*Schimpfwörter*" in those years. Just

[8] Robert BAILLIE, *A Dissvasive from the Errors of the Time*…, London, 1646. (hereafter: BAILLIE 1646) p. II.
[9] BAILLIE 1646. p. III.
[10] Ibid, p. I.
[11] Ibid, p. II.
[12] Ibid, p. III.
[13] Ibid, p. III.

on the contrary "renovation", "reformation" implied the return to the normal way of settling things, indeed to an order divinely and naturally approved of. Even "revolution" meant the return to normality. Well, Laud and his "faction", in the eyes of Baillie, introduced "novelties" in Church and State alike (instead of a consequent Reformation). Their activity was intolerable for Baillie.

Interestingly enough, in a very peaceful way, certainly not in relation with the Canterburians, Robert Baillie inserts here the sentence that he does not want to offend "our Brethren in Error".[14] His aim is "to bring many the dissenting Brethren to approve of the Government agreed upon in the Assembly and allowed by both Houses of Parliament […] This doth suppose that our Brethren shall not be permitted to print, preach, or publish anything against the Government established in Parliament […]". [15] Behold the evidence of how much and how closely political, "governmental" issues intertwined with religious affiliations! It becomes even more explicit when he goes on to assert that the General Assembly, i.e. the annual conference of the Church of Scotland, regularly held in Edinburgh, in the Lenten Period even today, and the Parliament do everything they can to lead back "our dissenting Brethren" to the good path. This effort of them, i.e. the two institutions (a Church-institution and a State-institution) seems to be of no avail, therefore it is a rather painful obligation for these institutions, and Baillie to pronounce that their error is schism, and indeed, one of the greatest in Christian ecclesiastical history ever. Very harsh words, definitely fuelled by the uproar and complete upheaval of Britain in those Civil War years.

Before starting to examine the main *corpus* of Baillie's writing, one cannot help avoiding to make clear what "Independency" and "Brownism", the two principal "dissents" actually meant at the time. We need to take a good look at their origins, relations, and main tenets. Even more so because Marxism, in many respects, introduced here much confusion just to fit the whole issue into its theory of "the great clash of interests", sometimes even adopted by the best-known of Whig historians, *mutatis mutandis* of course.

Karl Marx made frequent references to Puritanism in his treatment of the "English bourgeois revolution." Definitely, "original capital accumulation", the "deprivation of the peasants from their lands in the course of enclosures are just as much often repeated by him and his followers. Let us restrict us to Puritanism, however, that has yet to be adequately defined. As it is well-known, as the Greek word for the Cathars of southern France in the early 13th

[14] Ibid, p. III.
[15] Ibid, p. III.

century, the Latin word "*purus*" means clean. What we need to emphasize here is that these three words: "Puritan", "Nonconformist" and " Dissenter" are synonyms, thus were used, as they can be used today, interchangeably. Puritans did not conform to the rules and, especially, the rite of the Church of England, therefore they dissented. These "men of Dissent" had two major subgroups: Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the latter also known as Independents. In fact these two English (and Scottish, though Congregational "Independency" was unable to set a firm foot in Scotland) Puritan groups, both dissatisfied with the Church of England as officially established in 1534, i.e. the Anglican "Establishment", not to mention the "High Church", "Papist-like innovations" under Queen Elizabeth and further fortified by Arminian liturgical elements, naturally demanded an outspoken, consequent, "real" Reformation of the Church of England. To be sure, when speaking about England, they all professed to be true members of the Church of England, originally called "the Catholic Church in England", after all "Catholicism" is generally laid claim to by all Christian denominations, the word referring to the entirety of Christian truths.[16] Some Congregationalists even celebrated royal birthdays in Massachusetts, thereby underlining their adherence to the Church of England and their homeland. Definitely, Robert Baillie, as a Scotsman, claimed to be a true member of the Church of Scotland. A Church that was utterly Presbyterian and not Congregationalist. The Church of Scotland, also known as the "*Kirk*", whose greatest reforming figures were John Knox and Andrew Melville was Presbyterian, Calvinist Reformed. Knox even met Calvin in Geneva before returning to Scotland via England. One ought not to hesitate in making the assertion that in the course of a uniquely quick period, in the late 1550s and early 1560s, Scotland, this old bastion and stronghold of Catholicism, with the rare exception of some Highland enclaves, went over to the Presbyterian branch of Protestant Reformation. The "speed" of this change in confession was way much slower in England, although there the "gap" and dissimilarity between Anglicanism and the "Romish rite" was much narrower. True, Scotland had her own Reformation Parliament in 1559–1560 which passed its new articles of faith but basically the Scottish Reformation was a popular movement and, unlike in England, not governed from "above". This must have been one of the principal reasons for the amazing speed of the Reformation in Scotland leading to the formation of the Catholic

[16] Similarly, "Orthodoxy", not merely in the age of confessional orthodoxies, is a common claim of Byzantine, other Eastern, Latin and all Protestant Churches, as the term "orthodox" signifies "true faith". It is the content of this "true faith" on which they differ in their interpretations.

Queen's party backed by the French (in which next to Catholicism the century-old, anti-English "Auld Alliance" between France and Scotland was a significant factor and of the Protestant King's party). The Queen was the mother, Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. The King was the son, the new Presbyterian ruler, crowned as the monarch of the Scots when he was only thirteen months old.

Coming back to the differences of Presbyterianism on the one hand and Congregationalism on the other, what one must bear in mind that it was not even primarily a difference in dogmas, doctrines, in teaching. Far more, it was mainly of ecclesiological character. Presbyterians simply followed the way John Calvin envisaged the fabric, the very structure of the Church. Alongside the regular meetings of the "presbyteries", "the groups of elders", as the ancient Greek word can be translated, there were local, regional, and finally, national synods. These latter then have differed from country to country ever since they came to birth and convened. In the United Provinces, in the Dutch Calvinist "*Kerk*", e. g. separate councils are held in the provinces forming the "*Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*". It is a unique feature in the history of Hungarian Calvinism, that superintendents very soon received their offices as bishops.

Notwithstanding these and other differences, all the Calvinist Reformed Presbyterians have a "pyramided series" of their Churches which meet on regular occasions. This is a hierarchy of synods represented in Scotland, for instance, by the aforementioned General Assembly on the highest national level.

Congregationalists or Independents, however, have always held that each congregation is fully and completely independent from the others. This is not Calvin's Genevan model, or the pattern reinforced by John Calvin's contemporary and follower in Geneva, Theodore Beza. In Congregationalism, the unity of the doctrines is not safeguarded, even if the representatives, also called elders (sic!) of the independent congregations *may* meet occasionally but without any obligation to accept and follow each others' teachings. The hierarchy of synods is completely missing. It is important to note here that both Puritan groups that crossed the Atlantic in the first half of the 17th century, i.e. the Pilgrim Fathers on board of the Mayflower in 1620, and, ten years later, in 1630 the "Puritans" on board of the Arbella ("Puritan" is the name by which they are referred to, just to distinguish them from the "Pilgrims") belonged to the Congregationalist

branch of Nonconformists.[17] The group which came ashore in 1620 was commanded by Governor William Bradford while the "Puritans'" leader a decade later was Governor John Winthrop. Both arrived to New England, actually in what is today Massachusetts. However, there was a crucial difference between these two Puritan- Nonconformist-Dissenter groups. Whereas the latter had the firm belief in their mission-consciousness to find a place in New England from where to show first of all Old England (and "the rest of the world") how, in their opinion, Jesus Christ conceived of his Church.[18] This "city-upon-a-hillism", as it is generally called by historians and social scientists alike, this mission-consciousness (so much an integral part of American self-identity even today) was completely alien to William Bradford's group. They can be classified as the separating Congregationalists, or just "Separatists" because they declined all communion with the Church of England simply denying that it was a true Church at all. In their view and firm conviction, Anglicans, just like all other branches of Christianity were unworthy of the name "Church" as they all "swept in" everyone among their ranks without examining whether the "candidate" was a true believer in Christ or not. Indeed, Protestant Christianity normally share the opinion that wherever the Word of the Lord is preached *(praedicatio Verbi)* and the (two) Sacraments are administered (*administratio Sacramenti),* there a Church is present. To these two preliminary conditions the Separatists added a third one: discipline, and, in fact, in the strictest and literal sense of the word. Therefore, they started to call themselves, and nobody else, "Saints", the only heirs of Christ's Kingdom, the only members of the New Israel, of the New Jerusalem. This attitude of the "errand into the wilderness" and building up the New Mount Zion is justifiably rendered by social science as "Puritan tribalism".

It is advisable here to clarify very shortly who the "Brownists", to whom Robert Baillie, as we will see in due turn, constantly refers, actually were. They were the separating Congregationalists or (separating Independents) just described. As to their beginning in "Old England" we can say that about 1580, a group was formed under the leadership of Robert Browne at Norwich. Browne was the first to defend publicly the act of separating from

[17] The appearance of Anglicans in the New World evidently goes back to the Elizabethan period whereas that of the Presbyterians and others, e.g. Quakers etc. to the era of the Cromwellian Commonwealth or the Restoration Period.

[18] Cf. John Winthrop's famous words "And we shall be like a City upon a Hill and all the eyes of the World looking upon us". These were the words written by Winthrop on board the Arbella in 1630 while crossing the Atlantic. The world-famous quotation can be found in Winthrop's Journal, probably one of the earliest pieces of "American" literature.

the Church of England. In the 1590s Holland became the refuge of many English religious groups. Among these we find the famous Scrooby community led by Pastor John Robinson. They came to the Low Countries in 1607, left Amsterdam for Leyden in 1609 and settled there to be known as the Leyden Congregation. A year before the expiration of the Spanish-Dutch truce, in 1620 they first sailed back to England and left the harbour of Plymouth almost right at once for the New World.

Coming to the investigation of Baillie's work which he himself calls a treatise we have to draw attention to the evidence that throughout his writing he treats (Cf. "treatise") the questions of Church and State almost as matters of one and the same entity. At the very outset of the main body of his text he makes a clear allusion to the Civil War: "While the fire of War continues to scorch every one of these miserable Dominions, it is the duty of all compassionate Countrey-men to contribute the uttermost of their best endeavours for the extinguishing of these unhappy Flames, before the remainder of all our Churches and States be burnt down to ashes." [19] The way he continues, is the best possible and conceivable proof of the interrelation of ecclesiastical and State affairs: "Long may we petition both God and men for peace in vain; long may we article and treat for that end without any successe, unlesse a reall Reformation remove from the right of God the personall abominations, the State-transgressors and the Church-impieties of our Land". [20] The demand, need and call for a "reall Reformation", i.e. without any Catholic remnants and the two spheres of State and Church are present in the same sentence. In view of what we have discussed above it cannot be surprising whatsoever. Yet the transcendental community, the Church (let us make sure, for Protestantism it has always been more emphatically "merely" transcendental than for Catholicism, which regards the Holy Mother Church as an earthly institution as well, cf. the Catholic reasoning of the establishing of the Church by Christ built upon St. Peter) does come first: "[…] the deformity of the Body Politicall, is not so unpleasant to the eye of God as the Church." [21] Then the well-known blow against "Canterbury" follows, indeed , by making the "faction" responsible for the sects with which Robert Baillie intends to deal: "Who so will observe either the spring or the progresse of our present Woes in all the three Kingdoms, will finde that the open Oppression and secret Undermining of the Common-wealth, by the craft and tyranny of the malignant Faction, did

[19] BAILLIE 1646. p. 1.
[20] Ibid, p. 2.
[21] Ibid, p. 2.

highly provoke the wrath of God, and was a great occasion of all this Discord which hath broke out among men […]".[22] In spite of the petitions to London, as referred to lately, i.e. the petitioning of the monarch, "Canterbury" introduced "idolatry", superstitions and other spirituall burthens."[23] As if we heard the arguments and "recommendations" of Hungarian Calvinist Reformed preachers seeking a remedy for and a liberation from under the Ottoman Turks, Baillie argues in a strikingly similar way: the State(s) [Great Britain, as the name was coined by King James (VI) and I and turned into a reality under Oliver Cromwell] can be put to order only after the settlement of Church affairs.[24] An apt Old Testament reference is made here by Baillie, allusions to "God's Elect" being a common theme for Puritans anyhow: "So long as the Temple lies desolate, it is not possible to rear up the wals of the City."[25] Hereafter the blame for the emerging "sects" is put on the Episcopal-Arminian-"Popish" *inventions* of Canterbury in sentence after sentence. Just to mention a few of these: "Interests of private persons and particular factions, laid over with the colour of pretended State-reasons […]";[26] "[…] None of the named Sects are births of one day; but all of them were bred and born under the wings of no other Dame the Episcopacy: the tyranny and superstition of this Step-mother was the seed and spawn of Brownism, the great root of the most sects; all which were many years ago brought forth how ever kept within the doores so long as any Church-Discipline was on foot."[27] "Episcopall Courts were never fitted for the reclaiming of minds […]"[28] This is a clear reference to the hated High Commission of the Established Church. Baillie compares this to the true Reformed practice "But the Reformed Presbitery doeth proceed in a spirituall method evidently fitted for the gaining of hearts; they go on with the offending party with all respect and at so much leasure as can be wished, appointing first the fittest Pastors and Elders […]".[29] If they fail in their effort to reform the wicked," the Consistory of the Congregation" deals with the issue. In Protestant vein, Baillie does not forget to underline that, contrary to "Papists", the Presbyterians always argue on the basis of the Holy Writ.[30] They, again in

[22] Ibid, p. 2.
[23] Ibid, p. 2.
[24] Ibid, p. 3.
[25] Ibid, p. 3.
[26] Ibid, p. 3.
[27] Ibid, p. 7.
[28] Ibid, p. 7.
[29] Ibid, p. 7.
[30] Ibid, p. 7.

contrast with Catholics, "hardly ever excommunicate anyone" and never render the culprits over to the worldly authorities, [31] a conspicuous allusion to the Catholic Inquisition. One could, however, let us add, find contrary examples especially from Protestants in Northern Europe in Early Modern Times. Therefore Baillie, as he made it clear in the Introduction to his work, does not want to offend those "who went astray",[32] and puts all the blame for the flourishing of the sects on the bishops.[33]

Here Baillie congratulates the Reformed Churches to have "settled all their problems" [of dissent] "in Scotland, Switzerland, Germany, and France."[34] Next to England, Holland is the only exception. No wonder, he goes on, as in the United Provinces only one General Assembly was held over the past forty years. He most probably thinks of the Synod of Dort(recht) of the years 1618–1619. For England he demands "the Liberty of Consistories of Congregations, the Liberty of Presbyteries for Counties, the Liberty of Synods for larger Shires and the Liberty for National Assemblies for the whole Land."[35] This is the evident adherence to Presbyterianism as opposed to Congregationalism as we have discussed it in detail. No wonder again, he mentions Scotland, his native country as a great example for English Puritans: "[…] as Scotland hath long possessed these by the unanimous consent of King and Parliament without the least prejudice to the civill State but to the evident and confessed benefit thereof."[36]

In Chapter I Robert Baillie discusses "the Original and Progresse of the Brownists". He calls the Protestant Reformation the greatest gift of God. [37] A Reformation "of Religion from Antichristian pollution and tyranny" [38] The Pope is "the Prince of Darkness, Satan and Antichrist".[39] What follows on the pages to come is an enumeration of the victories of God over Satan in Protestant countries.[40] However, unfortunately "Luther and his followers […] became utterly impatient of all contradiction that Calvin and his Brethren should go beyond them to cry down a corporall presence of Christ in the

[31] Ibid, p. 7.
[32] Ibid, p. 7.
[33] Ibid p. 6.
[34] Ibid, p. 8.
[35] Ibid, p. 8.
[36] Ibid, p. 8.
[37] Ibid, p. 9.
[38] Ibid, p. 9.
[39] Ibid, p. 9.
[40] Ibid, pp. 9–11.

bread of the Sacrament, to remove images from Churches […]".[41] Truly, Lutheranism has adhered to the Catholic doctrine of real (corporal and not merely spiritual) presence, the dogma of *realpraesentia,* even if replacing transubstantiation with consubstantiation. Fair enough, not unlike Anglicans, they retained many of the Catholic "images" in church interiors.

Baillie than accuses the Anabaptists of the other extremity of "intemperate zeal".[42] Let us remember, for Luther himself Anabaptists were "*Schwärmer*", i.e. zealots. "Both those bitter roots were quickly transplanted from Germany to England".[43] On the one hand Baillie makes the assertion that Thomas Cranmer [44] and others rather followed Luther than Calvin, Bucer, or Martyr".[45] On the other hand, "the Lineants of Anabaptism are clear and distinct in the face of Brownism".[46] This remark made here by Robert Baillie is highly contestable. Nevertheless, he claims the following: "the ordinary running over of Separatists to the Anabaptists, demonstrates clearly enough who were their fathers of all, and who are their best bellowed Brethren this day".[47] On pages 13–20 Baillie enumerates the Brownist leaders: "The first Separatist I read of was one Bolton […]" of whom he mentions that he hanged himself.[48] Than he makes mention of the name-giver of the group, Robert Browne as "Brown, the second leader of the way, recanted Schism, and to his death was a very scandalous person".[49] There is no need to reiterate all the names of the Brownist Separatist leaders whom he mentions one after the other, certainly recalling their voyage to the Netherlands and dismissing them all as wicked and erroneous persons.

In Chapter II on "the Doctrine of the Brownists" he correctly remarks that concerning "the Constitution of the Church […] the Church of England, they say it ought not to be called a Church".[50] Consequently, "[…] all Communion with her even in the Word and Prayer, is to be forsaken".[51] To make matters worse, "Concerning other Reformed Churches […] they pronounce their Worship to be idolatrous, their Government tyrannous and Antichristian […]

---

[41] Ibid, p. 11.
[42] Ibid, p. 11.
[43] Ibid, p. 11.
[44] The first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury executed under Queen Mary (Tudor).
[45] BAILLIE 1646. p. 11.
[46] Ibid p. 12.
[47] Ibid, p. 13.
[48] Ibid, p. 13.
[49] Ibid, p. 14.
[50] Ibid, p. 20.
[51] Ibid, p. 21.

that the Reformed Presbyteries and Synods are no better then the English Episcopacy […]".[52] *Horribile dictu*, they even dare to criticize Calvin.[53] True indeed, they did criticized him and disagreed with him for his acceptance of all the former Catholics to the new Reformed Church in Geneva.

Regarding other aspects of Brownism, Robert Baillie mentions among others that each member of their congregations is allowed to preach loudly,[54] that sometimes they partake in the two Sacraments without a minister,[55] It occurred that somebody baptized himself, they are forbidden to utter the names of the week, these having pagan origins,[56] they even dismiss the word "Sacrament" calling it idolatrous.[57] Interestingly, however, the Lord's Supper is administered every Sunday yet without preparation scermons.[58] One must note here that originally Calvin did recommend the daily but at least weekly administration of the Lord's Supper[59] and the preparation sermons lasting normally a week before the Sunday when the Lord's Supper is administered, have become a crucial part in Scottish Presbyterianism.

Baillie mentions it as a shock that the Brownists sit to the Lord's Table with their hats on,[60] make no use of any catechisms, disregard the Apostolic Creed and deny the descendence of Christ to Hell.[61] What is most important, however, from the point of view of our investigation, is the following: "[…] their great Tenet about the Magistracy is this; That no Prince nor State on the earth hath any Legislative power; That neither King nor Parliament can make any Law in anything that concerns either Church or State. That God alone is the Law-giver, that the greatest Magistrate hath no other power, but to execute the Laws of God set downe in Scripture, that the judiciall Law of Moses binds at his day all the Nations of the world […]".[62] These tenets of the Brownists as Baillie calls them need no comment in view of what we have written earlier in this article. It is furthermore interesting that Baillie remarks

---

[52] Ibid, p. 21.
[53] Ibid, p. 21.
[54] Ibid, p. 25.
[55] Ibid, p. 26.
[56] Ibid,p. 28.
[57] Ibid, p. 29.
[58] Ibid, p. 30.
[59] he fact that this did not set root in Calvinist Reformed Churches is a clear evidence of Ulrich Zwingli's influence on "Calvinism". The Reformer of Zurich, as it is well-known, opted for the teaching of memorialism based on Jesus's Words: "Do this in memory of me". Zwingli's dispute with Martin Luther in Marburg is also a generally known event in ecclesiastical history.
[60] BAILLIE 1646. p. 30.
[61] Ibid, p. 30.
[62] Ibid, p. 31.

that the Separatists name all "worldly" science idolatrous, would close all schools,[63] and prohibit the reading of any other book for preachers but that of the Bible.[64] From the end of page 32 to page 52 the reader can find "Testimonies" of the Brownists which all are meant to support Baillie's stand and none of which can be discussed here as it would by far overstep the frameworks of this article.

Page 53 is the beginning of Chapter III bearing the title "The Original and Progresse of the Independents and of their Carriage in New-England". It is remarkable that the discussion of the separating Independents, i.e. the Brownists preceded that of the non-separating ones. The reasons for this must be that Robert Baillie did not share the view of modern Church historians as regards the relations and origins of Independency and "Separatism".

Also, it is conspicuous that Baillie asks the pardon of Congregationalists (consequently called by him Independents) for calling them a sect.[65] The main problem for Baillie is that Independents are present "in the Houses of Parliament in London, in the Army, and in the City and Countrey-Committies".[66] This does not take us by surprise in the Cromwellian era. Yet it is surprising and, much more significantly, incorrect in view of modern historiography, that Baillie writes the following sentence about Independents (Congregationalists): "Concerning their Originall; The Separatist were their Fathers".[67] Earlier in this article we tried to refute this assertion. What is striking is that Baillie right at once connects Independents to America by saying that a part of Independents "did carry" [the teachings of the Separatists] "over to Plymouth in New-England".[68] All this is true of the Bradford-group, the aforementioned Pilgrim Fathers of 1620 but Baillie here clearly misses the line of descent. Interesting is his claim that "Here" [in America] "it was when that new way begin first to be dangerous to the rest of the World".[69] The expression "rest of the world" is very much recalling the American mission-consciousness treated by us above.

Concerning the New World Baillie mentions a number of names (e. g. Cotton, Hutchinson, Hooker, Davenport), some of whom I discussed in my

[63] Ibid, p. 32.
[64] Ibid, p. 32.
[65] Ibid, p. 53.
[66] Ibid, p. 53.
[67] Ibid, p. 53.
[68] Ibid, p. 54.
[69] Ibid, p. 55.

article back in 1996.[70] What interests us more here is the way Baillie criticizes New England Congregationalists. He makes the claim that they call the overwhelming majority of Christians pagans,[71] they refuse to administer the Sacraments to many members of their own (sic!) congregations, saying that they are not "regenerates".[72] Baillie says that he hoped that the Puritans in America would open the way to conversion for the "poor Indians" but "the principles and practice of the Independents doeth crosse this blessed hope".[73] They only preach to their own congregations,[74] and "Of all that ever crossed the American Seas they are noted as most neglectful of the work of conversion." [75] Furthermore, "they did avow openly the personall inhabitation of the Spirit in all the godly, his immediate revelations without the Word; and these as infallible as Scripture it selfe."[76] On the basis of what we do know of New England non-separating Congregationalism, especially in Boston, the "New Jerusalem", these are correct remarks.[77] Baillie says that the Independents hold that the human body of Christ is not in Heaven but in the Church.[78] The "*corpus mysticum*" evidently comes here to our mind.

Baillie regards it as a dangerous self-assurance that they look on themselves as the only "Saints" on earth while referring to everybody else as Papist, idolatrous and the avowed enemy of the Gospel.[79] Instead of making the futile and superfluous attempt to go over to the "Testimonies" that are meant to buttress Baillie's claims on pages 65–75, let us make a brief clarification of what Boston Independents did hold about "regeneration". Perhaps the greatest scholar of New England Puritanism, Perry Miller does not attribute "orthodox Congregationalism" to New Plymouth, i.e. to the Separatists but to Boston.[80] Indeed, it is strange that while all Puritans shared the view of the distinction of the visible and invisible Church of Christ and the Brownists denied that the Church of England as a visible Church could

---

[70] Bálint RADÓ, 'Az új-angliai kongregacionalisták vitái az ó-angliai egyházértelmezések tükrében', [The Disputes of New England Congregationalists in the Light of Old England Concepts of Ecclesiology] In: *In Memoriam Barta Gábor. Tanulmányok Barta Gábor emlékére.* Ed. I. LENGVÁRI, Pécs, 1996. 309–322. (hereafter: RADÓ 1996)
[71] BAILLIE 1646. p. 59.
[72] Ibid,p. 60.
[73] Ibid, p. 60.
[74] Ibid,p. 60.
[75] Ibid,p. 60.
[76] Ibid, p. 61.
[77] RADÓ 1996. p. 318.
[78] BAILLIE 1646. p. 61.
[79] Ibid, p. 62.
[80] Perry MILLER, *The New England Mind.* Boston, 1963. pp. 379–380.

ever approximate the real, the invisible one, and it was them who first demanded that only "saints" possessing *fides salvificans* can be Church-members, finally, the precondition of the "saving faith" was demanded by non-separating Puritans of Massachusetts whom Robert Baillie calls Independents. In this procedure the Antinomian controversy played a key role, in New England linked to the name of Anne Hutchinson, finally, in 1637 banned from Massachusetts. Hutchinson had adhered to John Cotton, the minister of the "First Church" of Boston. Cotton's idea was that in the course of conversion, regeneration, humans are just as passive as at their birth, at generation. He was attacked by the theologian of Connecticut, Thomas Hooker.[81]

Antinomianism could only be overcome by making the assertion that the *certitudo salutis* is possible, even if candidates for Church membership might sometimes be unsure of their own, personal salvation. New England divinity maintained that there was a certain "Church Covenant", hence the names "Covenant or federal theology". This meant that provided that the persons of the "Covenant of Grace" in Christ can mutually demonstrate their "saving faiths", they are "Saints" and can form a congregation. They are a Church, the Church, as matters stand. It is then these Church-members' exclusive right to decide whom they receive after having searched for the candidates' *fides salvificans*. In 1679, John Cotton Jr. described this rather unique. particular and strange procedure.[82]

Calvin and the Presbyterians had not found anything in the Holy Scriptures to justify a procedure like this. Their standpoint has been a brilliant counterpart of the ideas of those who called themselves "Saints". Calvin and his followers abhorred elitism which restricted Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and even Church-membership. The sectarian character of many New England groups became obvious. We can share Robert Baillie's firm estimation that telling a sect from a Church is much more than a subjective feeling. Abstract measures do exist.

On page 75 Chapter IV starts under the title "The Carriage of the Independents in Holland, at Roterdam, and Arnhem". Here Baillie writes about their first leader in Rotterdam, Peters, of whom he remarks that that Cotton sent him letters from New England and then Peters himself sailed to America being replaced by Ward and Bridge from Norwich. [83] Baillie mentions that these Independents could not attract a single, definitely

[81] "The Soules Preparation for Christ" (1632) and " The Unbeleevers Preparing for Christ (1638)
[82] Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Publications, XXII. 1920. 145.
[83] BAILLIE 1646. p.75.

Presbyterian, Dutchman.[84] He also makes the not unimportant remark that these Independents dismiss both the Parliament and the National Synod.[85] Here, again, State and Church authorities are set next to one another.

What is more, Baillie accuses them of the claim that God can be acknowledged without the Scriptures and Christ.[86] He calls it sheer Popery and a nonsense.[87] In fact, let us add, Catholicism does hold that the existence, greatness and the love of God can be acknowledged from nature, from the Creation. Yet Baillie, and many other Protestants, went off the target by saying that this is what made no sense at all. Catholicism has always referred to the *inscripta nobis, imprinta nobis* Law of Nature which is the Light of Jesus Christ "at the bottom of everyone's heart". As a matter of fact, it is the "inherent Bible".[88] Also, Baillie mentions that the English Independents in Holland sometimes use "the Extreme unction", of which he abhorres. [89] Actually both Latin and Eastern Christianity find a Biblical passage for what is nowadays called the "Sacrament of the Sick".[90]

Again, "Testimonies" follow, from page 82 to page 101. After these the numbering of the chapters is false, as Chapter IV is followed by Chapter VI. This has the title "An Enumeration of the common Tenets of the Independents". It is remarkable how Baillie argues here. As the Brownists dismiss the Church of England, the Independents refuse all communion with other Reformed Churches.[91] This claim of Baillie is simply untrue. First, Brownists disacknowledged all other Churches but their own whereas the Independents did accept the Church of England as a true Church. What is logical in Baillie's reasoning is that he asks the question why the Independents left Anglicanism.[92] Our answer is very simple and just as logical: because of the Catholic elements in the liturgy of the Established Church. Robert Baillie treats the Covenant idea of New England Independents[93] we have just discussed and we will still have to treat in brief.

Thereafter he goes on to the examination of the liturgical practices of the Independents. He disagrees with Cotton's view that the congregation is

[84] Ibid, p. 75.
[85] Ibid, p. 78.
[86] Ibid, p. 80.
[87] Ibid, p. 80.
[88] Cf. Romans 2,14–15
[89] BAILLIE 1646. p.81.
[90] James 5,14
[91] BAILLIE 1646. pp.103–104.
[92] Ibid, p. 104.
[93] Ibid, pp 105–111.

above the group of elders.[94] Baillie enumerates the points of Independent practice he is virtually horrified by. In London, for instance, private men often celebrate the Sacraments.[95] Is worthy of note here that he resorts to the Catholic turn of speech "celebration". Also, he mentions, Independents, as we have seen, hold Church councils but without any jurisdictional consequence.[96] Everyone is allowed to form an opinion about the "Churches of the World". [97] Marriage is conducted in the presence of worldly magistrates.[98] Actually, this is a practice of today's Southern Baptist and Methodist Churches in the "Bible Belt" of the United States, let us add here. Just like Brownists, the Independents do not pronounce the names of the days and months and insist on the prohibition of holding Church gatherings in church buildings which had been Catholic before.[99] They never ever use the Bible in their sermons, just to emphasize spontaneity.[100] The sermons are followed by prophesying after which the members of the congregation can ask the Preachers and the "Prophets" doctrinal questions.[101]

What Baillie, however, has no objection to is that unlike Brownists the Independents do have set prayers in their services and during the worship they recite the Lord's Prayer. [102] He finds it especially great that the Independents regularly pray for the King and the Church. [103] Whereas Brownists take the Lord's Supper in the morning, they do so in the evening.[104] However, Baillie mentions it with complete disagreement that Independents are willing to take the Lord's Supper with Brownists and Anabaptists while decline any kind of intercommunion with all other Reformed Churches.[105] After the service any member of an Independent

[94] Ibid, p. 110.
[95] Ibid, p. 111.
[96] Ibid, p. 112.
[97] Ibid, p. 114.
[98] Ibid, p. 115.
[99] Ibid, p. 116.
[100] Ibid, p. 118.
[101] Ibid, p. 118.
[102] Ibid, p. 119.
[103] Ibid, p. 118.
[104] Cf. the changes in the Catholic Church: the partaking of the Holy Eucharist in the morning worship is justified by the Resurrection of Christ whereas the administration of the same Most Blessed Sacrament in the evening recalls the Last Supper. After the Second Vatican Council all restrictions in this matter have been abolished.
[105] BAILLIE 1646. p. 120.

congregation can utter his or her view, which for Baillie is identical with "destroying of the State both Civil and Ecclesiastick".[106]

Once again we encounter the interrelation of the Church and State. Robert Baillie is practically shocked by the Independents' idea that the secular magistrates have no word in the ecclesiastic matters.[107] Moreover, neither the "Prince nor the State" can pass secular laws, let alone Church ones.[108] For them, just like for orthodox Jews today, we can add, the only secular law is the Mosaic one.[109] Therefore, Robert Baillie's conclusion is that "Independency [is] much more dangerous then Brownisme."[110]

After the "Testimonies", mainly taken from John Cotton's writings between page 130 and 154, Chapter VII is inaugurated as "It is unjust scrupulosity to require satisfaction of the grace of every Church-Member". In this question, Baillie states, and indeed, as we have seen in details, they, i.e. the Independents (Congregationalists) by far surpass the Brownists.[111] It is just natural and evident that Baillie writes the following about the Independent tenets: "[…] their Tenet about the qualification of members, is the great cause of their separating from all the Reformed Churches."[112] This separation from Calvinism is appalling for Baillie, as we have seen. He, being a strict Calvinist (Presbyterian) kind of admired the great Genevan Reformer. Quite on the contrary to John Calvin's teaching Independents hold that "all Magistrates are Corrupt", just like other Reformed Churches.[113] They (i.e. the Independents) find it absurd to allow "anybody" in the Reformed congregations.[114] Baillie gives an accurate answer to this: neither Moses nor the Prophets dismissed their own people.[115] Robert Baillie's, quite convincing, argument in this matter is that no visible congregation can ever be perfect and, therefore, perfectly "clean".[116] Congregationalists demand the immediate dissolution of all Reformed Churches, including that of the Donatists,[117]and it is their firm stand that all communion with, in their own

[106] Ibid, p. 123.
[107] Ibid, pp 126–127.
[108] Ibid, p. 128.
[109] Ibid, p. 128.
[110] Ibid, pp 129–130.
[111] Ibid, p. 154.
[112] Ibid, p. 155.
[113] Ibid, p. 155. It is widely known how important the magistrates were for Calvin.
[114] Ibid, p. 156.
[115] Ibid, p. 157.
[116] Ibid, p. 159.
[117] 4th-century Christian sect named after their chief ideologist, Donat, bishop of Carthage. They believed in the possibility of immaculate holiness and perfection in this world. Ibid, p. 162.

words, "communities falsely called Churches" must be refused.[118] Baillie also makes the claim that the few whom they do baptize are adults, they simply do not practice infant baptism.[119] It is well known how vehemently Calvin fought for infant baptism arguing with Christ's Word: "Let the children come to me".[120] This must be the main reason for Baillie almost to equate Independents and Anabaptists.[121] On pages 165–167 the author ridicules the Independent's belief that they are "God's only Elect", the only true believers and "Saints".[122] They hold, so Baillie, that "God receives none to be members of the visible Church, but those who shall be saved: but the Stewards of Gods house may receive none but whom God doeth receives: *Ergo*, the Stewards of Gods house may receive none to be members of a visible Church but those who shall be saved."[123] The Presbyterian minister gives an astonishingly good answer to this Independent practice: even the traitor, Judas Iscariot was elected by Jesus.[124] It is difficult to imagine how his polemicists could have retorted. Still Baillie continues, in the Independent practice only those "appearing" in the "wedding robe"[125] can be accepted as Church-members[126] Sinners can be no members of the Church of Christ – to which Baillie gives the obvious reply that Christ himself regularly ate with them.[127]

Robert Baillie does not forget the Old Testament times, either by claiming that "Legall uncleanness did never hinder any from Church membership under the Old Testament, albeit for a time it might impede their fellowship in some services.[128] Perhaps in order to connect the Old and New Testaments, he refers to the "linking figure" between the two, John the Baptist while refuting the Independent idea that Jesus' immediate forerunner refused to

[118] Ibid, p. 163.
[119] Ibid, p. 164.
[120] Mark 10,14
[121] BAILLIE 1646. p. 164.
[122] Ibid, pp. 165–167.
[123] Ibid, p. 168.
[124] Ibid, p. 169.
[125] Evidently a reference to Matthew 22,1–14, a Biblical passage often misunderstood even today after all, the people in the streets could have no idea in advance that they would be "forced", i.e. cordially invited to the wedding feast, thus they clearly did not wear a wedding robe. These were offered by the janitors in the Middle East tradition as a kind of a uniform, so that nobody could boast. This is what Jesus refers to when he says hard words ("[…] and the gnashing of teeth") about a person who refused to put on the robe. This is a good example, actually, how dangerous and the misleading it can be if the Biblical text is torn off from its Church context in which it was written.
[126] BAILLIE 1646. p. 170.
[127] Ibid, p. 171.
[128] Ibid, p. 172.

baptize the Pharisees.[129] Yes, he said harsh words about them but "all" he demanded of them was the repentance of their sins.[130]

At this point we need to stop for a while. Robert Baillie a distinguished minister of the Church of Scotland i.e. the *Kirk* was a Covenanter himself. After all, this is what they signed in downtown Edinburgh early in 1638. This Covenant can justly be regarded as their self – identity as Presbyterian Scots. Church and State were though separate yet in the Covenant they sort of intrinsically intertwined.

The Covenant preached by New England Congregationalists was completely different from this. They distinguished the Old Testament Covenant of Works, the New Testament Covenant of Grace, and, finally, as a third level, their own Church Covenant. Presbyterian leaders started to direct voluminous pamphlets against New England Congregationalists charging them with schism. Presbyterians certainly clung to the ideal of a comprehensive Calvinistic Church. The original Calvinist idea evidently underlined the significance of the community of the elders and the synods as the guarantee of doctrinal unity. The heart of New England Church theory was the Church Covenant. Regenerate people, their theory ran, acquired a liberty to observe God's will and when a company of them congregated, they could satisfy each other that they are people of faith. Each society was an autonomous unit and no synods or assemblies had any power to dictate a "holy congregation". The members, from whom the Church originates, perpetuate it by receiving into the fellowship those whom they judged to be within the Covenant of Grace. Presbyterians, on the other hand, preached the theological Covenant. A Church, they said, must include the whole nation, everyone living under one civil government.

Chapter VII in Baillie's work is "Concerning the right of Prophesying". This was another issue of crucial importance in the debates between Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Baillie writes that according to Calvin's Genevan principle and practice it is only two of the four Church orders conceived of by the great Genevan Reformer, i.e. the ministers and the doctors, who are entitled to preach.[131] Contrarily, in Independency, all the Church-members have the right to do so[132] claiming that Christ combined preaching with sermonizing.[133] To this Robert Baillie gives the answer that

[129] Ibid, p. 173.
[130] Ibid, p. 173.
[131] Ibid, p. 174.
[132] Ibid, p. 174.
[133] Ibid, p. 175.

the latter right was only given to the apostles and their successors by Jesus Christ.[134] By referring to 1 Timothy 5,17[135] as well as Titus 1,5[136] on pages 178–180 Baillie refutes that the prophesyings causing, let us add here, so many calamities and even further dissents in Massachusetts, are allowed for every Church-member. Quite on the contrary, "The Apostle [only] speaks of the Preaching of men in Office."[137]

This chapter is not followed by any "Testimonies" but immediately (with an obvious misnumbering) Chapter IX comes under the title "Whether the power of Eclesiastick Jurisdiction belongs to the people or to the Presbytery". One must not regard the fact that perhaps Roman Catholicism ("Popery" for Baillie) is the only branch of Christianity where the jurisdictional question has unanimously been solved. One cannot be taken by surprise that Presbyterians on the one hand and Independents (Congregationalists) on the other, did differ on this vital issue, at least vital from the point of view of Church governance.

First and foremost, Baillie defines that the following tasks and rights belong to "the company of Elders, and Colledge of Church Govenors in all reformed Churches:" "[…] the admission of Members into a Church, their casting out again by Excommunication, their reconciliation after repentance, the Ordination of Officers, the Deposition from charge, the determining of Questions and the deciding of Controversies, and such other acts of Ecclesiastick authority."[138] Here, one has to see clearly that the authority of presbyteries is at stake. Baillie, correctly, ascribes the total disagreement with the points enumerated by him above to Brownists and Independents alike.[139] Although he mentions that the Independents speak of a "mid-way" (i.e. mixed) government in their congregations, that is the combined government of Church officers and Church-members,[140] he must come to the sad conclusion that in practice Independents do not insist on the mixed government: "[…] their Ordination of Officers, their admission of Members are done ordinarily by their people alone."[141] This means by the members of the congregations and not even in an agreement and with the consent of the presbyteries, the group of elders. The Scottish Presbyterian Robert Baillie

[134] Ibid, p. 175.
[135] Ibid, p. 176.
[136] Ibid, p. 177.
[137] Ibid, p. 179.
[138] Ibid, p. 181.
[139] Ibid, p. 181.
[140] Ibid, p. 182.
[141] Ibid, p. 182.

denounces this practice and maintains that "[…] the people are *not* the Governors of the Church. But the acts of Ecclesiasticke Jurisdiction belong to the Governors of the Church; *Ergo*, the acts of Ecclesiasticke Jurisdiction belong not to the people."[142] It goes without saying, definitely not in a Catholic way, he writes: "[…] whosoever hath the power of Ecclesiastic Jurisdiction, to them the Lord hath given the Keyes of Heaven for the remitting and retaining of sinnes. But to none *of* the people the Lord hath given these Keyes."[143] Than he adds that "The people are not the eyes and ears of Christs body for so all the body should be eyes and ears."[144] His conclusion is that "[…] the popular government brings in confusion, making the feet above the head"[145] and "the people have not the power of Ecclesiastick Ordination."[146] If they had it, the Church would simply be in the state of complete anarchy as Church-members could not devote enough attention and time to their everyday work to earn their own and their families' living.[147] Yes indeed in Athens, Rome and Holland (!) people had and have the final authority, yet only through their officers representing them.[148]

From a Catholic perspective it deserves much interest when the Presbyterian Robert Baillie dismisses the tenet of the Independents that Christ gave Peter the power of Keys for his profession (in Protestant terminology confession) of faith and therefore to all the believers.[149] Baillie remarkably writes that (St.) Peter received this authority from Christ as the Redeemer's apostle and presbyter."[150] As a member of the Scottish *Kirk* it could hardly have been Baillie's intention to defend the Catholic position, yet, in his controversy with the Independents, he came quite close to how "Rome" has always interpreted the "power of Keys".

On pages 191–195 Robert Baillie comes forth with a number of Independent claims for the authority of all Church-members, that is the "regenerates", the "Saints". These are all supposed to buttress the Independent view and practice of immediate Church government of

[142] Ibid, p. 183.
[143] Ibid, p. 184.
[144] Ibid, p. 184.
[145] Ibid, p. 185.
[146] Ibid, p. 186.
[147] Ibid, p. 187.
[148] Ibid, p. 187.
[149] Ibid, p. 189.
[150] Ibid, p. 190.

Church-members. These are Col. 4,17[151], Revelations 2,14–20[152], Galatians 5,1–13.[153] Baillie, as can be expected of him, one after the other refutes and denounces these, attributing the jurisdictional rights to the elected group of elders of the given congregation. Calling the immediate authority of Church-members a mere nonsense [154] he concludes this chapter, omits the "Testimonies" again and goes on to Chapter X which bears the title "Independency is contrary to the word of God". The title itself indicates that this is meant to be a final blow against Independency, sort of summing up the points of their dissent, verily, their schism, as we have seen before.

Conspicuously interesting and remarkable is Robert Baillie's assertion that ever since the original sin happened, God destined people for community life, in fact, because of their evident and in evitable inclination for sinning. Without uttering anything on the *"status naturae"* of which Calvin held that "*in statu naturae"*, i.e. in the state after Creation human free will was as strong as to retain eternal life, Baillie, the Calvinist, attributes the complete loss and forfeiture of free will after the Fall, so thereafter sin becomes unavoidable. Christ is the only and exclusive Saviour via *heterosoteria*. Nonetheless, this is not what primarily exercises Baillie's mind here. He is rather more interested in the government of people after the Fall, and this he presents, in an Augustinian vein. Let us remark, there is nothing strange in the fact that he chooses St. Augustine instead of e.g. St. Thomas of Aquinas. Protestants have always had a preference for Augustine and for his rather negative view of humanity as a "*massa damnata"*. Whereas for Thomas the state is a natural phenomenon, and, therefore, good in itself, good because natural and necessary, for Augustine it was a necessary evil. This latter (chronologically earlier) view is shared by Baillie. He mentions that this notion for the need for human government, whether Church or State was first disregarded by the Anabaptists,[155] than by the Dutch Hugo Grotius, i.e. de Groot, whose Remonstrant-Arminian standpoint he must have been very familiar with. Baillie hated Arminianism[156] and there is no reason to belive that he failed to pay proper attention to the Synod of Dort where Grotius played an important role and at the end of which he was imprisoned for his views on the nature of predestination.

---

[151] Ibid, pp. 191–192.
[152] Ibid, p. 193.
[153] Ibid, pp. 194–195.
[154] Ibid, p. 195.
[155] Ibid, p. 196.
[156] Cf. N. R. N. TYACKE, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and counter-revolution', In: C. RUSSELL (ed.), *Origins of the English Civil War*. Oxford, 1983. pp. 25–42.

Than the author mentions both the Independents and the Brownists, who share the negligence of the Anabaptists and the, let us make clear, Calvinist Grotius. [157] Turning to Church communities, Baillie gives significant definitions: a parish equals a congregation which is a "a company of faithfull people".[158] "A *Presbytery*, as it is called in Scotland, or a Classis in Holland, or a Colloque, as in France, is an ordinary meeting of the Pastors of the Churches nearby neighbouring, and of the ruling Elders deputed there from."[159]A *Synod*, is a convention of Pastors and Elders sent and deputed from diverse Presbyteries."[160] Based on what we can read in Timothy 4,14, Baillie makes clear: "The single congregations are not Independent" [161] and elsewhere, "ordination belongs to the Presbytery".[162] In his argument the Apostle Paul left no doubt whatsoever that "[…] the gift, office, and grace of Preaching the Gospel was conferred on Timothy by laying on of the Presbyteries hand." [163] Therefore, "Only Pastors lay hand on Pastors". [164] Thereby Baillie describes the essence of Apostolic succession. It is a further consequence that "No single Congregation exerciseth ordinarily all acts of Eclesiasticke Jurisdiction."[165] One of Robert Baillie's chief points of argument is when he refers to Matthew 8: "the subordination of fever to more appointed by Christ means that […] a Parochial Church is subordinate to a Presbyterial: for a lesser Church is subordinated to a greater […]."[166] He accuses the Independents of a demolishing the evident and logical structure of the Church.[167] To support this, he recalls the "inner" schisms of Brownists and Independents among themselves. [168] Also, he says that "[…] the Government of the Scottish Church by Synods, Presbyteries and Sessions sworne and subscribed of old and late by that Nation in their solemne Covenant, the same discipline of the Churches of France, Holland, Switz, Geneva, as also the Polity of the High Dutch and English, and all the rest who are called Reformed, is turned upside down by Independency […]".[169]

---

[157] BAILLIE 1646. p. 197.
[158] Ibid, p. 198.
[159] Ibid, p. 198.
[160] Ibid, p. 199.
[161] Ibid, p. 199.
[162] Ibid, p. 199.
[163] Ibid, p. 200.
[164] Ibid, p. 201.
[165] Ibid, p. 202.
[166] Ibid, p. 209.
[167] Ibid, pp. 210–211.
[168] Ibid, pp. 212–214.
[169] Ibid, p. 215.

By "all the rest" he can have meant the Hungarian Calvinist Reformed Church as well. So his accusation of the Independents is extended to a number of Reformed Churches where this tendency was not present at all. What is more, Hungarian Calvinism was already a combination of Episcopal and Council-Presbyterian models.

From the Acts 5,20 Baillie underlines that "It seemed good to the Apostles elders and whole Church".[170] Henceforth further Biblical passages are referred to between pages 218 and 222. The summary of these is given by Baillie in maintaining the conviction that to elect a minister by the congregation and to ordain him by other pastors are to basically different events.[171]

As this chapter is not followed by any "Testimonies" either, the last one is inaugurated under the title "The thousand years of Christ his visible Reigne upon earth is against Scripture." Here Baillie definitely thinks of Chilialism and calls the "Saints", i.e. the Independents against whom he writes his polemic work Chilialists.[172] He asserts that "Christ from his Ascention to the last Judgement abides in Heaven"[173] and "[…] is sitting at the right hand of God till the day of Judgement".[174] It is understandable that Baillie finishes his treatise with the discussion of eschatological questions. While between pages 229–235 he treats this rather sophisticated theological area, on page 236 he refutes the Independent "sainthood" once and for all: "Our Chiliasts are inventors of a new heaven and hell […] " whereas "[…] the Kingdome of Christ is Spirituall like his Priesthood […]".[175] Christ is eternal, he cannot be measured in and confined to one thousand years.[176] The rest of this concluding chapter abounds in Biblical passages from the Old and New Testaments, especially and naturally enough, from the Book of Revelations.[177] Before putting the closing word "FINIS" at the end of his writing he thus dismisses the arrogant and elitist view of the earthly, "visible Saints" propagated by New England Independents.

This political treatise by Robert Baillie was written in what is called in ecclesiastical history "the age of confessional orthodoxies". Just to mention the most significant documents, Lutherans with Philip Melanchthon's

[170] Ibid, p. 217.
[171] Ibid, p. 222.
[172] Ibid, p. 224.
[173] Ibid, p. 226.
[174] Ibid, p. 227.
[175] Ibid, p. 236.
[176] Ibid, p. 237.
[177] Ibid, pp. 237–250.

Confession Augustana , Calvinists with the Catechism of Heidelberg, Catholics with the decisions of the Council of Trent, Anglicans in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* , all put down their confessional tenets. To these they each adhered with extreme fervour in the 17th century as well, understandable in the period of complete confessional upheaval when each of these "orthodoxies" were under constant attacks from other "orthodoxies". 20th-century ecumenism was definitely still a very long way ahead.

Also, the polemical writing was written in the midst of the Civil War, justly called and referred to as "the Religious Wars of the British Isles", if we consider that the *apropos* of the outbreak of the Civil War was the Scottish military attack due to the enforced *English* Third Book of Common Prayer (of 1559), that "smacked of Popery". Needless to say, England and Wales were very much involved in the war and the Irish could tell us stories about what they had to experience in those years, too …

We must not overlook another aspect here, either. In the Marxist "cannon" Presbyterians were the "right wing" "revolutionaries", Independents the "left wing" warriors. The real heroes for them are, it goes without saying, the Levellers and even more the Diggers. (Just like Thomas Münzer as opposed to Martin Luther in the former "GDR".) Ever since this interpretation an the notion of the "English bourgeois revolution " – a term never ever used by any Anglo-Saxon historian infiltrated into the Eastern European minds, it is always shocking and provoking to a great number of people that these *confessional,* in many cases (certainly not considering the illustrated, rather peculiar New England "tribalism" here) merely *ecclesiological* divisions were primarily of religious and not of political character even if the Presbyterians, from the outbreak of the Civil War, undoubtedly showed much more inclination for agreement with the King. The polemical writ which has been examined here provides an excellent and outstanding proof that however much religious and political matters were interwoven, intertwined and interrelated, religion cannot be discussed as a mere footnote of political history in general. Political events did have their proper and obvious roots in old or contemporary ideas about religion and politics alike.