

THE Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII DECEMBER, 1906—JANUARY, 1907 No. 2

GEORGE BUCHANAN, THE SCOTTISH HUMANIST.

BY PROFESSOR STALKER, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Last year the quater-centenary of John Knox was celebrated amidst demonstrations of interest which not only extended to the remotest parishes of Scotland, but found answering echoes in every corner of the globe. This year is the quater-centenary of another famous Scot—George Buchanan; and the University of St. Andrews, of which he was an alumnus in his youth, and in which he held the distinguished office of Principal of St. Leonard's College in his maturity, issued to the country and the learned world in the beginning of the year an invitation to celebrate the event there in the month of July. The occasion was an interesting one, and speeches were delivered by men of eminence, well able to do justice to the subject; but the echoes from other countries, and even in this country, have been few and faint in comparison with those which replied to the summons to commemorate John Knox.

This contrast is not only an illustration of how in the course of centuries reputations may wax or wane, but is also a sign of the times. Once the name of Buchanan stood at least as high as that of Knox in the land of their birth, and was far better known in foreign parts. Indeed, for two centuries after the deaths of both, Buchanan was the more outstanding figure, Dr. Johnson declaring him to be the only man of European reputation whom Scotland had ever produced. But Buchanan's name may be said to have steadily waned from the time when the Latin language ceased to be the medium through which academic instruction was communicated, while John Knox, on the contrary, has, since about the same date, continued to rise

THE HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIANS; A SKETCH.

BY PROF. THOMAS CARY JOHNSON, D. D.

Not a few persons think of the term "Presbyterians" as a sectarian, or denominational appellative, of certain modern Christian sects. A glossary of ecclesiastical terms, in wide circulation, describes Presbyterians as "the followers of Calvin, Beza and other Reformers; so-called in England in the seventeenth century." This description at once informs and mis-informs. It is a fact that the *struggle* between certain advocates of representative church government, on the one side, and, of prelatical church government, on the other side, during the latter part of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century, was the occasion on which Christians of a given type were first habitually called Presbyterians. It is a fact, also that the bodies of Christians to whom the term was thus applied in Scotland and England, stood to John Calvin in intimate relations. But it is no less a fact that these British seventeenth century admirers of Calvin regarded him not as the originator but the restorer of Presbyterianism; it is no less a fact that the form of Christianity, generally called Presbyterianism only as late as the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, had existed and prevailed in the Christian Church a millennium and a half before Calvin had produced his immortal institutes, or attempted to apply not only the truth of God, but the power of God, to the lives of his people in the corrupt town of Geneva; it is no less a fact that Christ and the College of the Apostles, when giving to the Church its Christian form, gave it the Presbyterian form. Nay; somewhat more may be asserted: Some of the essential features of Presbyterianism had come down, more or less distinctly evolved, too, through God's chosen people, from the time of Ezra, and some of them from the time of Moses and beyond. Students of at least relative competence have asserted, that "During the whole tract of time embraced in the history of the Mosaic economy, we have

complete evidence that the ecclesiastical government, as well as the civil, was conducted, under God, the Supreme Ruler, by boards of elders, acting as authorized representatives of the people;" that to this mode of government "every city and every synagogue was accustomed;" that "the representative system was universally in use;" and, further, "that as each particular synagogue was governed by a bench of elders, of which the bishop or 'angel of the church' was the presiding officer; so, also, as the whole Jewish body was one—one Catholic church—there were always appeals admitted, in cases of incorrectness of judgment, to the 'Great Synagogue' at Jerusalem, where an opportunity was given for redressing what was done amiss;" and that "a system, which bound the whole community together as one visible professing body, was uniformly in operation." Certainly it may be safely asserted that Presbyterianism was essentially involved in Old Testament religion.

The subject before us—the historical development of Presbyterians—is no modern phenomenon. Names are frequently much younger than the objects to which they are applied. There were Christians, years before the disciples at Antioch were so-called. There were Trinitarians long before the term Trinitarian had been coined. There were Erastians in church government thousands of years before the term Erastian was applied to those who held that Church and State should be united and the State dominant over the Church, particularly in all matters of government and discipline. All must admit that Presbyterians are older than their name. Even those who would have John Calvin to have originated Presbyterians, must remember that they were not generally so-called in his day. If men will face the facts, they must admit more—that Presbyterians had figured in the world long centuries back of the time when they were first so-called.

Were we to attempt a complete sketch of Presbyterians, we would have to begin not only far back of the latter half of the sixteenth century, far back of Calvin's age; we would have to take account of Presbyterianism not only as the oldest phase of Christianity, and as the Catholic, or general, phase of Christianity in the Apostolic age; a complete sketch of Presbyterians would necessarily include some account of certain features of

the Mosaic economy, and would deal in pregnant outline with the religion of the synagogue.

Our limits as to space make it necessary that we should not, on this occasion, attempt to deal with Presbyterians since their origin, but, at the most, with Presbyterians since the time of Christ. Accordingly, we shall proceed to sketch our subject under the following heads:

I. Presbyterians in the Apostolic Age.

II. Presbyterians between the End of the Apostolic Age and the Epoch of the Reformation.

III. Presbyterians in John Calvin's Day and since.

I. *Presbyterians in the Apostolic Age.*—From the literature of the Apostolic age, we can learn nothing of any other form of Christianity as favored by an inspired apostle. We see Christ and his apostles teaching Presbyterian doctrine, exercising Presbyterian government, conducting Presbyterian worship, and exhibiting the Presbyterian type of life. It is, of course, not held that the apostles presented creed books, such as modern churches have elaborated, in a scientific and systematic way. It is not meant that the *Church*, as it left the hands of the apostles, set forth, with the fulness and exactitude of technical definition to which the Westminster Assembly attained, that essential view of Christianity which we have in our Westminster Standards. But it is held that the living form of Christianity in the apostolic age was genuinely Presbyterian; it is held that the early Church, while not setting forth scientifically the Presbyterian doctrine, polity, worship, etc., yet did set it forth in the living form in which Christianity stands recorded in the New Testament. Intelligent Christians, generally, hold that the Christians of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age were Trinitarians; and were believers in the true Deity, true humanity and single personality of the Lord Jesus Christ; while, yet, it is notorious that the Church only reached the technical and scientific ability to state the doctrines of the Trinity and Christology after centuries of struggle. Now, as the Apostolic Church was Trinitarian, so was it also, we hold, Presbyterian; it held the view of doctrine called Presbyterian, exercised the Presbyterian order of worship, and the Presbyterian form of government, and maintained the Presbyterian ideal of life.

If the Apostolic Church was Trinitarian, and if it believed Christ to be the Godman, one person in two distinct natures, one human and the other divine; it no less certainly took the view that *by nature man is not subject to the law of God, and as carnal, cannot be; that every son of Adam, save one, is a sinner by nature, perverting his own ends to God's glory, and his own impulses to God's law as a rule of his life—set in his way of sinning; that he cannot help himself, because he will not help himself; that, hence, if he is to be saved it must be gratuitously and by the mediation of One who is both man and God—man that he may stand in man's stead and bear the penalty due to man as a sinner; and God that his expiation may satisfy the Divine justice, which is inexorable in its demands for righteousness. It took the view that out of his infinite grace, God determined that he would save from this mass of perdition "a great multitude that no man can number;" that he sent forth his Son to be the propitiation for their sin—to be their prophet, priest and king; that he predestinated them to be transformed into the image of his Son; and that whom he did predestinate to this image, them he also effectually called; and that whom he called, them he also justified, counted righteous, and whom he justified, them he also sanctified, and whom he sanctified, them he also glorified.* Yes; according to the New Testament, and the Old, for that matter, salvation is all of God. We do not find the name of total depravity, unconditional election, particular redemption, efficacious grace, and perseverance of the saints, the emphasis of which, some have thought to be a distinctive mark of the Presbyterian form of the Christian doctrine; but we do find the doctrines, held in a most practical and living way. While magnifying the sovereignty of God, the Apostolic Church was careful to inculcate man's own responsibility. Not to particularize further, it received and adopted the Scriptures as being a revelation of the mind and will of God as given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, touching his glorious plan of saving helplessly lost men. That the Apostolic Church held these doctrines, including "total depravity," and "election of grace," we feel not the less assured, when we recall, that when, in the Reformation epoch, God sent down his Spirit, the mighty men upon whom he came, and who, in consequence of his coming upon them,

became the leaders of the Reform Movement, maintained them as the doctrines of Divine revelation. Martin Luther, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Bugenhagen, Patrick Hamilton, George Wishart, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley, Latimer and Hooper, Archbishop Grindal, John Knox, *et id omne genus*, thought they saw these doctrines set forth in Apostolic literature. Yes; the makers of all the great early Protestant Confessions—Lutheran and Anglican, as well as Reformed—save the Formula of Concord only, however, differing on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and correlated topics, agreed as to the great body of doctrines maintained by Presbyterians, including those so-called hard doctrines, for which the latter have been so maligned.

Back of the Reformation, Wycliffe, Hus, and many noble sons of God, took the same view. Nay, more; Augustine, the Prince of the Patristic fathers, a man singularly honored in profession by the Roman Catholic Church, which puts him into her little class of "*Doctores Ecclesiae*," while she quietly but pertinaciously repudiates his teaching,—Augustine held the lamp aloft by which the Reformers read so well these truths in the Sacred Scripture.

Sound Presbyterians of to-day stand in a great and noble company when they maintain that the Apostolic Church held the doctrines known since the seventeenth century as the doctrines of the Presbyterians.

If the Apostolic Church was Presbyterian in doctrine, it was no less Presbyterian in its form of government. The Apostolic Church exercised the republican type of government, both in its local organizations and in the Church as a whole. Go into an Apostolic church, as into the little Church of Philippi, or into one of the little churches of Crete, or into the larger Church of Ephesus, you will find the power of government in the hands of officers, who have been chosen by the suffrages of the Christian people of their respective congregations, and who are called, now bishops, and now presbyters; you will observe only this one order of ruling officers. There are, indeed, in this one order of rulers, two classes, one of which is devoted to the functions of ruling and teaching; and the other, to the function of ruling alone. But, as rulers, they are all officially equal. You cannot be mistaken in judging that the presbyters and bishops are

identical. You find the officers of the Church of Ephesus, for example, designated as presbyters in Acts xx. 17, called bishops in Acts xx. 28; you read Peter's exhortation to presbyters to tend the flock of God, and "to fulfill the *office of bishops* with disinterested devotion and without "lording it over God's heritage." You note many other proofs of the identity of presbyters and bishops. The proof is so manifest that not only modern Presbyterians, but a multitude of scholarly men throughout the ages have seen it, and taught it, ascribing the distinction between the bishop and the presbyter to usage, and denying it to be of inspired institution. Thus the great Augustine writes to his contemporary, Jerome, who was a presbyter: "I entreat you to correct me faithfully when you see I need it; for, although, according to the names of honor, which the usage of the Church has come *now* to have, the office of bishop is greater than that of presbyter, nevertheless, in many respects Augustine is inferior to Jerome." (Epistolo lxxxii., ad Heironimum, p. 35.) Jerome, who also is placed by the Roman Catholic Church in the very small class of *Doctores Ecclesiae*, and than whom no man in the first fourteen centuries after the Apostolic age was fitter to speak on the subject, observes in his commentary on Titus: "Before that, by the prompting of the devil, there were parties in religion, and it was said among the people, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the churches were governed by the common council of the presbyters. But *after that each one began to reckon those whom he baptized as belonging to himself and not to Christ, it was decreed throughout the whole world that one elected from the presbyters should be set over the rest, that he should have the care of the whole church that the seeds of schism might be destroyed. Should any one think that the identification of bishop and presbyter, the one being a name of age and the other of office, is not a doctrine of Scripture, but our own opinion, let him refer to the words of the apostle saying to the Philippians: 'Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons, Grace to you and peace,' and so forth. Philippi is one city of Macedonia, and truly in one city there cannot be as is thought, more than one bishop; but because at that time they called the same parties bishops and presbyters, therefore he speaks of bishops as of presbyters."*

And Jerome

continues his argument for the identity of these officers, expounding Acts xx. 17, 28; Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, in a most praiseworthy fashion. He then concludes: "We may thus show that anciently bishops and presbyters were the same; but *by degrees, that the plants of Dissension might be rooted up*, all care was transferred to one. As therefore, the presbyters know that, in accordance with *the custom of the church*, they are subject to him who has been *set over them*, so the bishops should know that they are greater than the presbyters rather by *custom* than by the truth of an arrangement of the Lord." (For the translation see Killen; Ancient Church pp. 524-527.) In another passage (*Epist. ad Evangelum*) Jerome informs us that this elevation of one to be bishop took place after the end of the Apostolic age. According to Dr. Philip Schaff, even Pope Urban II. (A. D. 1091) says that the primitive Church knew only two orders—the deaconate and the presbyterate. The original identity of presbyters and bishops is not only insisted on by Presbyterians, Lutherans and Congregationalists, but freely conceded also by Episcopal commentators, as Whitby, Bloomfield, Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Ellicot, Lightfoot, Stanley and other." Lightfoot teaches us that the officers called presbyters in the Jewish Christian Churches were called bishops in the Gentile Christian Churches. He says that it is clear that "at the close of the Apostolic age, the lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established;" but that "the traces of the third and highest order, the Episcopate properly so-called, are few and indistinct." He takes the view that the Episcopate was developed from the Presbyterate. He would see in James of Jerusalem a sort of "bishop properly so-called." His great honesty compels him to say, however, that "though specially prominent, James appears in the Acts as a member of the body of presbyters—that "he was, in fact, head or president of the college." He holds that, on the other hand, the Gentile churches of the Apostolic age present no distinct traces of a similar development toward the "Episcopate properly so-called." (Epistles of St. Paul: Philipians, pp. 184, ff.)

The ruling officers, which Jewish Christians commonly called elders, and Gentile Christians commonly called bishops, being a plurality in every local church, little or big, had, in order to govern with decency and order, to organize under a moderator,

deliberate over proposed ecclesiastical action, have a motion made, take a vote, and thus, by the majority vote, fix upon the course of action. It was not only necessary in order to decency and order, that the presbyters should rule jointly; they were naturally led to ruling in this way by the examples of the benches of the elders in the Jewish synagogues scattered throughout the Graeco-Roman world. In looking on the Presbytery ordaining Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14) you would not have been able to differentiate it from one of our sessions, perhaps. The body of presbyters constituted an organized bench, or parliament, or court, and as such did their work. Not only do you see this sort of rule in the local churches; go to Jerusalem about 50 A. D., and step into the Jerusalem Council, called to determine as to certain matters exciting greatly the Christians at Antioch about that time. These matters are recognized as of interest to the whole church. Two different local churches, and how many more we cannot say, got their commissioners together in this council to deliberate and determine. This is only one of many indications that the local Apostolic Churches regarded themselves as organic parts of a great whole, inclusive of all the churches. The organization of this Jerusalem Assembly is very much that of Presbyterian ecclesiastical courts superior to the session. It is a court of rulers, called apostles and elders, but with the apostles acting in the court just as elders themselves.

But, if the Apostolic Church was Presbyterian in faith, and in polity, it is no less Presbyterian in life. You can see that they give place in thought and action to the notion and requirement of duty. You hear them saying to their earthly rulers: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." These Christians that teach you, in one breath, that the earthly "powers that be are ordained of God," teach also that God is the *great sovereign*, and that little earthly potentates must not expect their obedience, in case they command anything contrary to the injunctions of the Lord God Almighty.

Much more you may see of the life of the Apostolic Church, making it clear that you have found, current in the Apostolic age, ideals that the noblest Presbyterians of later ages would have embraced as their very own. If Paul's doctrinal teaching in the eighth and ninth chapters of Romans is Presbyterian doc-

trine, no less surely does he set forth in a Presbyterian fashion, appealing at once to the noblest appetencies of regenerate human nature, our obligation to Christian service, in the twelfth chapter of the same epistle: "I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God which is your reasonable service; and be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." The stern condemnation of evil and the contempt for follies, the having one's conversation in things above and not in things on the earth, are other features one must note, and remark their counterparts in the noblest Presbyterian character of modern times. In a word, you may note the dignifying and glorifying of individual manhood and womanhood, the transformation of home into an earthly heaven, the progressive ennoblement of the whole Christian society into Christliness.

The worship of the Apostolic Church—transformed synagogue worship, was so evidently like the simpler Presbyterian, Puritan types of worship of modern times, that we may properly waive its illustrations.

This early Presbyterianism was mightily missionary. The greatest Presbyterian in the Apostolic Church was the greatest missionary of the ages, doing a vast amount of work strategically, thoroughly and effectively. He went at the work from a sense of duty, inspired by Christ's command, was kept at it by that and Christ's constraining love; carried with him in the work a sense of the unity of the whole Church and of her part in his work; reported from time to time to his mother presbytery; and carried to the superior court, questions of general interest which arose in connection with the progress of his cause. The Church at large not only responded to Paul in Presbyterian fashion; but according to the measure of its opportunities, so propagated the truth that it grew by leaps and bounds under the good hand of God.

Presbyterianism was a form of Apostolical Christianity. It was the prevailing form of it. We have found no other form of it in that age. Presbyterians had not been so-called. They had been known simply as Christians. Under the circumstances, that was the best name for them.

II. *The Presbyterians between the End of the Apostolic Age*

and the Epoch of the Reformation.—With the close of the Apostolic age, Christians began, on the one hand, a slow, painful and faltering advance toward the scientific grasp and technical and systematic statement of Scripture teaching; and on the other hand, began the appropriation of and building into their beliefs, and applying in their practices, elements foreign to and at war with Christianity as divinely established in the Apostolic age. As illustrative of their progress into the scientific grasp of the truth, may be instanced their statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Councils of Nicea (A. D., 325), and Constantinople, A. D., 381; their statement of the doctrine concerning Christ's person and natures, in the Council of Chalcedon, 451; their exposition of the doctrines of sin and grace through Augustine in the closing years of the fourth century and the opening years of the fifth century (though here a large part of the Church revolted from Augustine's teaching); and in the exposition of the true doctrine of the atonement by the saintly Anselm and Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages, (though here, again, the truth brought out was rejected save by a party). So far as the Church accepted these teachings, it continued to be, in doctrine, like the primitive Presbyterian Church of the Apostolic age, save that it was acquiring a more scientific grasp of those original teachings. Over against these instances of progress into the truth, doctrinal change for the worse also proceeded; slowly at first, but more rapidly as the centuries passed. In the second and third centuries, work-righteousness began to creep in; and the sacramental symbols came to be regarded as having spiritual graces tied to them by indissoluble bonds. In the sixth century, the Bible doctrine of sin, the doctrine of man's moral helplessness, together with his responsibility, the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty, the doctrine of salvation by faith, and their correlates were forgotten for the most part—buried—to be resurrected only by the Reformers.

When the doctrines of man's moral inability for the good, and election of grace, and their correlates, were taken away, Christianity had lost most important features. It was no longer in its primitive, Presbyterian phase. It was moving with an ever-growing turgidness toward the teachings of the Council of Trent and the Vatican.

In the sphere of government, a more thorough going and

vicious change rapidly proceeded. As there is no reasonable ground for doubting that the Apostolic Church was what, in modern parlance would be described as Presbyterian in government, so there is just as little ground for doubting that in certain quarters, as early as A. D. 250, full-fledged old Catholic Episcopacy was coming into its place; just as little ground to doubt that Episcopacy took practically the whole Church, in the course of the next three or four centuries; just as little ground to doubt, that, meanwhile, Episcopacy was developing through the Metropolitan and patriarchal stages; that, in the West it passed, after the close of the sixth century, into the Papal system of the Mediaeval Church; and that pure Presbyterianism was no more seen until the epoch of the Reformation.

As early as the middle of the second century, the presbyters of certain churches had begun to give up their prerogative of the joint government of their churches, permitting their presiding officer, who had been chosen for his abilities, singly to wield the ecclesiastical power. These presbyters probably had felt that they were doing a very amiable thing in stripping themselves of power and concentrating it into the hands of their strong brother. For, under the influence of current civil ideals in the Roman Empire, they believed that monarchical government was more effective than representative; that a Cincinnatian dictator would serve better than a senate. Hence, they turned their president of the session into a monarch of the congregation.

Through the close connection between any old first Church and its colonies, or daughter churches, the bishop of the mother church easily extended his monarchical rule by degrees over the colonies. Thus was the diocesan bishops, in the course of time, evolved. After a time, the more favored diocesans grew into metropolitans, exercising ecclesiastical lordship over a number of diocesans. Similarly, the more favored metropolitans grew into patriarchs; and, after a time, one of this small body of oligarchs grew into the Pope of Rome. The presbyters of the sub-Apostolic age, in conferring their own God-given prerogatives on one of their number, were consulting expediency, walking in the light of their own eyes, leaning unto their own understanding, instead of taking heed unto their way according to God's word. They had forgotten, too, the importance of the maxim: *Obsta principiis*. They were planting the seed in which

were wrapped up all the usurpations, exactions, extortions, abuses and nastiness of papacy and prelacy, as well as overthrowing the God-given form of church government.

The Presbyterian type of life passed away on the heels of the changes in doctrine and government. By the middle of the third century the ideal of a Godly life was becoming misshapen, owing to the growing presence of asceticism. The notion was coming in that, in order to live the holiest life, there must be no marriage, there must be no individual ownership of property; and the body must be depressed by fasts, vigils, flagellations, squalor or filth, etc. Along with this ideal as to what was necessary to the highest holiness, came a lowered demand for a strenuous moral endeavor, on the part of the whole mass of believers, to live in accord with the demands of God's law. And, in the centuries included in the great era usually described by historians as Mediæval (590-1517) there came about, owing to various causes, a wide divorce between morals and religion; so that the most religious after a sort might be grossly immoral. Gross immorality abounded; and, amongst even the choicer spirits, there prevailed widely an indifference to the obligation to be straightforward in behavior and true in speech. Many of the noblest Christian teachers justified indirection and deceit when employed as a means for the glorification of the Church. Augustine is the one man in his century, known to us, who plead that one must in writing, or speaking, for God's cause, write or speak always in accord with truth; the one man to maintain that one must never for any supposedly good end, write or speak that which he does not hold to be the truth. His century, be it remembered, was adorned, too, by Jerome and Chrysostom. They justified *ruses*. We are not sorry to recall, in this connection, that Augustine, who was morally too big to justify them, *was*, in much of his theology, particularly on the doctrines of sin, salvation by grace, election of grace, predestination, *what*, in common speech, would be called Presbyterian. The legitimate fruit of those doctrines, sorely abused though they have been, is high moral manhood. The practical recognition of God's sovereignty and man's responsibility should lift every teacher and every Christian above the commendation of a lie.

It is not meant, of course, that there were no noble Christian souls in these long centuries. The contrary is true. These were

the centuries within which lived Anselm, and Bernard of Clairvoux and Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura. John Calvin or John Knox would have exulted in the privilege of communion with the author of the *Cur Deus Homo*, of conferring about that infinite justice which inexorably demanded that sin should be punished according to all its infinite heinousness; or in the privilege of communion with Thomas Aquinas about the substitutionary nature of Christ's sacrifice. There were Christians who, on one side or other, had come into a nobility of character truly admirable; yet it is clear, even to a casual observer, that their ideal of life is, in important respects, not that of the New Testament Church. Signs, indeed, of the resurrection of this type of life there are, as in the Waldenses, in Wycliffe and his followers, in John Hus, and Jerome of Prague and their Bohemian followers, but speaking broadly, the Presbyterian ideal of life found few to strive for its realization during all the days between the epoch of Constantine the Great and the Reformation.

In the department of worship, a similar change went on. The simple New Testament type of worship gave way to one that the Church deemed better. Even in the sub-Apostolic age this change began. The whole witness-bearing, teaching aspect of worship, was allowed to sink largely into disuse and oblivion; and the Church came to be looked upon as invested with power, through her sacraments, and the priesthood, to lift men into light, life and glory. The ministers of worship were slowly transformed into special priests, the universal spiritual priesthood retreated. The business of the priest was chiefly to offer sacrifices and administer sacraments in a way supposed to be valid. Meanwhile the services became, by degrees, highly liturgical and ritualistic, appealing to the senses, imagination and superstition, whereas, in the New Testament, they appealed to the moral and spiritual affections. Sacraments were added to those enjoined in the Word of God, and these latter were doctored into shapes and significances unknown to New Testament times. The rite of baptism was perverted in matter and form, in power and significance, by the conjunction therewith of a number of man-devised additions, and by the efforts to connect in a physical way, spiritual grace with material emblems. The rite of the Lord's Supper was gradually and surely changed through the slow course of ten centuries and more, till it bore

the aspect given it in the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the mass—an unbloody repetition of Christ's sacrifice on the cross.

There was, with the early movements of the great Reformation in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, a return toward the Presbyterian type of Christianity. The two great fundamental principles of the Lutheran Reformation, viz.: Justification by faith, and the Bible the one source of authority in religion, so far as they were adopted, brought Christianity back toward the primitive form. But the proximate restoration of that form was to be more completely wrought out by one who outranked Luther in point of intellect, acquaintanceship with the Bible, power of systematic concatenation and representation of the truth, humble reverence for God's plan as revealed in his word, and the consistent and fearless effort to give the plan, in proximate entirety, practical application. The restorer of Presbyterianism, under the good hand of God, was John Calvin.

(To be continued.)

THE
Union Seminary Magazine

VOL. XVIII

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1907

No. 3

THE TRINITY.

BY REV. SAMUEL SPAHR LAWS, A. M., M. D., D. D., LL. D.

Why should this be looked on as one of the most mysterious, unintelligible, and least practical doctrines of the Christian religion? This is a mistake. On the contrary, it is one of the most obviously intelligible, and intensely practical.

This paper, brief as it must be, proposes to make that appear, allowing for the limitation, with reasonable certainty; and that, too, by a strictly scientific method.

All the laws of nature, which are its doctrines, rest on inductions upon the facts of nature. All the doctrines of the Bible, wrought into the creeds of christendom, are presumed to be inductions on the facts—the verbal utterances—of the Bible. As Nature is and must be recognized as of ultimate and unquestioned authority in the one case, so the Bible must be in the other. Without this, neither secular science, nor Christian Theology can attain creditable standing. No one acquainted with the half-dozen radically distinct systems of philosophy which have gone to record, would dare assert that the objective validity of the so-called facts of nature has not been and is not now denied as stoutly as the most rampant infidelity, has ever repudiated the truthfulness and validity of the so-called facts of the Bible. The nihilism of philosophy is, in the domain of nature, the analogue of atheism in the domain of religion.

But induction, in all cases, leads only to inferential and contingent knowledge; and all inferential knowledge is faith knowledge. This is true even of the universality of the law of gravitation. Hence, unquestionably, the laws of nature as really

THE HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIANS: A SKETCH.

BY PROFESSOR T. C. JOHNSON.

(Continued from last issue.)

III.—PRESBYTERIANS IN JOHN CALVIN'S DAY AND SINCE.

Martin Luther came, in the first decades of the sixteenth century, swung his hammer of Thor on Romish abuses; stalked around amongst the mediæval ikons, crushing on this side and on that side, reducing them to pulp, or to fine dust—a heaven-sent agent to tear down and to pluck up by the roots; and to plant, too, truths of which the world stood in dire need. Let no Presbyterian detract from Luther's merits.

But no other understood the Word of God so well as Calvin in his age. No other man was so capable of bringing out the teaching of the Word, as to the faith God would have his church hold, the form of government he would have it exercise, the worship he would have it engage in, the life he would have it live. Moreover, the world may be safely challenged to produce a man who had greater *desire* to know the content of Scripture teaching, and to have the church follow it, and it alone. He made the distinction, indeed, between essentials and non-essentials in the qualities of any body claiming to be a Church of Christ. In spite of the difference from Luther on the Lord's Supper and other points, he was ever ready to reach forth his hand across the separating chasm, and grasp that of the great Saxon Reformer as the hand of a brother in Christ. He saw that certain things were necessary to the well-being of the church, which were not necessary to the bare being of the church. He saw this as few did. Nevertheless, he believed that it was the church's duty to conform itself to all known scriptural truth. And he believed that scriptural teaching is sufficient for the determination of every essential phase of the church's faith, worship, government, and life.

He brought out, with large success, into scientific form, the old Presbyterian faith of the Apostolic Age—the faith of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the faith of Peter and Paul

and the rest. Into the Institutes he drew little from any philosophical system. They are built up of materials quarried from the Scriptures. They were intended to serve as an introduction to the study of the Scriptures, making it easier to understand aright the word of the Lord. The teaching of the Institutes is not in the same form as that of the Scriptures. They are the result of their author's life-long effort to set forth in scientific and systematic form that which the Scriptures teach in the form of living historical revelation and inspiration. His study of the Scriptures led him to walk in the paths trodden by Athanasius and Augustine concerning the doctrine of the trinity, in those trodden by Leo the Great and the Council of Chalcedon concerning the only Redeemer of God's elect. With these latter accordingly, he taught, as Bible doctrine, that the Lord Jesus Christ, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continueth to be God and man, in two distinct natures and one person forever. Following Scripture teaching, again, he found himself walking in the paths of the great Bishop of Hippo, in regard to man's primitive state, in regard to the fall, in regard to the consequences of the fall, including the much-abused, much-misunderstood, but Scriptural and philosophically sound doctrine of total depravity, and the necessity of man's being saved by grace if he is to be saved at all; and in regard to predestination. He did not follow Augustine fully; only where Augustine had caught up and reflected the light from the sacred page, did Calvin wish to follow him. Calvin surpassed Augustine in his knowledge of the Word, and was less under the power of false views, preventive of his reception of the light from the Word. Hence he taught somewhat more perfectly on all these topics, particularly on election and the perseverance of the saints. Out of his sense of the majesty of God's sovereign character, Calvin gave an emphasis to election somewhat beyond that which Augustine had given; and taught the perseverance of all the regenerate as Augustine could not, owing to his acceptance of the Catholic view of his day about baptismal regeneration.

On the great theme of the Atonement, Calvin, in his study of the Scripture, found himself traveling along the way that the saintly Anselm and Bonaventura, and, within limits, Thomas Aquinas, had gone. He, too, read in the Scriptures

that God's justice is as infinite as God's power; that God must pour out wrath against sin according to its measureless demerit; that man must suffer for his sin, and that the only possible ground of salvation must be found in the vicarious work of an infinite yet human substitute for man before the bar of Divine justice, who there has paid the full equivalent of the penalty due to man's sin.

On the doctrines of justification by faith as the sole instrumental ground of salvation on man's part, he trod in the way of Martin Luther, who, in that "doctrine of a standing or falling church," had apprehended almost perfectly the inspired teaching. In the matter of the inspiration of the Scriptures, too, Calvin found himself traveling the same road with Luther. These men are sometimes represented as having taught a "liberal view of inspiration." They are so represented by some who try to prove the Scriptures errant. But the representation has not been made good. These great reformers refer to the Scriptures with as much semblance of belief in their infallibility as our Lord and his apostles did. Along with Luther and the early Protestants Calvin had, of course, much to deny of the current teaching of the Roman Catholic Church—viz., transubstantiation and the five spurious sacraments, and purgatory, and saintly and angelic mediators, etc. With the disciples of Zwingli, at Zurich, he found the truth about the Lord's Supper to be in the so-called symbolic view; found it to be a great teaching and memorial ordinance; and upon the view he put his modification, making it more fully scriptural, in stressing the point that it is made efficacious by the concurring and efficient action of the Holy Ghost alone.

It is in his stress on this point and in the emphasis he gives to election and its corollaries, so ably handled by Augustine, and in his system of ecclesiastical government, and in the honor he puts upon the Word of God, that we find the distinctive features of Calvinism and of sound Presbyterianism as doctrine.

As Calvin's Presbyterianism, of doctrine, differed from that of the Bible chiefly, perhaps, in its being presented in systematic and scientific form. So in the same manner did his Presbyterian *form of church government*. His presentation of New Testament church government was not, however, as perfect as that of New Testament doctrine. His basal error as to the

proper relation of the church and state prevented his setting up a true counterpart of New Testament church government. Nevertheless, he went far toward this step.

He was not the first to *undertake* to re-establish Presbyterianism in polity after the Reformation began. As early as 1526, John Brentz, at Halle, in Suabia, and Franz Lambert, in the province of Hesse, had drawn up more or less imperfect schemes of Presbyterian Church polity. In 1530 Oecolampadius, of Basle, fearing spiritual tyranny, wished to join a body of elders with the clergy. At Strasburg a sort of Presbyterianism was actually established in 1531. Capito, at Frankfort, had made a similar attempt. These, where not mere theories, were limited, fragmentary and largely abortive. Calvin's it was to set forth the comprehensive system, and to give it the double authority of clear theoretic statement and practical realization.*

The constitutive principles of his scheme of government were:

1. The self-government of the church under the headship of Christ.
2. The ecclesiastical discipline of all the members from the least to the greatest.
3. A consistory, or parliamentary court, consisting of ruling elders and ministers of the Gospel, to exercise the discipline and government.
4. The recognition and reinstatement of the New Testament ruling eldership.

Calvin set the deacon forth also, in his New Testament aspects and proportions, as concerned with the care of the poor, and the funds contributed for pious purposes.

While distinguishing sharply between church and state, and holding that the church must be self-governing at the cost of self-support, should the state be unwilling to support the church without also governing it; he, nevertheless, held that, of right, the two powers should be in union, that in return for the church's tuition in morals and religion the state should support it. This was an impracticable and an illogical view. No state would support a church without interfering with its gov-

*Encyclopedia Britannica.

ernment; and when the state asked, Shall we support a body of teachers and have no say as to what they teach and how they teach? it had the logic on its side.

This connection of church and state, as always, issued in the most regrettable consequences, the persecution of Servetus amongst others. Geneva had a religion—the State of Geneva had. It regarded its creed as a part of its constitutional laws, saw in Servetus one hostile to the very foundations of the state and one worthy of death, therefore.

It was a great merit in Calvin that he, while believing in the propriety of the union of church and state, yet distinguished clearly between the two institutions, and maintained that the church should be self-governing at all costs. It was no less a merit that he insisted on discipline—the discipline of all the members from the least to the greatest. He suffered banishment for this insistence once. When brought back to his seat of power, it was upon the expressed condition that his system of discipline should be enforced. He believed in the application of the power of God as well as the truth of God to the life of every member of the church. He secured the application of thorough-going discipline only after mighty struggles with libertines and spirituals. Discipline was applied in his day in Geneva not in as harsh a way as is popularly supposed. He stressed the point that it is to be administered in a spirit of gentleness. The ends of discipline were nobly stated, and it was never forgotten that one end of discipline was the good of the offender.

His scheme of discipline did much to assimilate the life of the church to the New Testament ideals.

He brought his people back to New Testament ground in holding that there should be two classes of presbyters in the church, holding that, in the New Testament churches, bodies of presbyters were elected to rule, some of whom were subsequently developed for and designated to the function of teaching also. He taught that these presbyters of two classes should rule after organization into a court.

The chief fault to be found with the ecclesiastical government of Calvin at this point was owing again to the connection of church and State. The state appointed the ruling elders, and while the people were allowed the right of assent, or dis-

sent, as to the ministers they should have, even these were first nominated by the Venerable Company of Ministers already in existence, and appointed by the civil power. Thus the people never exercised their prerogative of freely electing their officers, and the church was in practice subordinated to the state. Had Calvin been able to realize his ideal of church government, that government would still have been faulty, since he had been unable to shake off the then universal belief in the propriety of the union of church and state. But he did not realize his ideal. He simply went as far toward his ideal as was practicable in the local circumstances, as he confessed.

The Presbyterian doctrine and the Presbyterian government and discipline wrought together for the production of a correlated life. This type of life, as exhibited by Calvin and his co-religionists, was the outcome of the abiding sense of the exacting and enabling, humbling and uplifting sovereignty of God. Their God compelled them to this life by the absoluteness of this justice, and the infinitude of his love. A sovereign of infinite majesty and justice, they felt they must obey him. A Saviour of boundless unspeakable love, they were irresistibly drawn to serve him. Conscious of obligations to obey the powers ordained of God, the Calvinists were good citizens. There were none better. But the representatives of state must not bid them do anything that seemed to be in conflict with plain laws of their *Great Sovereign's* own immediate imposing.

These spiritual children of John Calvin were not only good citizens; they turned the lewd city of Geneva into a city of at least relatively good homes, went to bringing their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; went to living, in a domestic way, soberly, righteously and godly in this present evil world; went to making all life pure, strong and even sweet.

Their doctrine, their government, and their type of life all alike led them back to a form of worship much like the simple type of the Apostolic and Primitive Church. Their ideal was a simple, spiritual mode of worship, adapted for intelligent devotion, which has been quickened by the presence and working of the Spirit of God; it made the sermon the central part of the worship, magnified instruction in the Word of God; it opened the foundation of free prayer; it gave to the congregation also the "inestimable blessing" of unitedly singing praise to the

Lord. The Lord's Supper and baptism were brought back to their Scriptural forms and significance.

The Presbyterianism of Calvin and Geneva was, like its prototype in the Apostolic Age, essentially a missionary phase of Christianity. This is seen not so much in the attempt of Calvin and Coligni to found a foreign mission in Brazil, at Rio de Janeiro, but in its reproduction of itself in many quarters of Europe.

It had taken up and made its own the German Swiss Protestants by 1549. It swept over the German Palatinate and made that country its own about 1563, finding congenial soil in several other German states. It spread into Bohemia, Poland, Spain, and Italy, in which countries it was soon to be wholly or largely eradicated by Romish persecutions. It spread into France, where, in spite of fierce and unrelenting opposition, a National Reformed Synod was held in 1559, representing about 2,000 congregations, with perhaps 400,000 adherents. At the conference of Poissy, in France, in 1561, the men of Calvin's view won the name of the Reformed party. Setting out with a creed penned by a disciple of Calvin, and perfecting a plan of ecclesiastical government similar to that in Geneva, this church ran a distinguished career down to 1685, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, notwithstanding the fact that it was involved in the political wars between the degenerate sons of Catherine de Medici, the Dukes of Guise, and the princes of Bourbon, and notwithstanding the more mournful fact that it became itself a sort of political party in the early course of its own history. About the epoch of the Revocation of the Nantes edict, near a half million of the best of the Huguenots went into exile, enriching the noblest currents in the life of every nation that gave them asylum. Though the small portion of the Huguenot body remaining behind had, for a long time, to live an underground sort of existence, and though they have increased only very slowly in numbers, they have not been without their heroic characters and their ornaments to the French name and nation. As a representative of the heroes Anthony Court may be named; as one of the men whom the French nation is proud we may point to M. Guizot.

Calvin's type of Christianity spread into the Netherlands. Here it met with better success than in France. Charles V.

and Philip II. tried to their utmost to destroy it. The Duke of Alva, ruthless servant of his ruthless imperious and bigotted master Philip, is said to have slain 100,000 Dutch Protestants between 1567 and 1573. But the old Frisian blood was not being turned to milk by Presbyterianism. On the contrary, it was receiving iron from it, and capacity for mighty wrath against all conceived wrong. Slow to boil, Alva made that blood boil. These Dutch Calvinists showed themselves a nation of heroes under the lead of the immortal William the Silent. The seven northern provinces, where the Gospel, as taught in Geneva, had brought forth much fruit, drove the Spaniards out and founded the union which grew into the Dutch Republic. Had the reformed religion been man-made, and had Calvin been the man to make it, he had had honor enough in the impress his teaching put upon the Dutch, who rose superior to the power of the greatest and most potent princes in the world at that time. In each of the seven provinces a reformed church was established, like the Genevan, in government, faith, and worship. These Dutchmen wrought out for themselves the Belgic Confession, which stands next to that of the Westminster, as an exposition of the doctrine of the sacred Scriptures. This confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of Dort, have no doubt been amongst the chief instruments in God's hands in keeping so undegenerate down to this day the great people of little Holland.

The Geneva type of Christianity went also to the British Isles. The Scotch mind had already shown, in the case of the man, too, who was to head the Scotch Reform movement, some indigenous bent toward developing that type of Christianity. But once Knox came under the influence of Calvin, he readily appropriated from the great Genevese his more developed system. Scotland had been no good land prior to the Reformation. Hardly a corner of Europe had been so marked for uncleanness, robbery and murder. The Scotch had been semi-barbarous and bad. But in 1560, by the blessing of the Lord, on the preaching of certain faithful heralds, and on the testimony of his martyrs from Patrick Hamilton on, by the working of His Spirit, and by the unsanctified aid of land-grabbing barons, the reformed religion of Calvin's type was made the established religion of the nation. No other people has made

so full an appropriation, perhaps, of this reformed and pristine form of Christianity. Nowhere else has been seen such a transformation of the national character. Owing to the uplift in character thus occasioned, this once unclean people became a pattern of morality, this people, once so given to robbery and murder, became honest and considerate of the rights of others. This cruel people began to furnish leading philosophers, divines, and historians to Great Britain. Being a prolific people, in a small country, many of them had to find homes on other shores, They have carried with them their peculiar character, giving sanctified common-sense and moral backbone to almost all other lands.

Meanwhile, for centuries, owing to the connection between church and state, the Scotch Presbyterians had to endure much for the sake of their religion. For the first thirty years subsequent to the establishment of the Reformation, it was necessary to fight the papacy; for the next hundred years to fight prelacy; since that time they have had to fight lay patronage. Each of these periods is crowded with incidents of dramatic interest. From the second period we may cite the renewal of the covenant in 1638. The renewal was occasioned by the effort of Archbishop Laud to force on the Scotch the royal supremacy with a Romanizing liturgy. Revolution had set in with Jenny Geddes hurling her stool at an offending clergyman, whom she thought about to say mass.

It had been the custom of these Presbyterian Scotchmen, since the memorable December 3, 1557, when a number of Protestant nobles and gentlemen signed, at Edinburgh, a "covenant," to maintain, nourish, and defend to the death *the whole congregation of Christ, and every member thereof*, to so bind themselves together in the presence of a crisis. After their custom, as Laud goes about forcing them to use his popish prayer-book, they purpose to resist him.

The renewal of the covenant took place in Grayfriars Church, in Edinburgh, the 28th of February, 1638. It was a most extraordinary scene. Sixty thousand people from all parts of the kingdom had gathered to Edinburgh, and to that church. "The dense crowd which filled the church and adjoining graveyard listened with breathless attention to the prayers, the addresses and the reading of the covenant. The aged Earl of

Sutherland first signed his name with trembling hand upon the parchment roll. Name followed name in swift succession. Some wept aloud; some burst into a shout of exultation; some, after their names, added the words, *till death*; and some, opening a vein, subscribed with their own warm blood. As the space became filled, they wrote their names in a contracted form, limiting them at last to the initial letters, till not a spot remained on which another letter could be inscribed. . . . Never, except among God's peculiar people, the Jews, did any national transaction equal in moral and religious sublimity that which was displayed by Scotland on the great day of her sacred National Covenant." Similar scenes were repeated throughout the country. The martyr spirit shown by these men and their children in the days of Charles II. and James II. lends immortal, pathetic, heroic splendor to the pages of Scottish history.

The exodus of the Free Church in 1843, because of the abuses of lay patronage, was one of the most glorious movements in all modern history. It showed that the martyr spirit still lived, and lent a glory to Scotch Presbyterian character. Tear the pages from Scottish history that tell of those who left manse and glebe and comfortable living and went out to want and penury, for righteousness' sake, in the middle of the practical nineteenth century, and you tear out that of which any nation might well be proud. Till of late the country has remained "an unconquerable fort of orthodox Protestantism,"—has been the most thoroughly Christian country in the world.

Christianity of Calvin's type went into England. During the reign of Edward VI. it seemed on the point of triumphing; suffered fearful persecution under Bloody Mary, and determined, though limited, repression under Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I. It came to the ascendant during the Long Parliament's struggle with the last of these monarchs; produced the Westminster Standards—the most consummate effort to translate into scientific and systematic form the Presbyterianism of the Bible, which has been made down to the present. It made a distinct advance on Calvin's grasp of the teaching of the Holy Scripture, in expounding and giving an elaborated place in the doctrinal system, to the covenant theology. Presbyterianism helped to create the political greatness of England.

On the restoration of the faithless Stuarts, in 1661, it suf-

ferred gloriously for the truth's sake, its ministers vacating the best English benefices, rather than take the oath of conformity and abjure the solemn league and covenant.

Sad to say, those English Presbyterians subsequently degenerated, ran into Arianism and other heresies, dwindled in numbers and influence till, in the beginning of the last century, they were an insignificant body. Since 1800, however, they have made considerable progress.

This type of Christianity crossed the Atlantic and furnished many of the most forceful and determining characters in the North American colonies. The Presbyterian organizations did not, in all quarters, keep pace with the advance of the colonists, and multitudes have entered other churches; but the Reformed and Presbyterian churches of the United States and Canada carry on in these great countries the work of the fathers. They hold the same faith, polity, and worship, with more or less of clearness and carrying power. In one respect the American Presbyterian churches have vastly improved the theoretical church polity which they brought with them from Europe. They have eliminated Erastianism from the theory; and in terms repudiated all connection of Church and State.

Similarly, Presbyterianism has gone out from Europe, and particularly Great Britain, into Australia and into Africa. Through the great, aggressive, missionary movements of the last century and a quarter, it has gone out from its homes, on both sides of the Atlantic, to Japan, and China and India, South America, Africa and to almost every land in which Christian missions of any name have been established. The once almost universal phase of Christianity, the original and divinely enjoined phase, has re-appeared more and more since the days of John Calvin. Twenty odd millions of adherents indicate somewhat as to the prevalence of the phase at present.

But this number of adherents tells little of the influence of this branch of Christendom on the general welfare of the world and the advance of our Lord's kingdom. There is something vastly more important than mere numbers, in the personnel of an army of an earthly monarch,—the *quantum* of manhood in each individual soldier and his intelligent and faithful obedience to every word of his commander. The analogue is true of the army of the Lord Jesus Christ. Judged in this way, the

present Presbyterian army of Christianity may be more significant.

But the special value of this division of Christianity may be further vindicated by calling to mind certain incidental services to Christianity at large and to civilization which Presbyterians have rendered. Of these we name:

1. The stability they gave to the Reformation movement and have continued to give to Protestantism down to this day.
2. Their aid in the causes of civil and religious liberty.
3. Their services in behalf of general education.
4. Their services in behalf of decency and good morals.

The Calvinistic system gave stability to the Reformation inaugurated by Luther. Luther rooted up error; and he set forth truths fresh from the word of God. But it may be seriously doubted whether Protestantism would have been more than a temporary phase in Western Christendom without the work of Calvin. It was his merit to set forth the common truths of Protestantism, as well as that which was distinctive of his own system, in scientific form, using a phraseology the most of which could not be misunderstood. When truth has been so expressed, it cannot be lost; it bites its way into the fibre of human thought; it also becomes perfectly communicable. From the day of Calvin to the present Romanists have recognized that Calvin's co-religionists have commanded the citadel which obstructs their re-extension of their dominion over the non-Papal world of the West. Said the Romish Francis de Sales, a contemporary of Theodore Beza, who tried to convert Beza back to the Romish faith: "All the enterprises undertaken against the Holy See and the Catholic princes have their beginnings at Geneva. No city of Europe receives more apostates of all grades, secular and regular. Thence I conclude that the destruction of Geneva would naturally lead to the dissipation of heresy." This is a sort of parable of the truth. The Presbyterian body, it is believed, has been a steadying power to the rest of Protestant Christendom. It has not only been an aggressive force for good in a direct way, but it has influenced Episcopacy on the one side and Congregationalism on the other, so that they have been truer in their witness and more beneficent to the world than they could have been alone.

The most respectable writers of modern history, of most diverse schools, teach us that the Calvinistic influence on civil and religious liberty has been vast. They tell us that the civil and religious liberty of the Dutch, and of the British of to-day, is the heritage of Calvinistic teaching; and that Calvin was the founder of our own republic. Mr. Bancroft, the great American historian, said of John Calvin: "More truly benevolent to the human race than Solon, more self-denying than Lycurgus, the genius of Calvin infused enduring elements into the institutions of Geneva, and made it for the modern world the impregnable fortress of popular liberty, the fertile seed-plot of democracy." In another place he says: "A young French refugee, skilled alike in theology and civil law, in the duties of magistrates and the dialectics of religious controversy, entering the republic of Geneva, and conforming its ecclesiastical discipline to the principles of republican simplicity, established a party of which Englishmen became members and New England the asylum." Mr. Bancroft says again: "We are proud of the free States that fringe the Atlantic. The pilgrims of Plymouth were Calvinists. The best influence in South Carolina came from the Calvinists of France. William Penn was the disciple of the Huguenots; the ships from Holland that first brought colonists to Manhattan were filled with Calvinists. He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberties."

Nor could the fruitage have been otherwise. The Presbyterian form of church government is the freest, manliest, noblest form on earth. It is the highest type of representative government. It cannot fail to suggest the right of suffrage in those citizens of civil government, who are possessed of the requisite character and intelligence. Nor can it fail to suggest the government of the State by officers who have been chosen by the free votes of the citizens. Both in church and State, therefore, it stimulates guarded and ordered liberty.

It was most natural, therefore, that colonial Presbyterians should have moved, with practical unanimity, toward the Revolutionary War. The sentiments expressed by the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in Southwest Virginia, in January, 1775, the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, in May, 1775, the Politico-Ecclesiastical Synodical action of the Synod of New

York and Philadelphia, of the same date, the work of Presbyterians in the Continental Congress, and in the armies, were fruits natural to the prevalence of Presbyterian polity of the Calvinistic type.

Certain theological and anthropological elements in this phase of Christianity, in a still more powerful way, stimulate the spirit of civil and religious liberty, particularly the doctrines of the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man. According to this teaching, when God commands a certain thing and any other being bids *another* thing, a man must do what God commands. In the first Genevese Confession of Faith, prepared by Farel and Calvin, man's duties toward the State are defined. We are there taught that the citizen must obey all decrees and statutes, *except* those which contravene the commandments of God. Look out now, all ye tyrants, whether kinglings, hierarchs, plutocrats, democracies. There is leaven in the teaching of these men: that absolute sovereignty is found in the Lord God Almighty and Him alone. Order these men, or their true disciples, to do somewhat contrary to the word of God, and they will defy you. Ye Spanish tyrants, lording it over the patient Netherlands; ye Stuarts, strutting about the divine right of kings, and all your like, look sharp! Your sovereignty is at best only a very small thing as these men see things. These Presbyterians are God's men, and must acquit themselves as such.

The people of this form of Christianity have favored the education of the classes and of the masses. Thus did Calvin. Thus did Knox. Thus did the Puritans. We would not take from Luther his due mead of praise. Let it be said that "Luther brought the schoolmaster into the cottage, and laid the foundations of the system which is the chief honor and strength of modern Germany, a system by which the child of the humblest peasant receives the best education the country can afford." Let it be said that this example counted for much in other countries. Much may be claimed, nevertheless, in regard to Calvinistic influence in forwarding general education. In the persistent demand of Presbyterians for a well-educated ministry they gave an impulse to general education. Hear the leaders of the Scotch Reformation, of the first generation, say to those who would have admitted to the ministry men not well-edu-

cated, owing to the dearth of fit ministers: "We are not ignorant that the rarity of godly and learned men shall seem to some a just reason why that so straight and sharp examination should not be taken universally, for so it shall appear that the most part of the kirks shall have no minister at all. But let these men understand that the lack of able men shall not excuse us before God, if by our consent unable men be placed over the flock of Christ Jesus, as also that among the Gentiles godly, learned men were also rare, as they be now among us, when the Apostle gave the same rule to try and examine ministers which we now follow; and last let them understand that it is alike to have no minister at all and to have an idol in the place of a true minister; yea, and in some cases it is worse, for those that be utterly destitute of ministers will be diligent to search for them; but those that have a vain shadow do commonly without further care content themselves with the same, and so remain they continually deceived, thinking that they have a minister when in very deed they have none. For we cannot judge him a dispenser of God's mysteries that in no wise can break the bread of life to the fainting and hungry souls; neither judge we that the sacraments can be rightly ministered by him in whose mouth God has put no sermon of exhortation."

In this demand for an educated ministry they did much to secure an educating ministry, a ministry that would by direct and indirect influence conduce to the general education of their people. But the Presbyterians of the Reformation moved even more directly for general education of the people.

Says the historian Bancroft: "We boast our common schools; Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools."

It is a historical common place that Presbyterians and their half brothers, the Congregationalists, were the chief advocates and abettors of education in our country from its settlement till within the past few decades.

No people have done more for the decency and the good morals of the world than Presbyterians. Some of its opponents have indeed said that certain of its doctrines have a tendency to promote licentiousness; but generally its enemies charge it with undue austerity and strictness; say that it belittles unduly worldly pleasures, holding in unjustifiable contempt the various

forms of public amusements. We have but to look over the faces of Europe and America to see that those countries in which the religion of this phase has most flourished, have been most moral, and that they have been most moral precisely during these periods in which this type of religion has prevailed most fully.

The following testimony of the moral tendency of Calvinistic or Presbyterian doctrine is of a piece with a vast amount of testimony on the subject :

“He [the Calvinist] believes, indeed, in the eternal purposes of God, as to the salvation of the elect; but as to the hopes of his own salvation, and of his individual interest in those purposes he professes to obtain it by the evidences which he possesses of his being himself in a renewed and justified state. He knows from the word of God that the saints are ‘chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit’ no less than ‘the belief of the truth; that they are ‘predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ,’ and ‘created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.’ And hence he feels that it is only so long as he experiences the sanctifying influences of the Spirit in his own heart, so long as he himself in some degree reflects the image of Christ, and walks, imperfectly indeed, but yet sincerely, in good works, that he can have any scriptural grounds for concluding that he is one of God’s elect, and will have his portion with the saints. This is true Calvinism. And where is the tendency of this doctrine to make its followers slothful or confident, negligent of the means of grace, or inattentive to moral and religious duties? While the practical evils which Calvinism is charged with producing are so prominently and studiously exhibited to view by many of its opponents, let us not omit, on the other hand, to do justice to this calumniated system, nor forget the abundant good which it is not only capable of accomplishing, but which it actually does accomplish. . . . Among no denomination or description of professing Christians is there to be found a larger portion of humble, pious, and devoted servants of God, persons of a truly Christian spirit, zealous of good works, and exemplary in every duty and relation of life, than among those who hold the Calvinistic tenets.” Thus wrote the Rev. Edward

Cooper in his *Letters Addressed to a Serious and Humble Inquirer, Etc.* Many such testimonies might be recited. A Methodist Conference, in addressing a council of the Pan Presbyterian Alliance, about a score of years ago, is reported to have said: "Your creed has furnished the inspiring spectacle not simply of a solitary and heroic soul here and there, but of generations of faithful souls, ready for the sake of Christ and his truth to go cheerfully to prison and to death. This rare honor you rightly esteem as the most precious part of your priceless heritage." It has been well said that "There is no other system of religion in the world which has such a glorious array of martyrs to the faith"; that "almost every man and woman who walked to the flames" in Scotland, England, Switzerland, Holland and France during the centuries of bitter persecution, "rather than deny the faith, or leave a stain on the conscience, was the devout follower, not only and first of all of the Son of God, but also of that minister of God who made Geneva the light of Europe, John Calvin."

Does a hearer feel like saying, Have you no word to say in dispraise of modern Presbyterianism? The answer is, Did time permit, somewhat could be said in dispraise of its slowness to cast off the improper connection of church and State, and of its inconsistent course in reference to this connection even in cases where the propriety of the union of the two institutions has, in terms, been repudiated. And grave interrogatories might well be put as to the significance of certain present movements in some branches of the Presbyterians, *e. g.*, the significance of loose tendencies here and there as to the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures; the significance of the apparent indifference, in certain branches of Presbyterians, to Presbyterian polity, and Calvinistic doctrine, seen in the movements toward Federation of Methodists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians in Australia, and in Canada, and in movements nearer home.

Certainly it has been a merit and a glory of the great Presbyterians in the ages past to stand for an inspired Bible, for Pauline, Augustinian, Calvinistic, Presbyterian doctrine, for a clear type of Presbyterian government, worship, and life. These things, one and all, were considered worth standing for.

To one reviewing, with veneration, the noble past of Presbyterianism, and noting that she has accomplished her beneficent services in behalf of God's cause and humanity, through the vertebrated character of her teaching, her government, and her life, the prayer comes:

“God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung witness line,
Beneath whose gracious hand we hold
The truth, to spread 'neath palm and pine;
Lord God of Grace, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.”