

# Presbyterianism

## Its Principles and Practice

*By*

S. L. MORRIS, D. D., LL. D.

Executive Secretary of Home Missions,  
Presbyterian Church in the  
United States

*Author of*

“At Our Own Door”

“The Task That Challenges”

*and*

“Christianizing Christendom”

---

“Hold fast the form of sound words.” 2 Tim. 1:13.

“Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed rightly dividing the word of Truth.” 2 Tim. 2:15.

“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.” Jude 3.

---

1922

PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION  
RICHMOND, VA., TEXARKANA, ARK.-TEX.

COPYRIGHT 1922  
BY  
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION  
RICHMOND, VA.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.  
BY  
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, RICHMOND, VA.

## Contents

I. PRESBYTERIANISM—A SYSTEM.....	1
II. PRESBYTERIANISM IN HISTORY.....	19
III. PRESBYTERIANISM AND CALVINISM.....	42
IV. PRESBYTERIANISM AND CHURCH POLITY.....	58
V. PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE SACRAMENTS..... (THE LORD'S SUPPER.)	77
VI. PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE SACRAMENTS..... (BAPTISM.)	87
VII. PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE COVENANT..... (INFANT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.)	102
VIII. PRESBYTERIANISM IN ACTION.....	118
IX. PRESBYTERIANISM AND CATHOLICITY.....	140
X. PRESBYTERIANISM AND MISSIONS.....	150

## Preface

THE purpose of this study of the distinctive principles of Presbyterianism is not controversial but undeniably apologetic. It is not in any sense an attack upon systems which differ from the Presbyterian, but it is an avowed defense of the latter. In this strenuous age which tolerates only short sermons, necessarily devoted almost exclusively to Evangelism and Missions, there is neither time, patience nor opportunity for instruction in the doctrinal principles, which are the fundamental basis of faith, and which contribute materially to the development of intelligent Christian character. As a consequence a generation of Presbyterians has arisen which knows not Calvinistic theology and Presbyterian polity. Sentimentalism and indifference to truth are calculated to produce moral flabbiness instead of the rugged characters of our forefathers who bequeathed to posterity civil and religious liberty by their moral heroism and sacrificial service.

As an illustration, one of our greatest city churches, having an official body of elders and deacons numbering about thirty, asked their pastor to organize them into a class for studying the principles of their Church. At the first meeting the pastor asked the significance of the word "Presbyterian." Not a man in the number could answer. This case is not unique, but the normal type of the average body of Presbyterian officers.

The object of this treatise on Presbyterianism is to meet the demands of the Church for doctrinal instruction. The difficulty in the preparation of a suitable Text-book for denominational classes is to avoid the merely technical and make it popular enough to interest thoughtful young people and the average layman, and at the same time to give it sufficient scholarship to stand the test of



criticism. The task is so difficult that it may fail to satisfy either the layman or the scholar.

The Presbyterian Church has no denominational "Shibboleth" with which to rally the masses,—which is both an advantage and a disadvantage. The advantage gained is that it prevents Presbyterianism from being narrow and sectarian, but it is at a distinct disadvantage in contending with the bigot characterized by intense sectarian propaganda and proverbial zeal. The task of Presbyterianism is to produce a loyal, intelligent membership, stalwart in faith and character, yet liberal towards all evangelical denominations. This attempt to accomplish the impossible is measurably successful in cultivating catholicity on the one hand and denominational loyalty on the other.

This discussion of Presbyterian principles and practice is intended as a contribution to the cause of that type of Christianity which knows its fundamental faiths and joins heart and hand with all God's hosts in the advancement of the common kingdom, having "one Lord, one faith and one baptism." The writer during his pastorate suffered for lack of such a treatise, which could be put into the hands of an inquirer willing to investigate truth for himself at the cost of time and thought. The author's purpose is not only to meet this long-felt want on the part of pastors, but also to furnish a Text-book, which can be used by our ministry in classes of young people, training for intelligent leadership, by Bible Classes in our Sabbath Schools seeking instruction in the principles of their Church, and by laymen who are dissatisfied with their lack of information and are ambitious to be "workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." In some cases Mission Study Classes might be willing to examine the fundamental principles of a Church, which by its intelligent zeal has led all denominations in the great field of missionary activities.

To meet the need of the denomination, in educating its membership for loyal service in the cause of Christ and His Kingdom, is surely a worthy ambition justifying the purpose of this study. Such has been the thought of the author in its production, which he now sends out on its mission with the sincere prayer that it may educate, stimulate and develop the spiritual life of the Church, which will bring forth the fruit, in future generations, of more intelligent and consecrated leadership of the Lord's militant hosts.

SAMUEL LESLIE MORRIS.

Atlanta, Ga.

## CHAPTER I

### **Presbyterianism—A System.**

Truth is ever consistent with itself. Given a few fundamental principles and they necessitate certain other kindred truths forming a complete system. As in a well-articulated fabric of network each separate stitch binds the constituent parts—or unravels the whole—so the web of divine truth is woven like the robe of the Master, without seam throughout. This is alike true in the realm of Nature, in the domain of Philosophy and in the sphere of Religion.

#### **Basic Principle.**

The Natural Sciences are based largely upon this principle. By virtue of this fact the comparative anatomist can reconstruct the entire skeleton of an extinct animal from the merest fragment of a bone. The records of science furnish well-authenticated cases where such men as Professors Owen, Kaup and Cuvier, from fragments of bone or tooth, have restored the entire skeleton of prehistoric species, and subsequent discoveries have corroborated the correctness of their conclusions. Systems of philosophy are likewise held together by kindred and consistent principles.

In keeping with this same principle Calvinism constitutes a well-articulated system of truth, which not only hangs together by virtue of its logical consistency, but involves the whole of Presbyterian conception of theology and life. The denial of scriptural predestination, for example, consistently necessitates the rejection of the sovereignty of God, divine foreknowledge, special providence, limited atonement, human inability, the sole efficiency of the Spirit in regeneration, and the final perseverance of the saints. One stitch dropped from the web of divine truth rends it in twain, or warps the whole, according to the bias of perverted human judgment. William of Orange, the illustrious Calvinist, author of religious liberty throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, according to

Macaulay, declared that he could not abandon the doctrine of predestination without abandoning with it all his belief in a superintending providence and becoming a mere Epicurean.

### **The Presbyterian System.**

While the Presbyterian form of Government is not a part of the Calvinistic system of theology, yet the two are so closely related that any hybrid alliance of Arminian theology and Presbyterian polity has never prospered but has eventually fallen apart by reason of the fact that they constitute an unsympathetic and illogical coalition.

The Presbyterian system, based on the infallible Word,, sustained by its irresistible logic and reinforced by its inherent philosophy,—as expounded and defended in this treatise,—is taken in its broadest sense, as embracing both Calvinistic theology and Presbyterian polity with all the kindred and distinctive principles involved. No claim will be advanced that Presbyterianism, as thus defined, is essential to the existence of the Church—much less as necessary to salvation—but it will be advocated as the most scriptural of all Biblical systems and, therefore, fundamental to the well-being of the Church. The things essential to salvation are common to all evangelical branches of the Church; and certain of the distinctive elements of the Presbyterian system are shared also by various religious bodies in one way or another.

### **Distinctive Principles.**

The purpose of this preliminary chapter is to outline briefly the general and distinctive principles of Presbyterianism, which will be enlarged, illustrated and re-enforced by appeals to the Word of God in subsequent chapters. Passing by those vital principles held in common with other denominations, such as Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Deity of Christ, the Atonement, Justification by Faith, the Necessity of Regeneration, etc., this inquiry will be confined to the four essentials of Presbyterianism:



## I.

### **The Word of God as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only infallible rule of Faith and Practice.**

Presbyterianism bases its claims entirely upon the Word of God. Nothing else is accepted as authority; and arguments based upon history, reason or philosophy may be cited as additional testimony, but they are not the final nor forceful appeal. The statement of this first principle will inevitably be challenged and met by the assertion that all denominations advance the same claim for the scripturalness of their respective systems; and yet, in the practical application of the principle, there is a vast and important difference.

#### **Variations Illustrated.**

The Roman Catholic Church bases its claim upon the Scriptures, but not exclusively. It places the Church and even traditions on equal footing with the Word. Recently the writer and a Romish priest were drawn into an argument as to the ultimate authority in religion, and when the former quoted Scripture, the priest appealed to the Church as the authority that produced the Scriptures, and that determined the canon of Scriptures, and, therefore, as the supreme authority. This fact, therefore, sets aside its claims as being based solely on the Word of God.

The Rationalist and others profess to accept the Scriptures as authority, but when confronted with the scriptural doctrines of the Sovereignty of God and the free-agency of man, they reject the former on the ground that the two are in their judgment contradictory in the sphere of reason. This is equivalent to setting up their finite human judgment, perverted by sin, as of higher authority than the Bible. There is beyond all question a legitimate place for reason in enabling us to understand and interpret divine Revelation. The Scriptures appeal always to reason and never ask us to accept anything which is inconsistent with it; but there are mysteries,—“the deep things of God,”—beyond the power of human comprehension to grasp fully in our present

limited understanding. Such must be accepted by faith in the spirit of the Apostle, who exclaimed: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!" If every man were at liberty to accept only that part of revealed truth which appeals to his judgment, there would be no uniform standard. It would be as variable as individual thought. Presbyterianism, therefore, while recognizing the value and function of human reason in ascertaining "the mind of the Spirit," makes it bow to the authority of God's Word as supreme.

Speaking for another large denomination of Christians, Dr. Wayland says: "The New Testament, the whole New Testament and nothing but the New Testament is our religion." This sets aside practically the entire Old Testament—as if the New Testament were a complete substitution for it, instead of a supplement. The butterfly is not a different creature from the caterpillar, but is the same creature with wings. In like manner the Old Testament is the same body of Truth more perfectly developed in the New. As one has strikingly said: "The New Testament is concealed in the Old; the Old Testament is revealed in the New." Instead of accepting a part of the Word as authority, Presbyterianism says: "The Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible is our authority."

Still one more important difference exists in the use of Scripture as the basis of truth. Some earnest Christian people appeal to isolated texts and build their systems upon scriptural quotations scattered at random throughout the Word. Anything can be proved from Scripture by this method—which accounts for the variety of sects that claim scriptural foundation. Presbyterianism insists that its system consists of fundamental principles which are embodied in the Word of God "from Genesis to Revelation," and are so interwoven throughout the whole fabric that they cannot be set aside without destroying the Bible itself.

This contention is of sufficient importance to justify an illustration as a specimen: The form of government by "Elders" runs through the whole Bible. The "Elders" come to view in the book of Genesis, which can be verified by any concordance. In Exodus 18:25 and 24:9; and again in Numbers 11, 16-30, a selection

of "seventy" Elders from the total number is the foundation of the Sanhedrim, the highest church court of the Old Testament. In the New Testament, it is said, "They ordained them elders in every church." Then again in Revelation, which closed the canon of Scripture, John looked through the open door in heaven and saw, "Round about the throne four and twenty seats; and upon the seats four and twenty elders sitting clothed in white raiment, and they had on their heads crowns of gold." So after the manner of this illustration the Presbyterian system bases itself not simply on isolated texts of Scripture, but is traced throughout the Word of God, and belongs to every dispensation of the Church.

Presbyterianism never once asks, What saith "antiquity"; what saith "tradition"; what saith aesthetic "culture"; or what saith "historic" practice; but its sole inquiry is, what "saith the Lord?" It institutes no new methods, tolerates no improvement on God's ordained means, and attempts no changing of the machinery to suit the times. Its appeal is solely "to the law and to the testimony." Where God speaks, it speaks; where God is silent, it is silent. It bows to God's Word as the sole authority, and it bows to nothing else.

## II.

### **Its System of Theology known as Calvinism exalts the Sovereignty of God and emphasizes the Free-Agency of Man.**

Calvinism places God on the throne of the universe as supreme Ruler in heaven and on earth, guiding the worlds in their orbits and equally the mote that floats in the sunbeam, and as "fore-ordaining for his own glory whatsoever cometh to pass." From the dozens of scriptural texts supporting this statement space permits only one as a specimen:

"And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the



firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified them He also glorified." (Romans 8:28-30.)

For those who accept implicitly the statements of Scripture this is sufficient. If it does not carry conviction, it would be unavailing to cite the hundreds of other proof texts equally pertinent and forceful.

### Scope.

Calvinism is not simply a system of theology based upon divine revelation, but it is as well a philosophy, which is the only adequate solution of the universe, and the only intelligent interpretation of providence. Predestination is the expression of the purpose which in eternity past planned the universe according to divine wisdom. Providence is the unfolding of the plan in the execution of that eternal purpose. William of Orange asserted that he believed in predestination, because he could not worship a God who created a universe without a plan and governed without a prearranged purpose. Many who reject the name unwittingly accept the fact, as may be seen by the following conversation between a Presbyterian minister and an Arminian lady:

LADY: "Do you believe in the doctrine of Predestination?"

MINISTER: "Certainly, and so do you."

LADY: "Indeed, I do not."

MINISTER: "Do you believe in the necessity of being born again?"

LADY: "Most assuredly."

MINISTER: "Who is the author of the new birth?"

LADY: "Why, God of course."

MINISTER: "Do you think God regenerates a soul without a previous purpose or without an intention to regenerate?"

LADY: "Why, certainly not."

MINISTER: "Well, does it make any material difference whether God formed that purpose to regenerate your soul ten minutes beforehand or ten million years previous to the event?"

LADY: "I suppose not."



MINISTER: "Very well; that previous purpose to regenerate your soul is what in Scripture is denominated predestination."

LADY: "Well, I never understood it before."

### **Sovereignty vs. Free-Agency.**

Predestination is the truth viewed from the divine standpoint, but Calvinism insists equally upon the free-agency of man, which is the truth viewed from the human standpoint. To demonstrate that there is no contradiction between divine sovereignty and human free-agency is a difficult task; but the truth may be illustrated in various ways. The writer in the night once heard the great town clock striking twelve, and at the very same moment in his room the small clock was striking the same hour. There was no connection between the two. Each was running according to its own schedule, yet they struck the hour simultaneously. In like manner the divine purpose in no way forces the human will; and yet they may and do coincide perfectly.

Not only are the two taught in the Word of God, but often in the same text, as for example, in Phil. 2:12-13: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," is a mockery if man is a machine and without free-agency. But immediately the Apostle adds, "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." If that does not affirm absolute dependence upon "the good pleasure" of God, both as to the "will" as well as to the "deed," then human language is utterly inadequate to express thought.

### **Illustrations.**

Scriptural illustrations are hereby cited as the most effective proofs of the truth under consideration. The advantage of scriptural illustrations is not that God deals with Biblical characters in a more direct and providential way than with his children in the twentieth century, but in scriptural incidents and characters we are permitted to look behind the scenes and see the purpose and working of divine Providence, thereby making them "examples; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." One illustration is taken from

the Old Testament and the other from the New, showing the principles are the same in all ages.

### Old Testament Illustrations.

The story of Joseph is the historic and inspired interpretation of the prearranged plan of an individual life and of its detailed fulfilment by human means according to the divine purpose in the execution of the decrees of God. Prophecy plays its part in "the dreams," which foreshadow Joseph's future preeminence over his brethren; but unless an event is fixed by predetermined decree beyond contingency, its fulfilment could not be predicted. The free-agency of man is conspicuous in the use of means, as revealed in the wicked deed of his brethren acting voluntarily and according to their evil impulses, as well as all the natural events in the story leading to the climax. At length comes the full explanation of the relation between predestination and providence through the lips of Joseph, the inspired "interpreter" of divine providence, as he comforted his conscience-stricken brethren with the assurance: "It was not you that sent me hither but God, for God did send me before you to preserve life, to preserve you a posterity in the earth and to save your lives by a great deliverance. As for you, ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good." (Gen. 45:5, 7 and 50:20.) If we had a similarly inspired interpretation of any human life it would reveal the same divine purpose, the same use of natural means, the same benevolent ends and the same fulfilment of the wise provisions of mercy for the future welfare of God's children; for He is "The same yesterday, and today and forever."

Edward Everett Hale has a beautiful tale based on the story of Joseph designed to illustrate divine providence and to show the consequences which would inevitably result from any interference with God's plans for the world's welfare. The story is entitled, "Hands Off." It represents a man in another stage of existence looking down upon Joseph in the hands of the Midianites. By his ingenuity Joseph manages to escape from his captors the first night of his captivity and had just reached the outer limit of the camp when a dog barked and awakened his captors, and

Joseph was returned to his captivity. The onlooker proposed to interfere and kill the dog before he alarmed the camp. Then Joseph would have reached home in safety and his bitter trials have been avoided. But his guardian said, "Hands Off." To let him see the evil consequences of his interference, he transferred him to another world where he could try his experiment. There he killed the dog, and Joseph escaped and reached home safely, his father rejoiced and his brothers were comforted. But when the famine came there had been no Joseph to store the corn against the day of evil. Palestine and Egypt were starved. Great numbers died and the rest were so reduced they were destroyed by the savage Hittites. Civilization was destroyed. Egypt was blotted out. Greece and Rome remained in a barbarous state. The whole history of the world was changed, and countless evils resulted, because a man in his misguided policy killed a dog and saved Joseph from present trouble to his future loss and to the dire distress of a wretched world.

#### New Testament Illustrations.

In the parable of the Lost (Luke XV) with its three parts—The Lost Sheep, The Lost Money, and The Lost Son—Jesus himself furnishes the most striking illustration of the harmony of divine sovereignty and human free-agency. In the first two parts of the Parable, the shepherd goes out after the "lost sheep" and the woman searches for the money, representing the seeking love of God in taking the initiative in salvation—while the shepherd bringing it home on his shoulder and the woman restoring the money, implied the absolute necessity and sole efficiency of divine grace in the salvation of a soul. From the divine standpoint, the soul is *brought back* upon the shoulders of the Great Shepherd, as if it were wholly the result of irresistible grace. That, however, is only one side of the picture. It takes the last part of the story to represent the human aspect of salvation. The prodigal son *comes back of his own accord*, as if salvation were conditional solely upon human free-agency in the use of means. In one sense, every lost soul is *brought back* in the everlasting arms of mercy. In another sense, each soul *comes back* by its own voluntary act in



response to the seeking love of God. If it had not been for the sovereign, enabling grace of God, typified by the act of the Shepherd seeking and bringing back the lost, there could never have been the voluntary *coming back* of the lost, represented by the return of the penitent prodigal. In the philosophy of the plan of salvation, Calvinism is, therefore, the only consistent and sufficient explanation of all the facts involved and recounted in the revelation of divine truth.

### **Analogy.**

The truth may be illustrated and emphasized by the analogy of human artifice and device. In the construction of a magnificent building, the architect draws the plan in all the minute details, which the contractor executes strictly according to prescribed specifications. In the weaving of some exquisite fabric of rare beauty the designer must first furnish the perfect pattern before the weaver can translate it into the finished product. In like manner predestination is the eternal purpose of God by which Divine Wisdom, anticipating all the contingencies of life, arranged the plan of the universe according to a perfect pattern. Divine Providence is the translation of the pattern into the fabric of human life, controlling all the movements and weaving all the threads into the finished product. God is the designer and we are the weavers. He furnishes the threads of warp and woof, while we move the shuttles in daily duties and in loving service to complete the immortal web of character and achievement. Tapestry weavers work on the wrong side of the fabric, never beholding the artistic splendor until the work is completed. So we play our part largely by faith, until at length we are amazed and thrilled at the beauties and glory of our poor humble lives as they fit into the perfect plan of God, interpreted in the light of eternity.

### **III.**

#### **The Presbyterian Polity is Government by Elders.**

It is not its Calvinistic theology but its form of government that gives its name to the Presbyterian Church. The term "Presbyterian" is a Greek word—*Presbuteros*—which is universally trans-

lated "Elder" in the New Testament. Only once in the English Bible does it occur in the original form. In I Tim. 4:14 Paul reminds Timothy that he was ordained "with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*." There the word is *Presbuterion*—differing only by one or two letters from Presbyterian, and it signifies a body of Elders acting in an official character. In the Greek of the New Testament as written by the Apostles, "Presbyterian" in its various forms occurs about 70 times. In the Old Testament written in Hebrew, the equivalent word for "Elder" is "Zaken" and occurs over 200 times; so the word "Presbyterian" is found in the original Scriptures nearly 300 times.

It would be indeed a revelation to most people if the Bible were translated literally. The fifteenth chapter of Acts would read: "They determined that Paul and Barnabas . . . should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and presbyters"; and "the apostles and presbyters came together to consider this matter"; "and as they went through the cities they delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and presbyters." Other passages of Scripture are equally striking: "Ordained presbyters in every church"; "and from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the presbyters of the Church"; "for this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain presbyters in every city." Through the open door of Revelation John looked into heaven and said: "Round about the throne were four and twenty seats and upon the seats four and twenty presbyters. . . . In the midst of the presbyters stood a lamb as it had been slain . . . and the four and twenty presbyters fell down and worshipped Him that liveth forever and ever." Presbyterian is, therefore, a Greek word which signifies a church governed by elders,—or presbyters as it is in the original.

### Forms of Church Government.

In the United States the official government statistics show that there exists 201 separate and distinct denominations, but there are only three primary forms of Church Government. Every denomination on earth is a modification or a variation of one of these forms:

## **Episcopal.**

The first is known as the Episcopal, and in its more extreme form called Prelatic in the Roman Catholic Church. It means government by "bishops" and corresponds in the political world to monarchy. It is the rule of the one man power,—the superior having subordinates under his direction and control. James I. King of England, although reared a Presbyterian, soon perceived that Presbyterianism would not tolerate tyranny in monarchs and said: "Presbytery agreeth with monarchy as well as God and the devil." His misguided son, Charles I. attempted to suppress Presbyterianism in the interest of Episcopacy and adopted the motto: "No bishop, no king." This meant that if the church were allowed too much liberty in self-government, the people would soon demand greater liberty in the state.

## **Congregational.**

The second is known as the Congregational form from the fact that each church is governed by the popular vote of the congregation. It is sometimes called Independency, because each church is a law unto itself and not bound by any rules enacted by its own denomination. The most ignorant or the youngest church member, has equal vote in determining vital doctrines or far-reaching policies, as the most experienced. Two churches of the same denomination in the same city may vote precisely the opposite to each other in matters of faith and practice. This form is exactly the opposite of the Episcopal—with its one-man power of the bishop.

## **Presbyterian.**

Between these two extremes is the Presbyterian form. It is government by representatives, elected by the people, known as "elders" in the English version, or presbyters according to the Greek, as written by the Apostles. In the political world, it is known as the Republican form of government. Calvinism and Republicanism go ever hand in hand. John Calvin reconstructed the Presbyterian form—which had lapsed and been practically suppressed by the hierarchy of Rome—and modeled it strictly after the scriptural type and Apostolic practices. The Republic of



Geneva was his twin creation—church and state having practically the same polity. Is it any wonder that Ranke, one of the greatest of historians, said: “John Calvin was the virtual founder of America”—because it is a Republic embodying Calvin’s principles.

D’Aubigne, who wrote the history of the Reformation, declares: “Calvin was the founder of the greatest of republics. The Pilgrims, who left their country in the reign of James I.,—and, landing on the barren soil of New England, founded populous and mighty colonies,—were his sons, his direct and legitimate sons; and that American nation which we have seen growing so rapidly boasts as its father the humble Reformer on the shores of Lake Lemman.”

The Government of the United States is modeled after the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. The Hon. W. C. Preston, one of the greatest orators of South Carolina, saw the resemblance, saying: “Certainly it was the most remarkable and singular coincidence that the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church should bear such a close and striking resemblance to the political Constitution of our country.”

As the founders of the American Republic and the authors of its Constitution were largely Presbyterian, it is not surprising that their church should have formed a model for their political creation. Chief Justice Tilghman furnishes this explanation: “The framers of the Constitution of the United States borrowed very much of the form of our Republic from the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.”

This form of government,—Republican in state and Presbyterian in church—may be traced in the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation with the help of any concordance by examining each text of Scripture where occurs the word “elder” in the English—or presbyter in the Greek. The following is a brief exposition of these principles based solely on the Scriptures:

## **THE ELEMENTS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT.**

### **1. The Election by the people of their representatives.**

When it became necessary to select one as a witness of the

resurrection of Christ, (see Acts 1:13-26), either there were only two men, "Justus and Matthias" who possessed the *necessary* qualifications; or else they were considered the *best* qualified among their number, and were nominated for election. It matters not whether the "lots" cast were "ballots," or an appeal to God by casting lots to choose between the two names. In either case it exhibited the church exercising its right of choice. The sixth chapter of Acts is more explicit in its account of the church in its first election of the deacons; while Acts 14:23, in selecting their Elders makes the striking statement in the Greek that they were "elected by a show of hands." These citations are sufficient to prove the right of the people to elect their own representatives contrary to the one man power of "appointing"—with its tendency in all ages to develop into "lords over God's heritage."

## 2. The Identity of Elders and Bishops as different names for the same office.

They are almost universally denominated "elders," but six times are designated "bishops." In every instance the context makes it perfectly plain that they are identical. In Phil 1:1, the Epistle is addressed to the "bishops and deacons." As elders are not mentioned, and as they are spoken of in the plural number, it is evident these "bishops" are local officers co-ordinate with deacons, and the same as those in other churches who are spoken of as elders. This amounts to an unanswerable demonstration in Acts, 20:17, where it is said Paul called for the "elders of the church" of Ephesus, and in verse 28 calls them bishops (See Revised Testament). Just one more illustration should surely suffice. Addressing Titus in Chapter 1:4, Paul speaks of them as "elders," and in verse 7 as "bishops." Throughout the entire Scriptures, bishop is invariably used as the name of a local officer. Jewish Christians called them elders—as they were so designated in their synagogues,—while the Gentile Christians spoke of them as bishops, the name of certain local town officers.

Even the great scholars of the Episcopal Church—which has its diocesan Bishops—admit that these scriptural "bishops" were entirely different from the diocesan Bishops of their church. The



late Rev. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D., Dean of Westminster Abbey, intimate friend of Queen Victoria, in a public address, uttered the following remarkable words: "The most learned of all of the bishops of England, whose accession to the great See of Durham has recently been welcomed with rare unanimity by the whole Church of England, has, with his characteristic moderation and erudition, proved beyond dispute in his celebrated essay, attached to his edition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, that the early constitution of the apostolic churches of the first century was not that of a single bishop, but of a body of pastors, indifferently styled bishops or presbyters, and that it was not until the very end of the apostolic age that the office we now call Episcopacy gradually and slowly made its way into Asia Minor; that Presbytery was not a later growth out of Episcopacy, but that Episcopacy was a later growth out of Presbytery; that the office which the apostles instituted was a kind of rule, not by bishops, but of presbyters; and that even down to the third century presbyters as well as bishops possessed the power of nominating and consecrating bishops; and besides, there were, from the commencement of the middle ages down to the Reformation, large exceptions from the principle of Episcopal government which can be called by no other name than Presbyterian."

Canon Venables in the Encyclopaedia Britannica and Edwin Hatch, Bampton Lecturer, make the same admission. Edward Gibbon in the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire,—not himself a Christian,—states that Elder and Bishop were identical during the first centuries of the Christian Era. Speaking of the government and administration of the Church prior to the Council of Nice, he says, "The public functions of religion were solely entrusted to the established ministers of the Church, bishops and the presbyters,—two appellations, which, in their first origin, appear to distinguish the same office and the same order of persons. The name of presbyter was expressive of their age, or rather of their gravity and wisdom. The title of bishop denoted their inspection over the faith and manners of the Christians who were committed to their pastoral care."

### **3. A Plurality of Elders in every Local Church.**

Without exception every scriptural allusion to the officers of a church shows this plurality. "Ordained elders (plural) in every Church," (Acts 14:23). "From Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called for the elders (plural) of the Church," (Acts 20:17); "elders (plural) in every city," (Titus 1:4). If the Scriptures are our guide as to the constitution of the Church, it must be universally admitted that in the Apostolic age there was a plurality of elders in every Church. Charles Spurgeon, the greatest preacher of modern times was so deeply impressed with this fact that he insisted on having a body of elders in the great Baptist Church, of which he was pastor,—making himself and his church Presbyterian in form of government.

### **4. In the New Testament ordination is always by a church court, and not by any bishop or one man power.**

Individuals practised "laying on of hands" in case of sickness for miraculous healing or for the impartation of spiritual gifts; but in the setting apart of officers for service, their ordination was always by church courts. See Acts 6th chapter where the deacons were so ordained; Acts 13:1-3 where missionaries were thus set apart, and specifically I Tim. 4:14 where the statement is unmistakable that Timothy was ordained to the ministry "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery."

### **5. A Gradation of church courts with the right of appeal from the lower to the higher.**

For confirmation of this principle the 15th Chapter of Acts should be most carefully examined. Briefly stated, the inspired narrative furnishes the following summary of the facts:

(1) In the church at Antioch a question of rites and ceremonies arose as to the necessity of circumcision. (2) This controversy between Paul and Barnabas on the one side and the false teachers on the other, could not be settled by the local church at Antioch. (3) The question was referred to an ecclesiastical assembly composed of apostles and elders at Jerusalem. (4) After much deliberation a decision was reached and a deliverance promul-

gated by this higher church court of apostles and elders. (5) The decision was rendered not to affect simply Antioch where it originated, but the whole church; for the records state: "and as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem." (Acts 16:4).

These, therefore, are the five elements which entered into the constitution of the apostolic church: (1) The election of representatives by the people; (2) the identity of bishops and elders as different names for the same officers; (3) a plurality of such bishops or elders in each local church; (4) ordination by a church court; and (5) a graduation of such courts with the right of appeal from the lower to the higher. The world may be safely challenged to produce any denomination of Christians today where all these scriptural principles are practiced except in the Presbyterian Church. The conclusion is unassailable that if a scriptural model and apostolic practice are the sole determining factors, there is no Church on earth which has higher claim than the Presbyterian as the Apostolic Church.

#### IV.

### **The Spiritual Character of the Church.**

The principle announced by Christ, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's," should forever settle and determine the fact, that there are two spheres of authority with distinct and separate jurisdiction. One is human government under kings or temporal rulers bearing the sword as their symbol of authority. The other is the church, a spiritual kingdom whose divine Head is the Lord Jesus, whose rulers are subject to Him and whose jurisdiction is spiritual, "ministerial and declarative." As Christ himself repudiated temporal jurisdiction, stating, "My kingdom is not of this world," so the Presbyterian church embodies in its constitution the prohibition: "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary."

Presbyteries and General Assemblies have not always conformed their practice to these principles, and sometimes have violated their constitution and occasionally invaded the province of the state, but such violations have afterward been recognized and repudiated and their principles reaffirmed. The mistakes are temporary. The principles are eternal.

These four general principles as thus expounded and hereinafter advocated constitute the substance of the Presbyterian system :

1. The Word of God, as the only Rule of Faith and Practice.
2. The Calvinistic Theology, involving Divine Sovereignty and Human Free-Agency.
3. The Scriptural Form of Government by Elders.
4. The Spiritual Character of the Church.

With this brief exposition of the System, the effort will be made in the remaining chapters to justify these principles by an appeal chiefly to the Word of God, to History and to the results of the System in its practical working, as witnessed by the general consensus of the greatest scholars of all ages and all Creeds.



## CHAPTER II

### **Presbyterianism in History.**

Ernest Renan, brilliant scholar and skeptic, unconsciously awards to the Presbyterian Church Apostolic Succession in his oft-quoted sneer, "Paul begat Augustine and Augustine begat John Calvin;" to which other scoffers have added, "and John Calvin begat the Presbyterian Church." None familiar with the facts as crystalized in the verdict of History will dispute the essential correctness of Renan's statement—however they may repudiate the scoffer's fling at the Presbyterian Church.

In his Lectures on Calvinism, the late Dr. Kuyper, eminent theologian as well as Prime Minister of Holland, rendered substantially the same judgment, but traced the historic succession to a far more remote source, affirming: "The development of life is organic and, therefore,, each new period roots in the past. In its deepest logic Calvinism had already been apprehended by Augustine; had, long before Augustine, been proclaimed to the City of the Seven Hills by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans; and from Paul goes back to Israel and its prophets, yea, to the tents of the Patriarchs."

#### **Apostolic Succession—Spurious.**

Advocates of "Apostolic Succession" appeal to history. Presbyterianism with far more force lays claim to apostolic sanction, but at the same time it bases its claim on much higher ground—in a historic succession which runs through the entire Scriptures. The figment of a so-called succession of men ordained by bishops in one unbroken line reaching back to the Apostles is the "baseless fabric of a dream." It has been utterly repudiated by the ablest scholars of the Communion, which sets up the unfounded claim. The arch-bishop of Dublin, one of the great scholars of the Episcopal Church and at one time the supreme head of the Church of Ireland, repudiated it in no uncertain terms, saying: "There is

not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty his own spiritual pedigree." Macaulay, the greatest of English historians and a member of the Church of England, nearly a century ago, hurled this challenge into the ranks of its advocates which has never been met: "The transmission of orders from the Apostles to an English clergyman of the present day must have been through a very great number of intermediate persons. Now it is probable that no clergyman in the Church of England can trace up his spiritual genealogy, from bishop to bishop, even so far back as the time of the Reformation. There remain fifteen or sixteen hundred years, during which the history of the transmission of orders is buried in utter darkness. And whether he be priest by succession from the Apostles depends on the question whether during that long period some thousands of events took place, any one of which may, without any gross improbability, be supposed not to have taken place. We have not a tittle of evidence to any one of these events. . . . If no evidence were admitted but that which is furnished by the genuine Christian literature of the first two centuries, *judgment would not go in favor of prelacy.*"

### **Apostolic Succession—Genuine.**

False assumptions of bigotry should not, however, prevent the plea that in all the ages there has been a genuine succession of spiritual men, custodians of the truth, who have transmitted the faith from generation to generation in fulfilment of the promise, "Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This guarantees the perpetuity of the *Church*—not of some *sect* asserting exclusive claims to the title, rights and prerogatives which are the inheritance of a common Christianity.

### **Denominational Names.**

Not a denomination existing today under any ecclesiastical name can show unbroken identity to apostolic times. "Things, however, are older than their names." The precepts and practices of each existed before any one of them had organic life, and each

is a development of the preceding. Contrary to prevalent opinion and contrary to its preposterous claims, the Roman Catholic, in its modern form, is the youngest of all. Traced historically, the development of the church took place in the following order :

From the necessity of the case, Independency existed first. This was due to imperfect organization and not to scriptural precept. Individual churches must have sprung into existence, isolated and separated, with no possible means of communication among themselves, and, consequently with no means of organic life. That this condition was temporary and imperfect is very evident from the scriptural accounts and apostolic acts, which resulted in this incomplete organization, but took definite form at length in "Presbytery" (I Tim. 4:14) and "General Assembly" (Acts 15th Chap.). If anything can be established by scriptural precept and precedent, it can be demonstrated that the normal type of organized church life was Presbyterian. This is the consensus of opinion shared by scholars of all ages and various denominations, as, for example: Canon Venables, Bishop Lightfoot, Dean Stanley and Edwin Hatch of the Episcopal Church, Jerome of the Roman Catholic, and Spurgeon of the Baptist.

This Presbyterian form existed in its scriptural simplicity at least till the second century and in some sections possibly longer. Next came Episcopacy—long after apostolic times—growing gradually by means of prominent Presbyters assuming authority over their brethren by reason of recognized ability or metropolitan position. In due course of time this new and higher order of ministers was called "Bishops" and gradually became well-nigh the universal and established order. This explains the origin of Episcopacy, and even its ablest friends do not claim it was the scriptural order—but "historic."

### **The Climax.**

Error ordinarily knows no such thing as arrested development. Very soon, therefore, among these unscriptural officials known as "Bishops," the most ambitious exalted themselves like "Diotrephes, who loved to have the pre-eminence." Consequently, there sprang up an order of arch-bishops, culminating finally in one head, su-



preme in authority, known as the Pope of Rome. The papacy was thus the latest development of organized church life, and which at length sought to suppress all others and conform the whole church to its unscriptural prelatic type. By fire and fagot, by rack and thumb-screws, by sword and Inquisition, by Knights of Columbus and political schemes, this Apostate Church seeks to "lord it over God's heritage" until it dominates the world in the interest of its system.

### **Historic Presbyterianism.**

Having given this exposition of the rise of ecclesiastical orders, the purpose of this chapter is to trace "Historic Presbyterianism" through the ages, showing that its principles have repeated themselves in the life and work of various tribes and nations; and under its symbol of "The Burning Bush" it has lived and flourished even in the midst of the flames kindled by its enemies for its utter destruction. Its motto, "Tamen non consumabatur"—signifying "Nevertheless it is not consumed"—is prophetic of its indestructible and immortal life.

#### **I.**

### **Early Days of Christianity.**

Not only was Presbyterianism the scriptural type, but for the first century, at least, it was the typical form of the organic life of the whole church. Edward Gibbon, skeptic and historian, having no interest in supporting the claims of any denomination, asserts in "The Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire"—quoted in our first chapter—that Presbyterianism was the type of the first centuries. In confirmation of this contention, he asserts that in North Africa alone there were more than a thousand bishops. They could not have been diocesan bishops in the prelatic sense, for one small section of North Africa would then have contained more bishops than there are dioceses throughout the whole world. It is perfectly evident, therefore, that they were only scriptural bishops in the Presbyterian sense, equivalent to elders.

Jerome, the chief authority in the Roman Catholic Church, makes the same admission: "In the beginning of the Church,



bishop and presbyter were the same; afterwards one was chosen to preside over the rest, as a remedy for schism." "Let the bishops know," he adds, "that they are superior to presbyters rather by custom than by an actual appointment of the Lord." During the first and perhaps the second centuries there existed no bishop in the Episcopal sense and no prelate of the Roman Catholic type. No claim is made that the Presbyterian Church with its name and all of its well articulated system, existed continuously, but without fear of successful contradiction—if the testimony of history and the weight of scholarship count for anything—the type of the first ages was Presbyterian in its simplicity, and nothing else.

### **Propagating the Faith.**

This was not only the age of martyrdom but the period of greatest missionary activity. Persecution itself has been used of God more than once as a means of scattering the seed of divine truth. As in the days of the Apostles, "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word;" and as in modern times the founding of America was due to the persecutions of the misguided Stuarts of England; so in all probability the period of martyrdom scattered multitudes of these Christian missionaries into the uttermost parts of the earth. Fortunately it was before the rise of prelacy, and so they carried the simplicity and purity of the primitive faith among the Waldenses in the mountains of Italy, among the Celts of the British Isles and doubtless among other tribes and mountain fastnesses unknown in the annals of history.

### **Historic Illustrations.**

As illustrations of this fact and in explanation of the existence of Presbyterian principles—though very imperfect in form and purity—among far distant countries, having no connection whatever with each other, account will be given—though not in their historic order—of the most notable of these historic churches and their struggles.

## **II.**

### **The Waldenses.**

In the northwestern part of Italy, nestling among picturesque mountains, situated in the province of Piedmont, are some of the

loveliest valleys of earth. Among these far-famed mountain ramparts there exists today a vigorous Presbyterian Church, the descendants of the martyred Waldenses, who are often styled "The Israel of the Alps" by reason of their resemblance to God's chosen people of old, maintaining a pure faith and worship reaching back into the dim twilight of history.

It would be claiming too much to assert they were Presbyterian in all their past and in all their parts, for that name had not yet become attached to any body of believers as a separate denomination. At the same time, their practices and principles more closely allied them with Presbyterianism than with any other historic faith. They were not even Protestant, for they antedated the Reformation and have always insisted that they were "*not reformed* because they had never been *deformed*."

The origin of the Waldenses has been, and will doubtless continue to be, a matter of dispute. They themselves have stoutly asserted their claims as dating back to the time of the Apostles. The road from Rome into Gaul and Spain led through these valleys, and it is believed that early disciples of Christianity planted the pure gospel here in their journeys westward. Others maintain that this ancient church had its beginning in the refugees driven from Rome under the persecution of Nero. This is the contention of Henri Arnaud, one of their most noted pastors, who himself led the "Glorious Return" of the remnant that marched from Geneva back to Piedmont and again possessed themselves of their native valleys:

"The Waldenses are, in fact, descended from these refugees from Italy who, after St. Paul had there preached the gospel, abandoned their beautiful country and fled, like the woman mentioned in the Apocalypse, to these wild mountains, where they have to this day handed down the gospel from father to son, in the same purity and simplicity it was preached by St. Paul." In a petition presented to their sovereign, Philibert Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy and Prince of Piedmont, in the year 1559, they make this statement: "We likewise beseech your Royal Highness to consider, that this religion which we profess is not only falsely reported, but it was the religion of our fathers, grandfathers and

great-grandfathers, and other yet more ancient predecessors of ours, and of the blessed martyrs, confessors, prophets and apostles; and if they can prove to the contrary, we are ready to subscribe and yield thereunto."

Their motto, "Lux lucet in tenebris"—signifying "The light shineth in darkness"—is symbolic of their mission. Through more than two centuries they endured every conceivable persecution at the hands of Rome, which sought in vain to extinguish the light. John Milton, author of "Paradise Lost," secretary to Oliver Cromwell, wrote the sonnet:

"Avenge, O Lord! thy slaughtered saints whose bones  
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;  
Even them who kept Thy truth so pure of old,  
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,  
Forget not: in Thy book record their groans  
Who were Thy sheep, and in their ancient fold  
Slain by the Bloody Piedmontese that rolled  
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans  
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they  
To heaven. Their martyred blood and ashes sow  
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway  
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow  
A hundredfold, who having learned Thy way  
Early may fly the Babylonian woe."

Oliver Cromwell heard their cry and, perhaps influenced by John Milton, raised 38,000 pounds for their relief and threatened "that his ships in the Mediterranean should visit Civita Veachia and that the sound of his cannon should be heard in Rome." This had the desired effect in calling off the minions of Rome and in giving them temporary respite. True to her bloody record, Rome again returned to her persecuting spirit till Napoleon Bonaparte gave them relief; and after repeated harrying, finally, in 1848, through the intervention of England and the edict of King Charles Albert, they at last secured religious liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience and to preach the faith of their fathers.



This ancient Church whose history is written in blood still lives. The present King of Italy has honored them—much to the mortification of the Papacy—in choosing one of their number as governess for his children. Marconi, the inventor of wireless telegraphy, is an honored member of the Waldensian Church. They have colonies in the bounds of our own Southern Presbyterian Church at Valdese, North Carolina, at Monett, Missouri, at Texarkana, Arkansas, and at Gainesville, Texas. True to their historic principles, they are a constituent part of the Pan Presbyterian Council—“An Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System.” No wonder Dr. R. P. Kerr states: “Empires have risen and fallen; dynasties have come and gone; the whole face of the world has changed again and again; but this heroic band has not been conquered, nor has their star ceased to shine above the snowy pinnacles of the Alps.”

### III.

#### Celtic Christianity.

According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the inhabitants of Western Europe were called “Keltói,” by the Greeks, from which is derived the name “Celts” for a remarkable race of people. The Romans named their country “Gaul” which coincided largely with the present boundaries of France, and which Caesar “divided into three parts.” In the migrations of races, historians inform us that a colony of Celts from Western Europe made their way into Asia Minor and settled the region known as Galatia, where Christianity was early planted and to whom Paul wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. Long before the invasion of Britain by the Romans, a branch of this Celtic race took complete possession of the British Isles. The subsequent invasion of the Romans under Julius Caesar, of the Anglo-Saxons under Hengist and Horsa, of the Danes and under Canute, and of the Normans under William the Conqueror, succeeded in dispossessing the Celts in England only. In their mountain fastnesses in Wales, Scotland and Ireland these fierce Celtic warriors, known in history as Picts and Scots, were

never conquered. Their descendants have held possession of the same territory for over two thousand years.

### **Ancient Origin.**

The introduction of Christianity among these Celts of Ireland and Scotland dates back to such a remote period that no historian can account for it. Two explanations have been suggested. One theory claims that communications between the Celts of Asia Minor gave their kinsmen in the British Isles the gospel in its primitive form; the other suggestion is that Greek Missionaries landed at Cornwall, England, and kindled the gospel light which speedily flamed throughout the British Isles. Only in this way is it possible to account for the Greek names "Alexander" and "Andrew" everywhere prevalent in Scotland and the still more singular fact the Greek Cross of St. Andrew is the National Coat of Arms of Scotland.

Tertullian, one of the earliest Church Fathers, who was almost contemporary with the Apostle John, asserts that "those parts of Britain that were inaccessible to the Romans (the highlands of Scotland) had become subject to Christ." No matter, therefore, what may be the explanation, Tertullian asserts the fact of the existence of Christianity among these Picts and Scots. Baronius, the Romish historian of the Church, asserts on the authority of certain manuscripts in the Vatican that Christianity was carried to Britain in A. D. 35, which would even antedate its introduction into Rome. Neander, the Church Historian, places on record his judgment "that the Britons had received their Christianity either immediately, or, through Gaul, from Asia Minor, a thing quite possible and as easy, by means of commercial intercourse." Dean Milman argues to the same conclusion from the controversy between the Scottish Missionaries and the Romish ecclesiastics in England, saying: "It is curious to find Greek Christianity thus at the verge of the Roman world, maintaining some of its usages and co-equality." Two Scotch Historians, Spotswood and Buchanan, concur in the statement that "the Scots were taught Christianity by the disciples of the Apostle John."

## Reversion to Paganism.

At the time Christianity of the Greek type was flourishing among the Celts of Scotland, the invasion by the Anglo-Saxons in 449 A. D. wrested England from the Romans and brought in their pagan Druid customs, which soon effaced from England whatever of Christianity it may have once possessed. This accounts for the historic incident recorded by Milman which led to the introduction of Romish Christianity into England:

“When Gregory the Great was a simple monk of St. Andrew, he saw some beautiful, fair-haired boys exposed for sale in the market place of Rome. He inquired from whence they came. ‘From Britain.’ ‘Are they Christians?’ ‘They are still pagans.’ ‘Alas! that the Prince of Darkness should possess forms of such loveliness! That such beauty of countenance should want the better beauty of the soul!’ He then asked of what nation they were. ‘Angles,’ was the reply. ‘Truly,’ he said, ‘they are angels! From what province?’ ‘That of Deira.’ ‘Truly, they must be rescued “de ira” (from the wrath of God).’ ‘What is the name of their King?’ ‘Aella.’ ‘Yea,’ said Gregory, ‘Allelulia must be sung in the dominions of that King.’”

After Gregory became Pope he sent Augustine the Monk (not the theologian) to England as a Missionary, which was the means of introducing Latin Christianity into England; but the Greek type already held possession of Scotland. *One hundred years previous to the coming of Augustine*, St. Patrick of Scotland had carried the Gospel to Ireland; and St. Columba of Ireland had but recently established his missionary institution at Iona on the coast of Scotland.

It is a curious coincidence that Scotland and Ireland not only exchanged names, but each gave to the other its patron Saint. Ireland, the home of the Scots, was called Scotia, which later became the name of Scotland; and Ireland became Hibernia, the name by which Scotland was originally called. St. Patrick, born on the Clyde in Scotland, went as a missionary to Ireland, and nearly one hundred years later St. Columba, born in Ireland, established his famous Monastery on Iona, adjacent to Scotland,—the



latter event being of much historic importance and of such far-reaching influence as to call for extended mention.

## Iona.

On the northwestern rugged coast of Scotland the bleak little Isle of Iona lifts its craggy peaks—in area only three miles long and scarcely two in width and with scarcely any arable land. Dr. Samuel Johnson, notwithstanding his contempt for everything Scotch, was constrained to say of this bleak isle:

“That man is little to be envied, whose patriotism would not gain force on the plains of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona.”

Such historic interest attached to it that it became the Westminster Abbey of Scotland, where illustrious Kings and famed warriors sleep side by side. Kenneth, the first King of Scotland, King Duncan and Macbeth who murdered him—immortalized by Shakespeare—as well as noblemen of other countries as far off as Norway and France, were brought hither to rest in its holy soil. On the last day of his life St. Columba, from the hill overlooking the Monastery, uttered this prophecy: “Unto this place, albeit so small and poor, great homage shall yet be paid, not only by the Kings and the people of the Scots, but by the rulers of barbarous and distant nations, with their people also. In great veneration, too, shall it be held by the holy men of other churches.”

Leaving Ireland in bitter disappointment, through some misfortune unrecorded, he acquired title to this seemingly valueless storm-swept Isle and founded a great “School of the Prophets” for training and sending missionaries throughout Scotland and even into England. King Oswald of Northumbria had found shelter in Iona,—where he was partially educated—and was so impressed with its religious life that he invited its missionaries to come and Christianize his subjects. This precipitated the unavoidable conflict with the Romish Monks of England, and King Oswald was finally persuaded to commit the religious instruction to them and dismiss those of Scotland. Milman in his “Latin Christianity,” speaking of this collision, said: “One-half of the island had been converted by the monks from Scotland, the other by those from

Rome. They were opposed on certain points of discipline,—held hardly of less importance than vital truths of the Gospel.”

### **The Culdee Church.**

Hitherto all reference to the Culdee Church has been avoided. The controversy waged between ecclesiastics—whether the Monks of St. Columba were Culdees, and whether these Culdees were as pure as claimed and whether they were substantially Presbyterians,—is not of material consequence. The essential facts, established by church historians, indicate that the type of Christianity known to St. Patrick, to St. Columba and to the Culdees of Scotland, so far from being Roman Catholic, was radically different from the modern Romish System. If the references as cited indicate that primitive Christianity was established among these Celts at a very early period, in all probability it underwent a gradual change, gravitating toward Prelacy, as in the case of Latin Christianity on the Continent. To say the least, however, it constitutes a connecting link in the Historic Church of Scotland, showing a line of succession probably independent of Rome, which may account for the fact that the Reformation there found more congenial soil than in other parts of Britain.

### **Distinguishing Marks.**

Contrary to Romish practice, their ministry was permitted to marry. The Bishops had no diocese and no jurisdiction over the ministry. Archbishop Usher states: “We read in Nennius that at the beginning St. Patrick founded (in Ireland) three hundred and sixty-five churches, and ordained three hundred and sixty-five bishops and three thousand presbyters or elders.” As there were three hundred and sixty-five bishops and three hundred and sixty-five churches, it is clear that these bishops were just what Presbyterian bishops are now—pastors, and nothing more. This was in Ireland, but St. Patrick, doubtless, established the same forms and ordinances in which he had been trained in his native country, Scotland. Bishop Stillingfleet says: “If we may believe their own historians, the Church of Scotland was governed by their own Culdei, as they called their Presbyters, without any (prelati-



cal) bishop over them." A Romish bishop, named Palladius, was sent up to Scotland in the fifth century, but the people refused to recognize his authority and rejected him. Bede, though indignant at their repudiation of the authority of the Romish bishop, testifies that "they preached only such works of charity and piety as they could learn from the prophetic, evangelical and apostolical writings." D'Aubigne says: "Iona, governed by a simple elder, had become a missionary college. It has been called sometimes a monastery, but the dwelling of the grandson of Fergus (Columba) in nowise resembled the Popish convents. When its youthful inmates desired to spread the knowledge of Jesus Christ, they thought not of going elsewhere for Episcopal ordination. Kneeling in the chapel of Icolmkill (in Iona) they were set apart by the laying on of the hands of the elders; they were called bishops, but remained obedient to the elder or presbyter of Iona."

Ebrard declares that it was "evangelical," not only because it was free and independent of Rome and, when the papal church came into contact with it, always and obstinately repudiated its authority under an appeal to the single and supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, but above all, because in its inner life it was penetrated throughout by the main principles of the evangelical church. However, modern scholarship leans to the opinion that these Culdees have been given too much credit for simplicity and purity, and that they evidently conformed more or less to the times of superstition and ignorance in which they lived.

### **Scotland vs. England.**

The types of Christianity which have prevailed in the two countries can be easily explained. The Scottish Church was much older than the English. The Scottish was the Greek type, while the English was Latin. The Scotch were Celtic, the English an admixture but chiefly Anglo-Saxon. The Scottish resisted the Romish Church many centuries; the English were papal from the beginning. The Reformation in Scotland was forced on the throne by the people. The Reformation in England was imposed on the people by the throne, and changed with the change of monarchs. It was Pagan under the Romans, Christian under the Britons,

Druid under the Saxons, Papal under the Normans, Protestant under Henry, Popish under Mary, Protestant under Elizabeth, Independent under Cromwell, Prelatic under Charles II., Episcopal since the Revolution of 1688.

The Reformation in Scotland was thorough and complete; the Reformation in England was an illustration of arrested development. The ancient Church of Scotland was somewhat of the type of the first century of the Christian era; the Church of England belonged to the type of the third century, after Presbyterianism had been corrupted into Prelacy.

### **“Like Precious Faith with Us.”**

The conflict of Presbyterian principles with Romanism went on through the ages and raged in many countries. The lack of space alone prevents chapters—similar to those recounting Waldensian struggles in Italy and the conflict in Scotland—which could be written of the heroic struggles of the Huguenots in France, of the Dutch in Holland with the infamous Duke of Alva, and in Bohemia of the followers of Huss with the same unrelenting foes. If any are inclined to dispute the fact that it was Presbyterianism which chiefly “contended for the faith which was once delivered unto the Saints,” then it devolves upon him to explain why in every instance after the battle triumphantly ended, these heroic and historic churches arranged themselves under the banner of Presbyterianism and are without exception constituent parts of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance today. Professor Heron of Belfast states substantially in another form the same truth: “It is a simple historical fact, of deep significance, that wherever the Reformation had free course and wherever it was permitted to shape itself spontaneously after Scripture, and without external interference, it assumed a Presbyterian form.”

## **IV.**

### **Presbytery vs. Episcopacy.**

The successful issue of Presbyterianism in its conflicts with Romanism did not end its struggle entirely. After the Reformation the battle was transferred to a new arena and was continued

in the conflict between Presbytery and Episcopacy. At the dawn of the Reformation Henry VIII of England made such vigorous onslaught on Martin Luther, that the Pope conferred on him the title, "Defender of the Faith;" but when the Pope refused to approve of his divorce, he broke away from Rome, not upon religious grounds but in the interest of his wicked ends. He *transformed* the Church, but he did not *reform* it. As a matter of fact, it was chiefly a change of masters with himself the head of the Church as its Supreme Pontif. The real Reformation began under his son, Edward VI, but was cut short by his untimely death. Bloody Mary made havoc of Protestantism in her efforts to restore England to the fold of Rome. Elizabeth, like her imperious father, imposed her royal will on the Church, which arrested the free development of Protestantism and resulted in what Macaulay denominated a compromise between Catholicism and Protestantism.

The coming of James I to the throne,—reared a Scotch Presbyterian,—was doubtless hailed as the working of divine Providence. He himself had signed "the National Covenant" of Scotland and was regarded as a "Covenanter," but he soon became alarmed at the republicanism inherent in Presbyterianism and began a series of acts calculated to suppress it and to establish Episcopacy in its stead, giving utterance to the famous saying, "Presbytery agreeth as well with Monarchy as God with the devil." Charles I, his ill-advised son, under the sway of the bigoted Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, undertook the unfinished work of his father and instituted more aggressive measures for forcing Episcopacy on the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

The Dean of Edinburgh, acting under orders from King Charles, attempted to introduce the liturgy in St. Giles in the presence of the privy council and magistrates and a large assembly of the people on Sunday, July 23, 1637. But it was unsuccessful. According to the old story, Jenny Geddes, an herb-woman, hearing the Archbishop call on the Dean to read the "collect for the day," misunderstood the word but not the act, and cried out, "The deil gi'e ye the colic! Villaine, dost thou say mass at my lug (ear)?" With that she hurled the stool whereon she had been sitting at the head of the Dean. This was the signal for an uprising of the congrega-



tion, and the people shouted through the streets: "A pope, a pope! Anti-Christ! The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!" This outburst of popular indignation was not confined to Edinburgh, but there was such violent opposition manifested throughout the kingdom that the project was abandoned by the clergy. Not so with Charles, who raised an army to force Episcopacy upon Scotland, and began a foolish conflict which ended in his own destruction and the establishment of a new government in England, with Cromwell at its head. Stanley says: "The stool" (now in the Museum of Edinburgh) "which was on that occasion flung at the head of the Dean of Edinburgh, extinguished the English Liturgy entirely in Scotland, for the seventeenth century, for a great extent even to the nineteenth, and gave to the civil war in England an impulse which only ended in the overthrow of the church and the monarchy."

To meet this new danger to the liberties of the Church, Alexander Henderson, next to John Knox, Scotland's greatest Reformer, modified the National Covenant to suit the exigencies of the crisis. It pledged the subscribers "to adhere to and defend the true religion, and forbear the practice of all innovations already introduced into the worship of God, and to labor by all means lawful to recover the purity and liberty of the gospel as it was professed and established before the aforesaid innovations." Henderson delivered a powerful sermon in Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, on February 28, 1638, after which it was signed in the churchyard,—tombstones serving for writing tables,—by thousands of persons, some of whom, it is said, drew blood from their arms to use instead of ink. It cost many of them the blood of their hearts, eventually. Copies of the Covenant were distributed throughout Scotland, and signed by great numbers of the best people in the land. On that memorable day, in old Greyfriars churchyard, Henderson said the people offered themselves like dewdrops in the morning for the service of heaven, as they swore allegiance to the King of Kings. The Covenanters at last triumphed, and in 1639 the "Barrier Act" was passed by Parliament, providing that no change should thereafter be made in the laws of the Church without the sanction of the Assemblies of the Church.



## The Westminster Confession of Faith.

The next year after Charles I fled from Whitehall, London, to return no more until his execution, while Cromwell was rising among his compatriots as their leader, a great gathering of ministers and elders from both kingdoms was called to meet in Westminster Abbey. It has become historic under the name of "The Westminster Assembly." It sat from 1643 to 1649, and prepared the noblest confession of faith ever given to the world. The English divines had already met, and now requested the assistance of commissioners from the Church of Scotland. Another celebrated declaration, also called a "Covenant," or "THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT," was drawn up by Alexander Henderson, in conference with English commissioners to Edinburgh. It was adopted by the General Assembly in that city on the 17th day of August, 1643, with emotions of the deepest solemnity, sent up to London, and there accepted and subscribed by the English Parliament and the Westminster Assembly.

"The Solemn League and Covenant bound the United Kingdoms to endeavor the preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, and the reformation of religion in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland, according to the Word of God and the example of the best-reformed churches,—the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy,—the defence of the King's person, authority, and honor,—and the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdom in peace and unity."

The object of this League was to secure uniformity in the religious worship of the two countries, and the Westminster Assembly was charged with preparing a doctrinal basis for the accomplishment of this end. The Assembly was called by Parliament, and consisted of Episcopalians, Independents and Presbyterians. The Episcopal divines declined to act; so the work was left to the two latter. The Independents were a small minority, yet they gave a great deal of trouble in the progress of the meeting. Before the arrival of the Scottish Commissioners, Parliament and the Westminster Assembly had resolved upon the abolition of prelacy in

the Church of England, though what form of church government should be adopted in its place was an open question. The English Presbyterians, not having been so well trained in Presbyterian polity, relied mainly upon the Scottish divines for the explanation and defence of that system of church government.

The results of this Westminster Assembly's labors have been of inestimable value in moulding the thought and character of millions of people, but uniformity of faith and worship was not secured in Great Britain. The Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Discipline and Directory for Worship were adopted only by Scotland at that time, though they have since become the doctrinal basis of nearly all English-speaking Presbyterian Churches throughout the world. The execution of Charles I at Whitehall was sharply condemned in Scotland, because the Scotch, while contending for liberty to worship God, were truly loyal to the Government. This threw them into antagonism with Cromwell. "Prince Charlie" took refuge among them. They proclaimed him king, with the title of Charles II, and he subscribed the "Solemn League and Covenant," thus becoming a "Covenanter." This act proved afterwards to have been hypocrisy; and when he was restored to the government of the two kingdoms, in 1660, a bitter persecution began, which lasted twenty-eight years.

### **Suffering for the Faith.**

Two thousand Presbyterian ministers were driven from their pulpits in England and Episcopacy restored. In 1661 Episcopacy was again forced on Scotland. The Covenants were denounced, and all who adhered to them declared to be traitors. The Marquis of Argyle was beheaded and James Guthrie hanged the same year, and those scenes began to be enacted throughout Scotland which have ever since been regarded as affording at once exhibitions of the most cruel tyranny and bigotry, and of the noblest heroism in devotion to religious convictions. Diocesan courts were set up, and no minister was allowed to exercise his office except by their consent. The Earl of Lauderdale was sent to the west country to enforce this system; but four hundred ministers resigned their charges rather than submit to what was in direct violation of their

consciences and their covenant. They were then forbidden to hold services, under penalty of death. Those who attended such services were punished by fines and imprisonment. Bodies of troops scoured the country, under such men as Sir James Turner and Graham of Claverhouse, hated names in Scottish history, to break up conventicles or out-of-door assemblies for worship and to kill the saints of God.

“Glory to God, whose witness train,  
Those heroes bold in faith,  
Could smile at poverty and pain  
And triumph even in death.”

Charles II, betrayer of Scotland, and at heart a papist, was succeeded by his brother, James II, who threw off all disguise and openly and unscrupulously undertook to impose once more Catholicism on Great Britain. It was his son-in-law, William of Orange, with an army of Dutch Presbyterians, aided by the sturdy Scotch, who defeated James at the Battle of the Boyne. The accession of William and Mary to the throne was the occasion, not simply of the permanent establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland, but of giving entire religious liberty to all sects and creeds throughout the British Isles.

### **The Restoration of the Stuarts.**

Having thus narrated the facts, it may not be inappropriate to consider them briefly from the viewpoint of the Philosophy of History. The colossal blunder of history was the restoration of the Stuart Dynasty in the person of Charles II to the throne of Great Britain. It was not only a case of arrested development in Constitutional Government, but it was likewise a violent reaction toward autocracy. The sacrifices of blood and treasure by the fathers were practically wasted—for that generation. The dire effects of the reaction reached like a dead hand into the future and laid its blighting touch on millions yet unborn.



## 1. Political Consequences.

It was a wretched reaction from the growing spirit of republican principles and human liberty. In 1215 the Barons had extorted from King John at Runnymede the Grant of Rights, known in history as the Magna Charter. The growth of liberty was given a new impulse by the Petition of Rights in 1628, a very memorable document, citing the Great Charter and rehearsing the legal limitations upon the powers of the English King. The victory won by the parliamentary forces against the Royalist Army of Charles I resulted in the "Commonwealth" under the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell during which time Britain enjoyed the first full breath of Constitutional liberty and bade fair to lead the governments of earth in the cause of democracy. Unfortunately the loyalty of Scotland to their Stuart monarchs led to the Restoration of the dissolute Charles II which set the world backward by hundreds of years. This blunder necessitated the Revolution of 1688 under William, Prince of Orange, who won the Battle of the Boyne in Ireland,—and as a result the Orangemen and the Papists have been fighting in that unhappy isle ever since. The Restoration of Charles made necessary the American Revolution in 1776. If it had not taken place who can say but that America might at this time have been a constituent part of a great Confederation of the Anglo-Saxon world—side by side with Britain, Canada and Australia. Speculation may be indulged to the extent of saying, possibly this reaction in 1660 was the explanation of the French Revolution in 1789 and may have been a remote cause of the World War for Democracy in the Twentieth Century.

## 2. Religious Disaster.

It permitted and promoted a reaction toward Sectarianism. The Westminster Assembly had been called by Parliament in 1643, composed of various denominations, for the purpose of preparing a Creed for Christendom in order to eliminate Sectarianism and unify the Faith of the Nation. Its Confession of Faith—the product of six years of the best scholarship of the Kingdom—was unanimously adopted by Scotland. It was fast crystallizing in the thought of England when this unfortunate Restoration halted its



progress; and Charles betrayed the Scotch—who had placed him on the throne—by driving 2000 Presbyterian ministers from their pulpits in one day. This arrested the new Reformation and promoted a reaction in favor of Ritualism,—which necessitated the great spiritual movement later under Whitefield and the Wesleys that gave birth to the great Evangelistic Methodist Church.

### 3. Three-Cornered Conflict.

In his "Outline of History" (page 776) H. G. Wells, the most suggestive writer of the day, makes this striking statement:

"In 1638 Charles tried to extend the half-Protestant, half-Catholic characteristics of the Church of England to his other Kingdom of Scotland, where the secession from Catholicism had been more complete, and where a non-sacerdotal, non-sacramental form of Christianity, Presbyterianism, has been established as the national church."

This effort, that had ended in disaster, was revived by the Restoration of Charles II, which prevented the possible unity of Protestantism and hopelessly complicated the conflict. Instead, therefore, of a simple contest between the prelacy of Rome and the democracy of Christianity, Episcopacy with its Ritualism came to the aid of Rome and perpetuated a system of worship, belonging more properly to Old Testament times than to the simplicity of the Christian Dispensation.

This has made more difficult the task of the church in promoting spiritual spontaneous worship, that appeals to the inner soul, rather than spectacular ritualism which appeals to the outer senses. This blunder of history did not confine its evil effects to the British Empire but reached across the sea and fanned into a flame the American Revolution, which was largely a rebellion against the encroachments of Episcopacy on religious liberty in America.

## V.

### The Conflict in America.

There remained, therefore, one more battle for historic Presbyterianism. Its struggle for religious liberty was transferred over-

seas to the American provinces. The Episcopal was the established Church in Virginia, New York, and other of the Colonies. Presbyterians were denied the right of worship, though many of them had emigrated to America for the privilege of worshipping according to the dictates of their own conscience. Francis Makemie, the first and ablest Presbyterian minister, was thrown into prison, and others were fined and imprisoned. It was one of the chief causes that led to the American Revolution. The Boston incident of the tea was simply the occasion. Men will fight more valiantly for religious principles than for any other consideration. Until the time "of the Declaration of Independence the Presbyterians were denied a charter of incorporation" in New York. John Adams, one of the Presidents of the United States, said: "In Virginia the Church of England was established by law in exclusion and without toleration of any denomination. In New York it displayed its essential character of intolerance. Large grants of land were made to it, while other denominations could obtain none; and even Dr. Rodgers' congregation in New York, numerous and respected as it was, could never obtain a legal title to a spot to bury its dead." In the same letter he adduces facts to prove what he terms "the bigotry, intrigue, intolerance and persecution" of the Establishment, and to confirm his statement that the dread of Episcopacy was one of the chief causes of the revolt of the Colonies against Great Britain.

The first Declaration of Independence that was published and adopted at Charlotte, North Carolina, May 20, 1775, written by a Presbyterian elder, Ephriam Brevard, became the model for the National Declaration in 1776. The Revolution was known in England as a Presbyterian Rebellion, and Horace Walpole in the British Parliament said that, "Cousin America had run off with a Presbyterian parson."

In fighting the battles of religious freedom for itself, it has incidentally given this boon to all lands and creeds, but never once has it imposed its principles by force on people of other creeds. Its weapons are not carnal. It seeks to win by moral suasion and by appeal to hearts and consciences, based solely on the Word of God.

The eloquent language of Dr. Thomas Verner Moore, spoken of Scotch Presbyterianism, might with equal force be applied to the Presbyterianism of the ages: "Its acorn had been planted on the misty hills by the hands of men who gathered it from spots where Paul planted, Apollos watered, and John garnered the increase; and it was lodged in a soil that was untrodden and unsubdued by the tramp of those mailed legions of Rome that had almost conquered the world. Its stalwart trunk grew on apace, although the boar out of the wood did waste it, and the wild beast out of the field did devour it, though the fierce storm of persecution wrested with its boughs and snapped many of them with a martyr's bloody fate; though the axe was laid at its root again and again, and twice at least was it hewn to the very ground by Saxon and Anglo-Saxon hands, yet the root still lived, and put forth its undying vigor with a greener growth by this terrible pruning, until it stands today, the brave old Charter-Oak of Christendom, with a life so ineradicable that the gates of hell never prevailed against it, and we trust never shall, until its topmost boughs shall catch the earliest rays of the coming of that Jesus, for whose crown and covenant so many of its offspring loved not their lives even unto the death."

## CHAPTER III. •

### **Presbyterianism and Calvinism.**

The two are not identical, but are so thoroughly linked together by their logical consistency, by their natural affinity and by their association in the Word of God that it might be appropriately said of them: The effort to separate them has but verified the statement: "United we stand, divided we fall." Each has at times maintained a precarious separate existence, but neither has flourished apart from the other. As the learned Dr. Albert Barnes says, "There are no permanent Arminian, Pelagian, Socinian Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies on earth. There are no permanent instances where these forms of belief or unbelief take on the Presbyterian form. There are no Presbyterian forms of ecclesiastical administration where they would be long retained."

#### **Distinctive Differences.**

Presbyterianism has sole reference to the form of government by "elders"—republicanism in the religious sphere. Calvinism denotes a certain type of theology as opposed to Arminianism. The name is a misnomer, called Calvinism after John Calvin, one of its ablest expounders and defenders in the argument with Pighius. Paul's reasoning in the Ninth Chapter of Romans with a theoretical Arminian was repeated in the controversy between Augustine and Pelagius, and later between Calvin and Pighius,—forerunner of Arminius. The system in its theological aspect has, therefore, been variously designated as "Pauline," "Augustinian," or "Calvinistic." On its scientific side as a world system, embracing the whole realm of life— theology, republicanism, and a distinctive type of Christian living—it is justly accredited to John Calvin, whom Renan, the skeptic and scholar, terms "The most Christian man of his generation."



## The Philosophy of Life.

1. In the Koran, Mohammed represents "Allah," his God, as plucking a piece of clay and throwing it backward over his shoulder for those that are to be saved, and saying "I care not," and then as plucking another piece and tossing it over his shoulder for the lost and saying "I care not." This is known as Fatalism, the creed of Mohammedanism, the philosophy of stoicism, the theology of the Primitive Baptist, the guiding principle of certain individuals, such as Napoleon Bonaparte.

2. The opposite of Fatalism is that philosophy of life which exalts man as the arbiter of his own destiny, as sufficient unto himself, as self-determining in volition, as actuated by his own feelings and influenced largely by environment rather than heredity. For lack of a better name it might be called "Chance." As a life system its natural affinity is with the philosophy of Epicureus and the theology of Arminius. In its last analysis its votaries are victims of circumstances. In their thought, "The Sovereignty of God" and "Divine Providence" are not the controlling factors of human life; but "accidents" play a prominent part. Illustrating this view of life, occurred an incident years ago which is still narrated in that community. A certain character—as well called Jones as by any other name—was notorious for "falling from grace." During a campmeeting conducted by Father Danly and others, "Jones" again "professed religion." The fact being reported to Father Danly, the eccentric Arminian preacher cried out: "Kill him! Kill him! before he loses it!" It was the subject of a jest; but it attaches to a system which teaches that the salvation of a soul depends upon the accident of death occurring at a time of being "in" or "out of" grace.

3. Between these two philosophies of Fatalism and Human Sufficiency stands Calvinism, which places God on the throne as Sovereign, "foreordaining whatsoever cometh to pass," as "governing all his creatures and all their actions." It differs from Fatalism in that Calvinism recognizes the free-agency of man and insists on the use of human means. It differs from Human Sufficiency in that it makes salvation depend not upon the human

but the divine "will," and lifts salvation out of the realm of "accident" and into the sphere of Providence, in which the soul is "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." Its key-note is grace—"sovereign grace," which "first contrived the way"; and chose us in Him, "before the foundation of the world"; *enabling* grace, "which gently forced us in"; "*sustaining* grace" in time of temptation, or in the trial of affliction; and *sufficient* grace for all times, events, circumstances and conditions.

One being asked of what "persuasion" he was, replied as only a Calvinist can—whether so classifying himself or not,—“I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

This definition and exposition of Calvinism are stated for the purpose of demonstrating its truth, by argument and logic, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, and for a defense against misrepresentations which have been brought against it, whether by ignorance or prejudice. If it does not "convince gainsayers," it may perchance edify its adherents as to the stable foundation upon which faith rests.

## I.

### To the Law and to the Testimony.

First of all and most potent of all is the appeal to the Scriptures in the support of its truth. What is the supreme test of truth? Are reason and fallible human judgments to be the final authority; or is the Word of God? It is not a question whether it commends itself to our opinions, thoughts or desires. The sole question is, does the Word of God teach the system known as Calvinism?

The general terms used to express it occur so frequently that it can be truthfully maintained that it is interwoven throughout the whole structure of the Bible. "Predestinate" occurs six times; "ordain" and "foreordain" twelve times; "Election" twenty-seven times; and "chosen" twenty-five times; making a total of seventy times. Equivalent expressions abound so numerous that in order to eliminate it effectually, it would be necessary to rewrite the

entire Word of God. Supporting this general statement the truth becomes irresistible by the following specific citations.

### 1. The Teaching of Christ.

It was Christ who affirmed that "many are called but few are chosen," and who unhesitatingly declared that the divine providence affecting individuals and nations was determined and conditioned "for the elect's sake." No Calvinist ever uttered stronger Calvinism than his declaration: "No man can come unto me except it were given him of my Father." "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." "And I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." (John VI and X Chaps.)

It is often said, "All men are Calvinists on their knees." Prayer itself is essentially Calvinistic. Never was there a better illustration of this fact than the intercessory prayer of the Master at the first sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in the very shadow of the cross: "Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son that thy Son may glorify thee as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to *as many as thou hast given him*. . . . I have manifested thy name unto the men *which thou gavest me* out of the world. Thine they were and thou *gavest them me*. . . . I pray for them; I pray not for the world but for *them which thou has given me*. . . . Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom *thou hast given me*. . . . While I was with them in the world I kept them in thy name; *those that thou gavest me* I have kept. . . . Father I will that they also *whom thou has given me* be with me where I am," etc. (John XVII.) In this intercessory prayer Christ asserts over and over that certain were "given" Him of the Father, "kept" by Him; and he could surrender His trust with the proof of his fidelity in that "none of them is lost." Lest any should charge Judas Iscariot as an exception he expressly excludes him as "The son of perdition," who was never one of his chosen, but a "devil *from the beginning*." Calvinism cannot be better expressed than in the language of Christ—"Given" to Christ and "kept" by His almighty power.



## **2. The Theology of Paul.**

The Confession of Faith contains no stronger statement than the following by the inspired Apostle: "According as He has chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved." (Eph. 1:4-6. This specimen of Pauline theology is the very essence of Calvinism.

## **3. The Testimony of Peter.**

Peter, while reminding believers that "our beloved brother Paul," wrote "some things hard to be understood which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest as they do also the other Scriptures unto their own destruction," was no less positive and Calvinistic in his own epistles: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ; Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied." "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." (1 Peter 1:2 and 5.)

## **4. The Declaration of the Apostle of Love.**

John, the beloved, is none the less emphatic and as positive in his statements. In his explanation of the defection of some from the faith he goes at once to the root of the matter boldly affirming: "They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." (1 John 2:19.) In his description of the "New Jerusalem" with its gates of pearl and its streets of gold, its glories and the happiness of its inhabitants, he makes bold the assertion that none enter in "but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life." (Rev. 21:27.)



## 5. Other Inspired Writers.

James, the brother of our Lord, affirms: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning." Jude, the briefest of all writers of the New Testament, bears testimony to the same truth: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called: Mercy unto you, and peace, and love, be multiplied. Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning from grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .

"Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever. Amen."

Without an exception, therefore, the writers of the New Testament join with one accord in support of the succinct statement of Luke, author of the Acts of the Apostles, that "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed," (Acts 13:48) thereby linking the sovereign decree of God with the voluntary act of the soul in the exercise of saving faith.

These are but specimens of multitudes of testimonies to the truth which could be adduced—sufficient to prove any proposition in the range of thought—and if they are not convincing it is useless to appeal to the Scriptures as authority.

Although an appeal to Scripture is thus sufficient in itself, yet certain other considerations will be adduced simply as corroborative testimony.

## II.

### The Logic of Philosophy.

No effort is attempted to prove the separate "Five Points of Calvinism" for lack of space, and for the other sufficient reason

that the system is consistent and the proof of any one carries with it necessarily the others; so that the method of treatment for the sake of brevity is rather of the system as a whole.

The sovereignty of God, which is the fundamental essence of Calvinism, is necessitated by the nature and the attributes of God.

1. Foreordination and foreknowledge imply each other. If any event is foreknown it is because it was fixed and unchangeable. There is no escaping this conclusion except by denying foreknowledge itself, which contradicts the Scripture—"Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world." Adam Clark, the ablest exponent of Arminianism, attempts to avoid the difficulty by saying, "God holds in abeyance some things which He does not choose to know." This involves two greater difficulties. (1) God must necessarily first know all things before He could choose to discriminate. (2) It would be unworthy of His moral character to avoid responsibility by voluntary ignorance.

2. The immutability of God necessitates a plan for the universe which admits of no change. Any modification would argue afterthought and imperfection. Limited wisdom and mutability of decree would divest God of His nature and attributes. William the Silent was driven to Calvinism as a refuge, because he could not worship a God without a plan and with limitations of his perfections.

3. Prophecy is in itself an unanswerable argument for the fixed decrees of God. Only that which is fixed and will surely come to pass can be predicted. Unless the future is predetermined, how can any prophet foresee and foretell? Were the prophets better informed than the Sovereign Ruler of the universe? The decrees of God are inseparably linked together according to inspired revelation. "Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called them He also justified, and whom He justified them He also glorified." The same parties are predestinated, called, justified and glorified—four links in the golden chain of decrees which reach from eternity past to eternity future. Not a link in the chain can be broken without doing violence not simply to revealed truth, but to the character of God himself.

## Conditional Decrees a Contradiction.

Even Arminians ordinarily admit the force of the truth, but would void its force by making the decrees conditional on faith and limited to time, and consequently subject to change. Contrary to the statement that faith is the moving cause of predestination, Scripture affirms that it is God's own good pleasure and not on account of anything in the subject of the decrees. Contrary to decrees originating in time, Scripture affirms that it was "from the foundation of the world." Conditional decrees would be a contradiction in terms. Decrees which change with changing circumstances are only divine attitudes, moods or impulses, and not decrees in any sense. If it be argued that predestination is based upon foreknowledge simply, then it becomes a work entirely unnecessary; for if foreseen, then the matter is already a certainty, and "predestination" would be a farce in determining that which for some reason is already fixed.

Conditional eternal life is a contradiction in terms. If "conditional," it is not "eternal." If "eternal," it is not conditional. Christ says, "I give unto them *eternal* life." The Calvinistic system therefore is not only strictly Scriptural, but consistently logical.

### III.

## Calvinism Reinforced by Science and Literature.

From the most unexpected sources, confirmation of the truth is now coming. Skeptics have attacked with all the force of their ungodly scholarship, and the criminal classes have manifested a bitter hatred of Calvinism which can be explained only as a manifestation of the "carnal mind which is enmity against God," and is therefore an indirect proof of its truth. Such opposition of unregenerate human nature is in keeping with the divine statement: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the Heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways than your ways,—and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isa. 55:7-8.) It is strikingly significant, therefore, that unconsciously and unintentionally such eminent scientists as Charles Darwin and Herbert Spenser, in their conclusions as



to the laws of heredity and evolution should become blind witnesses to a philosophy of the universe, which is strangely consistent with some of the phases of Calvinism. It is still more significant that only Calvinism can save their system of philosophy from the pitfall of hopeless fatalism. The reign of law in nature precludes and excludes all possibilities of chance. Calvinism is that system of philosophy which exalts the sovereignty of God in nature and in grace and which prevents nature—and sinful human nature as a constituent part—from becoming a blind machine working out its inevitable consequences according to immutable laws. No other system except Calvinism can take into account the facts and laws of the universe and evolve a theory which gives hope to a chaotic world and at the same time glorify the God of nature and of grace.

### Literature Assents.

As a specimen Robert Louis Stevenson, writing to a young man who chooses art as a profession makes this singular statement: "Lastly we come to those vocations which are at once decisive and precise; to the men who are born with the love of pigments, the passion of drawing, the gift of music, or the impulse to create with words, just as other and perhaps the same men are born with the love of hunting, or the sea or horses, or the turning lathe. These are *predestined*; if a man love the labor of any trade apart from any question of success or fame, the gods have *called* him."

Even poetry lends its rhymes in approval. Speaking of the inborn inclination of two brothers, it affirms:

"You may grind them in the self-same mill,  
You may bind them heart and brow,  
The poet will follow the rainbow still,  
The other will follow the plow."

To its support Calvinism is the only system which can summon Scripture, Philosophy, Logic, Science and Literature. It has been assailed by ignorance and by scholarship alike, but it has never been shaken. It has been misrepresented by passion and by prejudice, and much of the opposition is directed not against Calvinism but against caricatures of it. It is not more unpopular than



many other plain teachings of the Word of God, and we may safely leave its vindication to the Scriptures and with the God of grace and of providence.

#### IV.

### The Calvinism of Presbyterianism.

With those who caricature it and make a man of straw for the pleasure of demolishing it, argument is worse than useless. For the instruction of our own people and to correct misapprehensions, it may be said, Calvinism is not what is charged by its enemies, but it is what is believed by its advocates. The exposition of Calvinism as held by Presbyterians will make plain our teaching and serve at the same time to answer some of the popular objections to it.

#### 1. Calvinism, Not Fatalism.

The objection that Calvinism teaches that some men were made to be saved and others to be lost, irrespective of their actions and character, is a caricature of the truth. That is fatalism pure and simple, repudiated by Presbyterians, and as much condemned by them as by any other class. The Confession of Faith emphasizes the use of means, which distinguishes Calvinism from Fatalism. The objection is most effectually answered by the following quotations from the Confession: "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second cause taken away, but rather established." "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted and sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation."

Nowhere does the Confession of Faith represent that God created any souls unto damnation. On the contrary, Calvinism

contemplates men as already lost by their own sin; and the object of predestination is to rescue from death "a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds and peoples and tongues." "The rest of mankind" were "passed by" and left to the consequences of "their sin." No decree of God constituted them sinners, and it cannot be claimed that God was under obligation to save them from the consequences of their own sinful nature and wicked deeds. If salvation were a matter of obligation it would not be of grace. If the question is raised, why any are "chosen by God" it might be answered, it is because men in their wilfulness and depravity would not "choose" God. Left to themselves without the saving grace of God every individual of the lost race would have refused the offer of mercy and the whole race would have been inevitably irretrievably lost; so that Christ would have died in vain. Therefore the very object of predestination is to prevent the universal damnation of a lost race.

If the objection be raised, why God did not save all the lost, it could be answered that it would at once eliminate all motives to a holy life. If God should decree a whole lost world to salvation, it would take away all freedom of choice and all moral character. If the question be asked what influenced God in his distinction between lost souls, it must be answered that God himself has not revealed His secret purposes, and His creatures must leave some things to the wisdom, holiness and justice of God. "Who can by searching find out God or know the Almighty unto perfection?" Where human reason fails adoration begins—"Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!"

## 2. The Sovereignty of God and the Free-Agency of Man.

The objection is often raised that divine Sovereignty and human free-agency are contradictory. Some under constraint of choosing between them reject the Sovereignty of God because in their judgment it would destroy free-agency. Calvinists are not compelled to choose between them, but accept both as true, because the Word of God teaches one as truly as the other. "Holy men of

God, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," not only saw no contradiction between them but did not hesitate to join them together in the same text, as for example:

Christ asserts in John 6:37, "All that the Father giveth me shall come"—Divine Sovereignty—and adds in the same text, "And him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."—human free agency. Paul unhesitatingly joins them together: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." (Phil. 2, 12-13.)

Peter declares the crucifixion was "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and yet asserts their free agency in that His murderers did it "by wicked hands." If there were conflict between the two, then the Sovereignty of God in foreordaining the crucifixion "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" would have relieved the agents of all responsibility and it would not have been "by wicked hands." It is evident then that an event may be foreordained without in the slightest affecting free-agency.

Calvinists who accept the two because both are taught in the word readily admit the difficulty of reconciling the two by reason of the limitations of the human mind.

### Illustrations.

At best, illustrations by way of analogy are all the explanation which can be given of some of the deep things of God. Common table salt is necessary to seasoning and health in articles of diet, yet it is composed of two deadly poisons. Separate them and discard either and the other is a menace to life itself. The orbit of earth is the resultant of two forces diametrically opposite. Separate them and the centrifugal force would cause the earth to fly off into space at a tangent. The centripetal on the other hand would hurl it into the sun to its utter destruction. Under the influence of the two combined it moves safely in its appointed orbit. In like manner human life is controlled by two influences seemingly contradictory, according to human judgment. Destroy either, and the consequences are fatal. Destroy the free-agency of man and



he is the victim of inexorable fate. Eliminate the Sovereignty of God and man is as inevitably the victim of capricious chance. Under the combined influence of the two, the soul moves harmoniously in its orbit of righteousness.

### The Divine and Human.

The plan of salvation has its divine and its human aspect. From the divine standpoint every human life is a plan of God. All the circumstances, events and actions in the life of the individual are arranged and determined according to a divine plan,—the dictates of infinite wisdom for the moral government of the universe. Nothing can thwart the loving purpose of God. Predestination in eternity past, providence in the working of the plan, the welfare of the universe and the glory of God, are “parts of one stupendous whole.”

An appeal to human experience surely confirms the truth. Who determined whether you should be born in a Christian or a heathen land? Who determined whether you should have the environment of godly parentage and Christian influences or be influenced by an ungodly atmosphere? Who influenced the Holy Ghost to regenerate your soul by a new birth or else to leave you to the consequences of sin? Whose divine grace has transformed your life? Yet notwithstanding these gracious, determining influences, compelling you to say, “By the grace of God I am what I am,” you know absolutely in your experience there was no power that forced your will, and that you were perfectly free in all your actions. From the human standpoint each man acts according to his impulses and motives, utterly regardless of any influence emanating from his knowledge of God’s plans or purposes. Predestination, however, is not the guide of life. It is the secret purpose of God. Man acts by faith and “works out his own salvation” as voluntarily as if nothing had been revealed of God’s decrees. By the use of the means of grace he “makes his calling and election sure,” and only as he responds to the demands upon him for a holy life can he assure and comfort himself that his name is in the Lamb’s Book of Life among the elect.



### 3. Influence On Moral Character.

It is objected that Calvinism destroys moral character and all inducements to holiness. The objection is contrary to the express statements of Scripture and to the facts as revealed in religious experience and evidenced by the observations of men. Scripture is very explicit in affirming that the subjects of divine grace are "predestinated to be *conformed to the image of his Son*, that He might be the first born among many brethren." "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world that we should be *holy and without blame* before Him in love, having predestinated us into the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself." "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." According to the inspired Word, therefore, not only destiny but character is also the object of God's decrees.

License to sin in view of fore-ordination would turn the grace of God into lasciviousness, "prostitute" the heavenly calling and disobey the injunction to "walk worthy of your vocation." Fortunately this test of character can be safely subjected to the judgments of men. An Arminian Bishop on a railway train to a small circle of hearers was denouncing Calvinism as heretical in theology and evil in results. A young Presbyterian elder listening to this stereotyped attack upon Calvinism could resist no longer and modestly inquired: "What is your opinion of the character of the Presbyterian people?" Suddenly thrown on the defensive the self-complacent Bishop answered: "I admit there are no finer body of Christian people in the world than the Presbyterians; but as a matter of fact they are better than their creed." To which the modest young elder replied: "I do not so understand the teachings of Christ who declared, 'A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit . . . wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.' If Calvinism is evil how can it bear such splendid fruit?" The argument is unanswerable. Every creed in the world "brings forth fruit after its kind." The saying of Christ, that "Wisdom is justified of her children" has never been contradicted.

The character of Presbyterians is the best answer which can be given to the charge of immorality as to the tendency of Calvinism. Jas. Anthony Froude and other scholars and writers have borne willing and unmistakable testimony to the character of the Scotch Covenanters, English Puritans, French Huguenots, Dutch Calvinists and Italian Waldensees—Calvinists all. All faiths, creeds and sects are unhesitatingly challenged to duplicate these products of Calvinism in Christian character, in moral courage, in good works, in missionary operations—by any test or standard of living, chosen in any sphere of action.

#### 4. Calvinism Vindicates the Justice of God.

The objection that election is a reflection on God's justice requires no answer and the divine character needs no vindication. The Ninth Chapter of Romans is an inspired answer, which by hundreds of years anticipated and demolished the objection. Calvinism stands alike for the defense of the truth and of the character of God, but is not careful to answer any assault on the Word or on the justice of God. It speaks when the Word speaks and is silent when it is silent, with no inclination to be "wise above that which is written." With John Milton it is content to "assert eternal providence and justify the ways of God to men."

An objector once went to Charles Spurgeon with the question: "If I am not one of the elect and I earnestly desire salvation, is there any hope for me?" To which Mr. Spurgeon made the unanswerable reply: "If you earnestly desire salvation enough to seek God's mercy, it is the unmistakable evidence of your calling and election. If you do not desire it, why should you cavil at God's not giving you that which you do not want?"

No objector would be so bold as to claim that God is under any obligation to save any of the lost. If under no obligation to extend mercy to any, then no injustice is done, if some or all are left to the consequences of their own sin. Was any injustice done to the fallen angels because God in his Sovereign grace passed them by and provided salvation for lost men? No injustice is practiced by a creditor exercising clemency to some debtor and exacting full payment from others. Human governments pro-

vide that a chief magistrate may according to his judgment, exercise clemency in behalf of some criminals and leave others to the consequences of their deeds. If such discrimination is lodged in the hands of fallible human rulers, shall we limit the prerogative of the Almighty? Calvinists so exalt the divine character as to justify them in meeting any objection with the challenge: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" If others conjure up difficulties, let them take these to the revealed Word of God as the arbiter of controversies, or on their knees to God himself, and their difficulties will either vanish or else their faith so strengthened as to commit themselves and their burden to the God who is "infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth."

### **Why Calvinism Revealed.**

The query is sometimes raised: If predestination is not the guide of life, why should the Word of God challenge faith to wrestle with these "deep things of God?" Many considerations might be argued; a few must suffice. It is one of the strongest evidences of the truth of the Word. If it had been a human composition it would have sedulously avoided Calvinism which is contrary to the thoughts and impulses of human nature. Calvinism is a divine revelation. It transcends human conceptions. Calvinism takes all the pride out of men. It exalts God and places man in the dust of humility. It confronts him with the truth that he is lost by his own act but saved by grace. "Not of works lest any man should boast." Calvinism allows the sinner no part nor credit in his own salvation but magnifies the grace of God not only as manifest in his experiences, but as according to the eternal purpose of mercy. Others may claim some credit for choosing or some merit for persevering, but Calvinists, of all others, will in heaven cast their crowns at His feet in unspeakable gratitude and adoring love, saying: "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name be the honor and the glory." To them heaven as the gift of God's free grace will be sweeter and the Saviour who loved and chose them "from the foundation of the world" will be more precious throughout the endless ages of eternity.



## CHAPTER IV.

### Presbyterianism and Church Polity.

The Acts of the Apostles is the first chapter of the history of the Church under the Christian dispensation. Although not specially designed to teach Church Government, yet the principles and precedents furnished therein by apostolic precepts and practices are so numerous and specific, that it alone would be sufficient to reveal the constitution of the Church, if there were access to no other inspired writings. Notwithstanding the fact that the voice of inspiration was never heard after the first century, yet the advocates of Prelacy and Congregationalism appeal alike to the testimony of the post-apostolic age in support of their respective systems.

#### The Historical Appeal vs. Scriptural.

Mr. Litton, of the Episcopal Church, quoted by Bannerman in his "Church of Christ," makes the remarkable statement that the claims of Episcopacy are strong so long as the appeal is to the post-apostolic age, and become weak only when the appeal is made to Scripture. Canon Venables, in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, article *Episcopacy*, furnishes the following still more explicit testimony to the same effect: "It may be desirable here to remove the confusion which may be produced by the ambiguous use of the word 'Bishop' . . . In its fundamental sense of an 'overseer,' 'inspector,' it was not originally a term of office at all. When it appears as such in the New Testament, it is simply synonymous with presbyter, that officer of the church being called indifferently by one or the other name." After establishing this fact by the ordinary Biblical proofs, thereby indirectly testifying to the scripturalness of Presbyterianism, he frankly admits, "Any conclusion, therefore, drawn from the use of the term bishop in the New Testament, as to the existence of the episcopal office, would be fallacious",—claiming for Episcopacy nothing more than



“traces in apostolic times.” Concerning its divine origin, he speaks unequivocally: “Do we intend that Episcopacy stands on the same level as Baptism and the Lord’s Supper as a direct ordinance of Christ? . . . Though asserted as an unquestionable fact by many learned defenders of Episcopacy, we may safely assert that there is not a trace in the New Testament.”

In like manner Congregationalists have appealed to the testimony of Mosheim, that every local church in the post-apostolic age was independent. If deemed necessary, Presbyterianism might appeal as confidently as any to the post-apostolic age. That the government of the church was essentially Presbyterian for the first century and part of the second, is the only explanation of the conflicting testimony of Church historians;—one party magnifying the authority of Presbytery in the post-apostolic age into Episcopacy, the other magnifying the liberty of Presbytery into Independency.

### **The Scriptural Appeal.**

In the effort to establish the scriptural character of the Presbyterian form of government the argument will be based on the Council at Jerusalem, recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. The principles of ecclesiastical polity therein contained necessitate certain other kindred principles, which, taken together, form a perfect system, and being tested by Scripture for confirmation, becomes impregnable against every assault.

The Church is indebted for this Council to the false teachers of circumcision. Just as the sneer of the Jews, “This man receiveth sinners,” gave to the church and the world the beautiful parable of the Prodigal Son, so the Church is indebted for the Council to the heresy, “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.” It is the tendency of human nature in every age to attach great value to external ordinances or humanly devised means. “Except ye be circumcised,” is but a tie linking the human nature of the apostolic age with the human nature of the present, which is still making similar demands for carnal ordinances: Except ye be immersed according to our mode, ye are not baptized; except ye be confirmed by a bishop in the line of aposto-

lic succession, ye cannot receive the Holy Ghost; except ye be absolved by a priest, or anointed with extreme unction, "ye cannot be saved!" These three demands, legitimate successors of "Except ye be circumcised,"—though varying in degree, and only the last attaining unequivocally the alternative of "ye cannot be saved,"—yet agree in one thing, virtually unchurcing all other communions except their own, and thereby casting considerable doubt on the prospects of others entering the kingdom of heaven in glory.

Inordinate stress laid upon an outward ordinance is presumptive evidence of its human origin, or human corruption of the divine. Under the pressure of such teaching, the Council at Jerusalem becomes a necessity for the suppression of error and vindication of truth. It is immaterial who were "they" that appointed the delegation. The trouble arose at Antioch: a delegation from thence obtained audience (Acts 15:12) before the body of apostles and elders, who came together for the express purpose of considering the matter (Acts 15:6). A debate was held (verse 7); a decision was reached; and the decrees were published, not simply at Antioch, but delivered to all the churches to keep (Acts 16:4)

### **This Council, Keystone of Church Polity.**

This Assembly is of special importance because it is the keystone in any system of Church polity. If the Prelatic interpretation of this Council be destroyed, the Prelatic system of infallible Councils falls with it to the ground. Undermine the Congregational theory and there is no warrant for any voluntary association, giving advice. If it be not a higher court, according to Presbyterian theory, it would be difficult to exhibit any warrant for a higher court than the Presbytery of Antioch, which laid hands on Paul and Barnabas, and commissioned them to the foreign missionary work, or the Presbytery at Lystra which ordained Timothy.

The multitude of theories which have prevailed in regard to the nature of this Council are reducible to three, according to the threefold classification of Church polity—Prelatic, Congregational and Presbyterian. All other systems are but variations, modifica-

tions, or combinations of these three simple elementary forms. Consequently, this Council at Jerusalem must have been:

I. Either an inspired Council, according to the Prelatic type;

II. Or, exactly the opposite, only a voluntary association according to the Congregational theory;

III. Or, else something intermediate between them, a representative Assembly convened as a higher court, to hear appeals, interpret and apply the law of Christ, according to the Presbyterian system. Each system, to a certain extent, stands or falls with the above.

## I.

### The Prelatic Theory Untenable.

#### An Inspired Council Superfluous.

It could not have been the first, because inspiration was not needed to determine a case which had *already been determined*, both by inspiration and the providence of God, admitting the Gentiles into the Church without circumcision. If inspiration had been needed, there was no necessity to search for the mind of the Spirit at Jerusalem among the apostles. Was there not an apostle at Antioch, one "not a whit behind the very chiefest," who could have given an inspired utterance? Being himself "the Apostle of the Gentiles," was he not possessed of the mind of the Spirit touching the very class for whose sake he is specially called to be an apostle? There could have been no necessity for a college of inspired apostles, unless it be claimed that the inspiration of a collective body is more authoritative than the inspiration of an individual. But the very nature of inspiration is a denial of the latter assumption. If they were guided by human wisdom, then a "multitude of counsellors" might be required for "safety." But from the very nature of inspiration, what God reveals to one man is as authoritative as if revealed to an assembled universe. The authority imparted by inspiration consists in the person speaking,—the Holy Ghost,—and not in the number who are made the medium of communication. If the latter statement be erroneous, then the inspiration of the Epistles of Paul and all



Scripture must be impugned, because uttered through the medium of single individuals. When has inspiration ever chosen a multitude to become the vehicle of conveying truth? What fundamental truth of the inspired word was revealed by a college of apostles, or by any other multitude?

The very method of procedure is a denial of the inspiration theory. If the "apostles and elders" coming together to "consider the matter," was in reality in order to consult the oracle of inspiration, there could have been no disputing and no difference of opinion. The truth would have been revealed simultaneously to the whole assembly. Or, if one person in the number had been made the vehicle of conveying it to the others, no sooner had he spoken, than there would have been universal assent. The very opposite, however, were the facts of the case. It was only after "much disputing," consulting the word of God in the prophecies concerning the Gentiles, and the providence of God in admitting them without circumcision, that a conclusion was reached *in accordance with the mind of the Spirit*. But, does not the Council claim inspiration in that expression, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us"? The very union of their own names with that of the Holy Ghost forbids the theory of inspiration.

What, then, must be understood by the expression, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost"? In other words, how did they learn what "seemed good to the Holy Ghost"? Not by a new revelation of the Spirit, but manifestly by consulting the inspired utterances of prophecy touching the Gentiles (Acts 15:15-18), interpreted by the providence of God in admitting them in uncircumcision (Acts 15:7-11, 14). The record shows that exactly this was done and nothing more. Why demand a new revelation, when the mind of the Spirit could be learned by one ample and previously given? It was, therefore, by searching the Scriptures that they discovered what "seemed good to the Holy Ghost." If they had come together to inquire of an oracle, and "hear what God the Lord will speak," they would have published the decree simply, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost." If a Church court cannot be guided to conclusions in accordance with the mind of the Spirit

except by inspiration, then the opening prayer of a church court, praying for the guidance of the Spirit, becomes a mockery. If, then, it cannot be claimed that this was an inspired Council, prelacy must look elsewhere in search of a model and warrant for its pretended infallible Councils, and for authority to alter the law of Christ and legislate for the Church.

## II.

### Advisory Council, Inadequate.

It could not have been, according to the second theory, simply a *voluntary association giving advice*, considering the *composition* of the council, the *authority* of its decrees, and the *extent* of its jurisdiction.

1. We join issue with the Congregationalists squarely upon the *composition* of that assembly. Their argument is based upon three expressions in the record: "the multitude", of verse 12, "with the whole Church," of verse 22, and "brethren," of verse 23. It seems almost ludicrous to base an argument on verse 12, "all the multitude kept silence"! Therefore, because "the multitude" were present and "kept silence," they are entitled to become a constituent part of every church court, and *not* "keep silence"! In sending up the case from Antioch the "brethren" are not mentioned as a constituent part of the Council, whose decision is asked. It is simply said certain "should go up to Jerusalem unto the *apostles* and *elders* about this question." In giving the composition of the Assembly, nothing is said of any "brethren," but simply "the *apostles* and *elders* came together for to consider of this matter." In publishing the decrees among the churches, nothing is said of any "brethren" having participated in decreeing, but simply "delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the *apostles* and *elders*. Is it merely accidental that these two classes, and *no others*, are said to have been consulted by Antioch, to have come together to consider and to have ordained the decrees? Congregationalists utterly fail to discover any others in the composition of that assembly than "*apostles* and *elders*." "The multi-

tude kept silence," "the whole Church" simply acquiesced in the action of the assembly, and the "brethren" are only the "apostles and elders" combined.

2. It is equally easy to overthrow the voluntary association theory by an examination of the *authority* of the decrees. The language is too emphatic and unmistakable to be regarded as the language of advice. Advice may be offered, but has never yet been offered, in such terms as, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to *lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.*" Unless human language meant then exactly the opposite of its present meaning, *advice offered* and *decrees ordained* must be regarded as contradictory. Advice may be submitted for consideration, but never "delivered for to keep." "Lay upon you no greater burden," etc., and "delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem," is the language of authority.

3. Still another feature of this Council is not in keeping with the Congregational independent theory. Does the decision affect Antioch simply? By no means. Instead of being published at Antioch simply, they are published with authority throughout Christendom (Acts 16:4). Recognizing no frigid isolated independency, but, on the contrary, acting on the principle of the unity of the Church—that what is binding on one is equally binding on all—the decrees are delivered to all the churches to keep. The decision of the Council affected every church as truly as Antioch. Considering the composition of the body, the authority of its decrees, and the far-reaching sweep of its jurisdiction, it could not have been a voluntary association. Congregationalism, therefore, must look elsewhere for authority to enact the grand farce of giving advice.

### III.

#### Representative Assembly.

If neither the first nor the second theory can be accepted, let us view this Council as a Representative Assembly, according to the system of Presbyterianism. This follows from the nature of the destructive conditional syllogism. If truth lies between the three,



to disprove two is equivalent to the establishment of the third. It may be further demonstrated from the *composition*, "apostles and elders," the former being teaching elders, and the latter, at least including ruling elders, exactly the composition of every Scriptural court in its normal condition. Arguments might be adduced from the *object* of the Assembly, "came together for to consider of this matter," which was a case of appeal or reference; from the *method of procedure*,—the decision being reached by consulting the Word of God as the sole authority; from the *authority* of its decisions, "decrees," "ordained," "delivered them the decrees for to keep," and laid upon them as a "necessary" "burden"; from its *jurisdiction*,—acting not simply for Antioch, but for all the churches; from the *harmony* of this theory with the whole system of Presbyterianism; and from the universal support of the principles embodied in this Council by Scripture, ranging through the whole Bible.

### **Principles of Church Polity.**

Attention is directed next to the principles of Church polity exhibited by this Council, confirmed by an appeal to other Scriptures,—serving to completely establish the Presbyterian theory of the Council.

### **Government by Rulers.**

1. Contrary to Congregationalism, this Council exhibits the government of the Church in the hands of rulers, and not in the hands of a mixed multitude of men, women, and children, where passion and prejudice sway alternate scepters. But instead of such confusion, this Council exhibits the "*apostles and elders*" in the very *act of ruling*, considering and deciding a precedent,—involving principles affecting all the churches. It exhibits all the churches in the attitude of recognizing the authority of their rulers in the meekness of submission and the alacrity of obedience. This principle of rule exhibited, tested by Scripture, is abundantly sustained as follows:

(1) The *names* by which the officers of the Church are called are the very symbols of rule, the badges of authority. The elders were the "rulers of the synagogue," and, according to Neander and

others, were "transferred to the Christian church from the Jewish synagogue." In the New Testament, wherever "presbyters" occurs, only the connection can determine whether it relates to elders of the synagogue or of the church. The office and the name change places from synagogue to church, but retain the same relative significance. Interchangeable with presbyters is used bishops (Acts 20:17, 28), by which the same officers were called among the Gentiles. Concerning the latter, Neander remarks: "The appellation, bishops—overseers—over the whole Church and over all its affairs; just as in the Attic civil administration, those who were sent out to organize the states dependent on Athens were called bishops; and just as this name seems to have become generally current in the language of civil life to denote any kind of governing superintendence in the public administration" (Neander's Ch. Hist., Vol. I. Page 184).

(2) Scriptural *distinctions* imply two classes, the rulers and the ruled. "He that ruleth with diligence," etc. (Rom. 12:8). "Governments" (1 Cor. 12:28). "Ruleth" and "governments" are terms which demand the corresponding terms "ruled" and "governors," or else they are unmeaning and misleading.

(3) The *direction to rulers*, how to rule, imply two classes. "The *elders* which are among you, I *exhort* . . . Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: *neither as being lords over God's heritage*," etc. (I Peter 5:1-3). "*Elders that rule well*," etc. (I Tim. 5:17). "*Take heed*, therefore to yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost has made you *overseers*," etc. (Acts: 20:28). These directions are not addressed to the *whole church*, forbidding the majority from "*lording*" it over the minority, which would have been the case and the *danger* if all shared in ruling, but they are addressed to the *elders*. They are unmeaning, if there are no rulers, and unnecessary, if there are none ruled.

(4) The *instructions to the ruled*, concerning their attitude toward their rulers, imply such distinction. "Know them which labor among you and are over you in the Lord," etc. (1 Thess.

5:12). "Remember them which have the rule over you," etc. (Heb. 13:7). "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves," etc. (Heb. 13:17). The very word employed to express the ruling authority of the elders is the same denoting parental government of children. One of the very qualifications of rulers in the Church is experience in ruling in their family. "One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" (I Tim. 3:4, 5). Such exhortations are inexplicable, if no such distinctions exist.

(5) The *plurality of officers in every church* cannot be explained on any other supposition than as rulers. "Ordained them *elders* in every church," etc. (Acts 14:23). "Ordain *elders* in every city," etc. (Titus 1:5). "To all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi with the *bishops* and deacons" (Phil. 1:1). "Know *them* (plural) which labor among you and are over you in the Lord," etc. (1 Thess. 5:12). "Obey *them*" (plural) (Heb. 13:17). *Elders* of the church, etc. (James 5:14). According to the Congregational theory and practice, but one elder is needed in each church. The government of the church by rulers, exhibited by this Council, and supported by these five separate scriptural arguments, becomes an established principle of Church polity and invincible against every assault.

### The Eldership.

(2) Contrary to Prelacy, this Council exhibits the government of the Church in the hands, not of one man as pope, prelate or archbishop, nor of apostles simply or apostolic successors (so-called) as diocesan bishops; nor of preachers simply, apostles and preaching elders as in a conference of bishops, presiding elders, preaching elders, and preaching deacons; but in the hands of two classes of *elders*, teaching elders and ruling elders. In order to demonstrate this fact it becomes necessary to examine the two classes who are six times mentioned in connection with this Council, and five of the times at least as composing it.

(1) The "apostles" were present simply as "elders," combining



in themselves the elements both of the teaching and ruling eldership. The proof is three-fold: (a) The *fact* of their eldership is indisputable, for they call themselves "elders." "The elders, which are among you, I exhort, who am also an *elder* (I Peter 5:1). "The *elder* unto the elect lady and her children" (II John 1). "The *elder* unto the well-beloved Gaius" (III John 1). (b) They are not engaged in this Council in exercising their function of "apostles," but are in the *very act of ruling*. Therefore it was the *ruling* function of their office which was then being exercised. The conclusion seems inevitable, that because they are both teaching and ruling elders, and are engaged in the very act of ruling; therefore, they were present in that capacity. (c) The conclusion becomes irresistible, when it is further remembered that they did not exercise their *inspired apostolic authority*, or perform any act which had the appearance of exercising the *extraordinary authority* which belonged to the apostles exclusively.

(2) The "*elders*" present in the Council were either ruling elders simply, or included some of both classes, some who were simply ruling elders, and some who were both teaching and ruling elders. It is utterly impossible to determine between the two alternatives, and it is quite as immaterial, it being necessary only to show that the ruling elder simply was present in that capacity. (a) The *name* presbyters has special reference to ruling. The presbyters of the synagogue were the "rulers of the synagogue," while the scribes, rabbis, and priests were the spiritual teachers. (Geikie's Life of Christ, Vol. II, P. 623). (b) The *plurality* in *every church* cannot be explained, unless they are *ruling elders*. The previous chapter announced they "ordained them elders in every church" (Acts 14:23), which must have had special reference to ruling elders; the same term being employed in the following chapter, without any indication of its being used to designate a different class, leads to the conclusion that the elders of the previous chapter and of this Council were identical. (c) The *distinctions* between them are proof of two classes of elders. "He that teacheth," etc. and "he that ruleth," etc. (Rom. 12:8), clearly distinguish between them. "Let the elders that rule

well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who *labor in the word and doctrine*" (1 Tim. 5:17), recognizes two classes of elders. (d) The burden of rule is laid upon the elders at Ephesus (Acts 20: 17, 28), in the exhortation of Paul, at the very time when Timothy was preacher at Ephesus (1 Tim. 1:3). (e) The use of the word "*presbytery*" is further evidence of the ruling eldership. Occuring but three times in the New Testament (Luke 22:66; Acts 22:5; and I Tim. 4:14), though translated presbytery but once (I Tim. 4:14), twice it refers to a Jewish court undoubtedly composed of ruling elders simply (Luke 22:66, and Acts 22:5), and when used with reference to an ecclesiastical court of the Christian Church, without any indication of a change of designation, the conclusion is irresistible, that it must have contained at least some who were ruling elders simply. Having then shown that the distinction between the two classes of elders existed, the fact that there was a plurality at Jerusalem in the local churches, which necessarily included some of this element, is proof positive that the presbyters of the Council were either ruling elders simply, or included some of that class; and therefore the government of the Church is in the hands of the "elders."

### Equality of the Eldership.

3. Contrary to both Prelacy and Congregationalism, this Council at Jerusalem exhibited the *parity of the eldership*. Presbyterianism is not careful to demonstrate the parity of the ministry. If the parity of the eldership be established, the other follows as a necessity. The latter is not peculiar to the Presbyterian system, whilst the former is one of its most distinctive principles, and is plainly demonstrated by this Council in several ways.

(1) In sending up the case to Jerusalem for a decision, no superior apostolic, prelati, or ministerial authority is recognized by Antioch higher than the presbyterate. It nowhere appears that a decision is asked simply of the apostles, whilst they by courtesy or for some other cause associated the elders with themselves. But the very opposite appears, that Antioch ac-

knowledged no superiority of apostolic authority whatever. The record simply states that certain "should go up to Jerusalem unto the *apostles* and *elders* about this question." Why not go simply to the apostles? Why are the elders associated with the apostles in the appeal? Did not Antioch appeal to *elders* as well as apostles? Did they not appeal to both upon precisely the same equality? Is there the shadow of authority for supposing that they made any distinction between the two classes in asking a decision of apostles and elders?

(2) In their coming together, is any distinction made between them? Can any discover from the record, that the apostles came armed with more authority than the elders? The narrative simply states that the "apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." Did the apostles come to consider and act, whilst the elders came to be spectators? If our judgment must be formed solely from the inspired record, there is no alternative but to acknowledge the manifest fact, that they came together upon equal authority.

(3) During the session of the Council did any apostle or the whole number at any time by any word or act *claim* any more authority than the elders? Did any apostle *assume* any more authority? Did any apostle *exercise* any more authority than the elders? What evidence is there that the body recognized the superiority of either class? So far as the record goes, each class considered the other as peers.

(4) In publishing their decrees, did the apostles send them forth in their own name as their act and by their authority? On the contrary, associating the elders with themselves, and causing it to read, "apostles and elders, brethren," they acknowledged the parity of the eldership by issuing the decrees in their united names as by equal authority, wiping out even the distinction of names, and gathering both into one class of "brethren," exhibit the opposite spirit of those claiming superiority over their "brethren in the Lord."

(5) In delivering the decrees to the various churches scattered throughout Christendom, did they lay them upon the churches as ordained by *apostolic* authority? Did they recog-



nize any difference between the two classes constituting the Council? On the contrary, it is the positive statement of the Scripture, that the decrees were "ordained of the apostles and elders,"—equal authority being accorded to the elders as to the apostles. Considering these five facts, which could not have been merely fortuitous, that Antioch appealed to "*apostles and elders*" as upon equality, that "*apostles and elders* came together, as upon equal authority, that they acted together, as upon equal authority, that they issued their decrees in their united names as by equal authority, that the decrees were delivered and received by the churches as "ordained of the apostles and elders" in equal authority, the conclusion necessitating the parity of the eldership is irresistible.

### Unity of the Church.

4. Contrary to Congregationalism this Council exhibits the *unity* of the Church. If not upon the principle of unity of the Church, then upon what principle does a Church Council convened at Jerusalem decide a matter affecting Antioch simply? If it were a local matter, why should any other place than Antioch be the scene of the conflict? Jerusalem was not troubled by the matter, but Antioch was. If an effectual settlement of the matter as is alleged, had determined the place, then Antioch would certainly have been the place. That, however, is a matter of little importance, compared with another feature of this Council demonstrating the Church's essential unity. It is the *jurisdiction* of the Council, which the Congregationalists cannot explain upon any other theory than the underlying principle of unity. Did they publish the decrees simply at Antioch? "As they went through the cities they delivered them the decrees for to keep," etc. (Acts 16:4). They are no more binding on Antioch than on Christendom! If the jurisdiction of the Council extended to all the churches, upon what principle other than the unity of the Church? Tested by Scripture, which is the interpreter of Scripture, the Church's unity is still more manifest

(1) The use of "*Church*" in the singular, comprehending the whole, manifests its corporate unity. Such unmistakable evidence

is borne by one passage in the Revised Testament, that it alone would be sufficient to establish the fact. "So the *Church* throughout all Judea and Gallilee and Samaria had peace being edified," etc. (Acts 9:31 Revised Version).

The twelfth chapter of 1st Corinthians is an elaborate argument to demonstrate the unity of the Church, which has the advantage over every other argument, that it is inspired; but if the Church's unity be denied, that argument becomes a mystery. Arguing the fact from all having the same spirit, illustrating it by the unity of the human body, it closes with the assertion, "Now ye are the *body* of Christ and members in particular. And God hath set some *in the Church* first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversity of tongues," etc. (I Cor. 12:17, 28). If it be objected that this language applies to the invisible Church, the reply is, that the invisible Church, *as such*, needs no "apostles," "prophets," "teachers," "miracles," "healings," "helps," "governments," and "diversity of tongues"; these things are for the visible Church. If to this it be objected that the two cannot be separated except in thought, at least the part of the invisible which is still in the visible, that would *necessitate* predicating unity of the visible as well as invisible. If it be claimed that I Cor. 12:28 applies to the local church it may be answered, that God had not set "apostles," "prophets," etc. in the local church of Corinth.

(2) Such *figures* are employed, representing the unity of the Church, that they become unmeaning when that principle is eliminated. Eph. 2:19-22 presents the Church as a state, a family, and a temple; but a temple is not a building of independent disconnected parts. The Church is the body of Christ (I Cor. 12:27). But though every organ, muscle, bone, and sinew of the body were collected *disconnected* in a mass, they would not constitute a body. The Church is the kingdom of Christ. But a kingdom of absolutely independent clans or provinces would be an anomaly. If it be claimed that such expressions, "temple," "body," and "kingdom," refer to the invisible Church, then the reply is, if the invisible Church has essential to its very being

a unity, the visible Church which approaches nearest the divine ideal must exhibit visible unity.

To the support of the latter truth may be adduced the testimony of Dr. Thornwell: "The relations between the two is so close, that it is unwarrantable to predicate unity of the one and the want of unity of the other. The visible or professing Church approaches perfection, as it seeks to realize the invisible or spiritual. The two ought to coincide, and the purity of the outward is determined by its approximation to the inward. A Church, therefore, which cannot realize a visible unity, and thus aim to coincide with the invisible Church, is self-condemned; and any constitution which does not recognize this fact, is convicted of being unscriptural. This principle of the unity of the Church lies at the foundation of the Presbyterian polity, and all its peculiarities are designed to bring this out, and give it formal expression. It is singular that the only two bodies which claim to realize this unity are in the deadliest antagonism—each charging the other with being Antichrist. They are the Church of Rome and the Presbyterian Church. Rome does, in a certain sense, give unity to the Church. She compacts all its parts. There is no stronger outward representation of unity than is furnished in her system of government. There is, however, this marked difference between the two cases: the Church of Rome undertakes to exhibit the body in its unity with an earthly head—to exhibit Christ as well as his members; the Presbyterian Church exhibits in visible unity on earth the body only, and connects it with a heavenly Head. The Bishop of Rome claims to be the head of the Church. He alone who is in communion with him is a member of the Church, and consequently a member of Christ. Now, he must be either a real or a true head, or a symbolical and typical head. If the former, then as a body cannot have two real heads without being a monster, the headship of Christ is displaced. If the latter, then, as the body must partake of the nature of its head, the Church is destroyed" (Thornwell's Col. W., Vol. IV, Pages 135 and 136).

In regard to the method of realizing and exhibiting this unity of the Church, Dr. Thornwell affirms: "That unity is realized



by representative assemblies. The government of the Church is not entrusted to individuals, nor to the mass of believers, but to Councils. . . . These constitute a bond, which brings all the parts together into unity, and gives the Church the property of indefinite expansibility. . . . It is worthy of note how all churches have practically acknowledged the representative feature of Presbyterianism. Episcopacy, for example, has its General Conventions, in which, in the attempt to realize unity, the parliamentary principle is grafted upon the system. Congregationalism has its Councils, the existence of which is a tribute to the importance of the representative principles. Even the Pope, on occasions of great emergency, calls Councils to decide disputed questions. We are but carrying out, then, a principle, the practical necessity of which is recognized by all Churches, but which is inherent in the very nature of the Presbyterian system alone." (Thornwell's Col. W., Vol. IV, Pages 136, 137 and 138).

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* bears similar testimony to the completeness of the Presbyterian system of Councils. "It is of course in the Presbyterian Churches that Councils have received their most systematic development, and without claiming infallible authority retain the most extended powers as legislative, administrative, and judicial. . . . In non-Presbyterian Churches, Synods have various degrees of deliberate or decisive authority." (*Encyclopedia Brit.*, ninth ed., Vol. VI, Page 512). If it be argued that the Council at Jerusalem could not have exhibited the unity of the Church, because all the apostles were not present, and very few of the churches are supposed to have been represented (perhaps only Antioch and those in and near Jerusalem), it may be answered that a quorum of a court as truly realizes unity as if every church in existence were represented by delegates.

### The Right of Appeal.

5. Contrary to Congregationalism, this Council exhibits the *right of appeal*. This principle is inseparable from the unity of the Church, and either one established is proof of the other. If, then, the unity of the Church has been established by Scripture, the right of appeal follows as a necessary principle, and *vice*

*versa*. It matters not what may be the difference of opinion as to the nature of the appeal to the apostles and elders, whether a specific case was carried up, or a decision asked as to the principle, the evidence still remains of an appeal, complaint, reference or overture of some nature. The record is too plain to be "explained away." The heresy existed at Antioch, the delegation was appointed to lay the matter before the apostles and elders, they came together to consider the matter, the delegation was heard, a debate occurred, a decision was rendered, and a delegation appointed to publish the matter at Antioch. These are the facts furnished by the inspired narrative, which may be variously interpreted, but can never be so obscured that the multitude of Bible readers will fail to recognize the fact of some kind of appeal, furnishing a precedent, according the right to the humblest member of the Church to be heard at the bar of the highest tribunal of the Church.

### Scripture the Sole Authority.

6. Contrary to the "Charybdis" of Prelacy on the one hand, and the "Scylla" of Congregationalism on the other, this Council exhibits the *word of God as the sole basis of any ecclesiastical deliverance*. The apostles and elders were governed by no traditions on the one hand, nor human wisdom and expediency on the other. They dared not attempt to legislate, in the sense of making law, for the Church of Christ. That would have been to **usurp** the authority of Christ, who alone is the Church's Law-giver. Nothing lay within the province of that Council but to consult the written law, the revealed will of Christ, and apply the principles therein contained to the question under consideration. But they certainly acted as if it was their province to interpret, apply, and enforce Christ's law. Synods and Councils may not think to change the law of Christ, or legislate for the Church, but there must be some authoritative court to apply the principles of that law to each particular case. Whilst not interfering with the right of private judgment, yet ecclesiastical Councils may not permit licentiousness in word or deed. The only safety for church courts between ecclesiastical tyranny and ecclesiastical

licensing of wickedness is speaking where the Word of God speaks, and being silent when it is silent. Christ, who has given law to the Church, has also given authority to the rulers, assembled in the courts of His house, to enforce that law. Liberty of conscience and dissent of judgment are possible only where Synods and Councils have erred by violating the law of Christ. As that Council at Jerusalem inquired the mind of the Spirit by appeal to the Scriptures, so no church court can ordain, forbid, or enjoin anything whatever, unless it can exhibit as its warrant, "Thus saith the Lord," or an inference therefrom both good and necessary.

This Council at Jerusalem answers the question how the Church can obtain the mind of the Spirit after revelation has ceased to guide unerringly. It furnishes a model and warrant for the Church in like circumstances. It is a precedent which should guide every church court in all its deliverances. The Ariadne clue, which alone is sufficient to guide the Church safely through all its labyrinths of difficulties and mazes of doubt, is prayerful dependence on the Spirit to discover in the written Word what "seemed good to the Holy Ghost." Only when that which "seemed good to the Holy Ghost" also seems good to the Church, is there safe ecclesiastical action. Any church court, acting by virtue of a divine constitution, guided entirely by the precepts of Christ, and depending on the influence of the Spirit, can use the language of the Council, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." These principles exhibited by the Council at Jerusalem are also the principles of the Presbyterian system, and the principles which everywhere are sustained by the Word of God,



## CHAPTER V.

### **Presbyterianism and the Sacraments.**

#### **THE LORD'S SUPPER.**

In the order of time the sacrament of Baptism is administered to a believer previous to his participation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and it is, therefore, ordinarily considered first in any treatment of the subject. In the order of nature, however, the case is reversed. The Lord's Supper pertains to the atoning work of Christ. Baptism represents the work of the Holy Spirit in the application of redemption in the sphere of Christian experience. For this reason this treatise will discuss them in the natural order.

#### **The Identity of the Church.**

Presbyterianism is unique in one respect at least. It alone insists on the unity and identity of the Church in all ages and under all dispensations. It maintains that the Church of the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian Dispensations is one and the same; and the Presbyterian Church identifies itself, therefore, not simply with the Apostolic age, but with the life and order of the entire Old Testament regime. The only difference between the Presbyterianism of the Old Testament and of the New, is that one was prophetic, looking forward by faith to a coming Christ and the other historic, looking backward to Christ, "manifest in the flesh" and who will "come again the second time without sin unto salvation."

#### **Proofs of Identity.**

This identity of the Church under various dispensations may be conclusively established: (1) By the fact that the theology of the Church has always been the same—salvation by "the blood of the Lamb." This theology was preached in the Patriarchal dispensation by the sacrifices; made clearer in the Mosaic economy by

the passover lamb; blazed afresh in the vision of prophecy, which saw him "brought as a lamb to the slaughter"; burst forth into the full light of the gospel, as John the Baptist designated the antitype of all preceding types as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world"; and in the preaching of apostles, gathered around, as a nucleus, the "Lamb without blemish and without spot," whose "blood cleanseth us from all sin"; while John looked through the open door of Heaven and saw "In the midst of the throne . . . a Lamb as it had been slain."

(2) By the fact that salvation in every age is by the same instrumentality, the exercise of faith. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." So Paul argues we are saved in the same way, "Being justified by faith," etc. The only difference was that the Jew looked by faith to a Messiah to come, and we look by faith to a Messiah already come.

(3) The Sacraments of the Church are the same. In the Jewish Church there were two—Circumcision and the Passover—and in the Christian Church, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Circumcision, having exactly the same significance as Baptism has given place to it, there being no change of the sacrament, but simply of the symbol; hence Paul identifies them: "In whom also ye are circumcized with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism," etc. (II Col. 2:12). So also the Passover has given place to the Lord's Supper, both having the same significance; hence Paul announces, "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us" (I Cor. 5:7). The Passover was prophetic, and the Lord's Supper is the same sacrament, historic.

(4) The constitution of the Church is always the same, in every dispensation, a government in the hands of the "elders." In the patriarchal age these "elders" were the natural heads of families. In the Mosaic age he and Aaron submitted their credentials to the judgment of the "elders" in Egypt. In the "Church in the Wilderness" there were elected "seventy elders," which gave rise to the Sanhedrim at a later period. After the settlement in Caanan there was in each local synagogue a bench of

“elders,” the “rulers of the synagogue.” Not at all surprised, therefore, are we that in the New Testament it is said they “ordained them elders in every Church” (Acts 14:23). So naturally enough when John on Patmos “looked and behold a door was opened in heaven,” he saw through that open door in heaven no bishops, archbishops, cardinals, nor popes, but “four and twenty elders.” (Rev. 4:4).

If the plan of salvation is the same in all ages; if “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever; if He is the Divine Head of the Church; these considerations would seem to indicate that “the Church of God” is one and the same, though existing under different dispensations. Alexander Cruden in his “Concordance,”—recognized as a standard by scholars generally,—furnishes perhaps the simplest and most comprehensive definition of the Church ever framed as, “All the elect of God, of what nation soever, from the beginning to the end of the world, who make but one body, whereof Jesus Christ is the Head, Col. 1:18.” The identity of the Church in all ages is, therefore, of vital consideration, because it determines the place and importance of the Sacraments in the Church and imparts additional significance to them as not mere ceremonial observances but as having a holy and spiritual purpose. Especially does it have a bearing on the mode and subjects of Baptism as will appear in the further treatment of that sacrament.

## I.

### **Sacraments, Their Significance and Purpose.**

The word “sacrament” comes from the Latin word “sacramentum,” designating the oath of a soldier. According to the definition of the Catechism, “A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein by sensible signs Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers.” In other words, a sacrament consists of two things—(1) The “Sensible Signs,” which are the outward symbols, and (2) the things signified. In baptism the outward and visible symbol is water—the thing signified is the cleansing of the soul



through the regeneration of the Holy Spirit. In the Lord's Supper the outward symbols are the bread and wine. The thing signified is the death of Christ and our participation in its benefits.

### **The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.**

Confining our inquiry at this time to the Lord's Supper, the Catechism defines it as "A sacrament wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ's appointment, His death is showed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporeal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of His body and blood, with all His benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."

### **Diverse Interpretations.**

1. The theory of the Romanists is called "Transubstantiation," which teaches that the bread and wine by the officiating Catholic priest are converted into the very body and blood of Christ. The objections to this interpretation are fatal. In the first place, it violates the nature of a sacrament by destroying its symbolism, for the bread and wine are no longer symbols but are changed into the thing which they are supposed to represent. In the next place, it contradicts our senses. It asks us to believe that the symbols which look like bread and wine, which taste like bread and wine are really not bread and wine; and that our senses of sight, taste, smell and touch deceive us. In addition to this, it contradicts our reason by asking that we believe the law of nature governing matter can be so suspended in its operation as to allow the material body of Christ to be present in a million or more different places where as many priests are transmuting bread and wine into that same body of Christ. The Romish interpretation taxes our credulity to the utmost. Faith may soar beyond the sweep of reason, but it never contradicts rationality.

2. The Lutheran interpretation is very similar, entitled, "Consubstantiation," which insists that the symbols still remain bread and wine, but "in, with and under" them the believer receives the very body and blood of Christ. All the objections to the Transubstantiation of the Catholic hold against "Consubstantiation"

and one more, for it violates another law of nature by teaching that two material things, the bread and the body of Christ can occupy the same place at the same time.

3. The Zwinglian interpretation is just the opposite of these two and goes to the other extreme. In his reaction from Rome Zwingli, the great Swiss Reformer taught that the sacrament was symbolic and nothing more. It has been rejected by almost the entire Protestant Communion as too inadequate. It would be difficult to believe that so solemn an ordinance dealing with such sacred things as the suffering and death of Christ means nothing more than a symbolic representation of the truth. Such belittling of the sacrament, as thereby to rob it of spiritual benefit, would dwarf its functions to such an extent as to deprive it of all significance and value.

## II

### The Calvinistic Interpretation.

*In medio virtus* is a Latin proverb equivalent to the statement that the truth lies ordinarily between the extremes. In keeping with this proverb the Protestant teaching as to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, occupies middle ground between the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the symbolic view of Zwinglianism. John Calvin, followed by our Confession of Faith, imparts to this sacrament a spiritual flavor. The elements remain simply bread and wine, entirely unchanged; and those who do not "discern the Lord's body" receive nothing but bread and wine. The true believer, however, by faith feeds upon Christ really and truly. It is to the soul a spiritual "feast of fat things . . . of wines on the lees well refined." (Isa. 25:6). In this sacrament just as the body assimilates the natural food of bread and wine, so the soul partakes by faith of the very life of Christ "to its spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."

#### Sacerdotalism.

In nothing does the essential difference between Catholicism and Protestantism appear more marked than in the sacrament.

Sacerdotalism is a term characteristic of the whole papal system. It means priestcraft—the domination of the whole church to the authority and will of its priests no matter how corrupt. In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the benefit derived from this ordinance depends entirely upon the will of the officiating priest. It accords him the power of blessing the ordinance according to his intention. The communicants can never know whether he has given them the benefits of his good intention or converted the ceremony into a farce by withholding his blessing.

In the Protestant Church the benefit never is dependent on the will of the officiating minister, but solely on the relationship of the believer to Christ and on his improvement of the occasion as a means of grace by prayer, self-examination, repentance and faith.

### **The Lord's Supper, Nature and Purpose.**

This leads naturally to the consideration of the purpose served by this sacrament. It has its place and function in the life of the Church just as truly as has prayer, preaching, baptism, benevolence, and any other divinely appointed ordinance of God's house.

#### **(1) Symbolic Ordinance.**

First of all it is a symbolic ordinance. "By sensible signs"—bread and wine,—Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented. Just as in the preaching of the gospel the atonement is apprehended by the hearing of the ear, so in these elements the same truth is symbolized and apprehended by the eye. The sacrament confirms "the word preached," and enables the believer to get firmer grasp of the benefits of the covenant of Redemption, purchased by the precious blood of Christ as the expression and proof of his dying love.

#### **(2) Sealing Ordinance.**

The symbolism is valuable but is only a part of the sacrament. Still more valuable, and the essential element of the Lord's Supper, is the indispensable "sealing" of the covenant. The figure of speech is very striking and significant in the business world; and in human government a seal serves several purposes. It is used



to stamp a document as genuine and confirm an agreement. The pardon of a convict by the President of the United States may have the official name attached but is of no binding force as yet and might be reversed; but if the Seal of State is affixed it becomes inviolate and binds all parties, even the President himself. The seal of the Government on its coin or currency binds and pledges all the resources of the State to its support. For inviolate security and protection valuable packages are "sealed" with the official stamp of the party or State which so guarantees the unmolested contents. To safeguard the dead body of Christ, Pilate authorized the protection of the sepulcher with the seal of the Roman Empire. Nothing less than the invisible power of God himself could have had the temerity to break that seal. Backed by the authority and resources of the Empire the contents of that sepulcher were as safe as human power could render it. In like manner the sacrament is the "Seal" of the covenant. It binds Christ to guarantee the salvation of the believer and it binds the believer to a life of obedience and consecration. Every participation in the Lord's Supper is a renewal of the covenant between the soul and its Saviour. The believer "sealed" is guaranteed eternal life and protected by the omnipotent power of a covenant-keeping God.

### (3) Commemorative Ordinance.

On monument, tablet or tomb the inscribed words—"In Memoriam"—have always peculiar and sacred significance. They are a perpetual memento of one that is "absent." In instituting the Supper both in giving the bread and in giving the wine—twice—"our Lord the same night in which He was betrayed" emphasized the memorial feature of this perpetual ordinance, saying, "This do in *remembrance* of Me."

Surely the blood-bought Church could never forget "dark Gethsemane or cross-crowned Calvary." It is sad reflection on the fickleness of human nature that the church should need a perpetual reminder of "His dying love," yet time and circumstances efface impressions and deaden affections. The Lord's Supper is the Master's appeal for perpetual "remembrance," not

simply to the apostles who loved Him in the flesh, but to distant ages, bringing to mind Him, "Whom having not seen we love." Each observance is a "remembrance" pointing backward through the ages to Calvary. Each remembrance is calculated to stir the heart of the believer to its deepest depth and awaken a love begotten of love of which we fervently sing:

"Immortal love, forever full,  
Forever flowing free  
Forever shared, forever whole  
A never ebbing sea!

Our outward lips confess the name  
All other names above,  
Love only knoweth whence it came  
And comprehendeth love."

#### (4) Anticipative Ordinance.

If it commemorates, it likewise anticipates. If one hand points to Calvary, the other points forward to the future saying: "Till He come." This sacrament is the connecting link between the first and second coming of Christ. It ever keeps alive the faith of the Church in the future glorious triumph of the Church through the triumph of her divine Lord.

"Till He come"—The age of doubt may grow skeptical and sneeringly ask, "Where is the promise of His coming?" To this challenge the sacrament points to the heavens and cries—"Till He come." The ungodly world may be utterly unprepared and overwhelmed by His appearance, but the sacrament is ever echoing its warning—"Till He come." Even His own bride, the blood-bought Church may grow cold and cease to pray, "Come Lord Jesus, come quickly," yet the sacrament is a constant reminder reiterating its message, "Till He come." No voice of prophet or seer can tell "What shall be on the morrow"; but this sacrament acclaims one inevitable event, crying through the ages, and will continue its appeal to faith with the challenge—"Till He come."

## (5) Gracious Ordinance.

Not by some mysterious efficacy or inscrutable method, not by some inherent power—"ex opere operato," signifying virtue within itself,—nor by some inexplicable operation, does the holy communion benefit the soul of the believer. The blessing obtained is that which pertains to it as a spiritual "means of grace." It sums up in itself all the other means appointed for spiritual edification. It enlists prayer, the Word, meditation and the sacrament itself. It functions as a gracious exercise which makes its appeal to the whole spiritual nature of the believer. The "remembrance" brings Calvary afresh to the mind in a very realistic manner that is calculated to awaken contrition for our "sins which pierced Him," and to stir the soul to its deepest depths of love. The broken bread and wine poured out enable the soul to obtain a firmer grasp by faith of Christ "evidently set forth crucified before us." The sense of pardoned sin and the assurance of salvation are calculated to restore to us the joy of salvation. Reflection on our failures and sins inherent in our unsanctified carnal nature—dying but still active—causes penitential tears and stimulates new purpose of amendment of life and manners. The communion of saints, including our Lord Himself, affords a sweet foretaste and blessed hope of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb, "When we shall drink anew" in the kingdom of our dear Lord, when the body of believers is complete and the blood-bought church shall see face to face "Him whom our soul loveth," when for the first time the vast redeemed host shall assemble in one innumerable throng, when the "old, old story" shall burst into "the new song" of redeeming love, and we "shall bring forth the royal diadem and crown Him Lord of all," amid the joint hallelujahs of saints and angels.

Is not this conception of the nature and purpose of the sacrament worthy of the name, "holy communion"? An ordinance so symbolic, sealing, commemorative and gracious exalts it into a large and indispensable place in the scheme of Redemption. Is not the church justified in lifting it to a higher function of service in the kingdom by more scriptural interpretation and exposition for the comfort of believers and by more intelligent and spiritual



celebration as a distinct means of grace, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the statute of the fulness of Christ;" and that we "may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. Now unto Him that is able to do exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end."

## CHAPTER VI.

### Presbyterianism and the Sacraments.

#### BAPTISM.

Definitions lay the foundation for constructive work as a basis for Scriptural exposition and interpretation, in reaching the truth in regard to any subject, doctrine or ordinance.

#### Definition of Baptism.

Baptism is the thorough change wrought in the spiritual life of a soul through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and is outwardly symbolized by the application of water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. In the popular conception of the ordinance, water baptism so occupies the thought and attention of many people as to cause them to lose sight of the fact that the outward rite is not the real thing but only a representation of the work of the Spirit. The definition of the Confession of Faith may serve, therefore, to reinforce the real significance of the ordinance: "Baptism is a sacrament, wherein the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's."

The thing signified is the cleansing operation of the Spirit by the application of the blood of Christ that "cleanseth us from all sin." The symbol is water, which has no efficacy in itself, but which visibly represents the invisible grace of the "new birth." According to the Confession of Faith, "The efficacy of baptism is not tied to the moment of time wherein it is administered." The baptism of the soul by the Holy Ghost and the baptism of the body by water seldom, if ever, take place the same moment. The Spiritual is supposed to precede the symbolic. Unless, therefore, a change of heart is wrought by the Spirit, baptism with water is of no avail,—regardless of the mode of applying the water.

## Mode of Baptism not Essential.

Water baptism itself not being essential to salvation, much less is the mode. At the same time being a scriptural ordinance, it should correspond as nearly as possible to the thing which it signifies. It is of fundamental importance that every ordinance should conform to the scriptural type because of the tendency of human nature to attach undue importance to any ceremonial ordinance in proportion as it departs from the simplicity of the scriptural form. This justifies inquiry into, and a discussion of, the mode of baptism. The first consideration touches the whole question at issue: *Is baptism the application of the person to the water; or the application of the water to the person?*

### I.

## The Meaning of the Word.

As the advocates of immersion base its claim largely on the meaning of the Greek word, *baptizo*, from which is derived the English word baptism, it becomes necessary to subject it to the closest scrutiny. Two words in the Greek, *bapto* and *baptizo*, are very similar in appearance but very different in their meaning. *Bapto* means primarily to "dip," although in the secondary meaning it signifies to "dye" and loses the idea of dipping entirely, as the dyeing may be done by sprinkling.

This word *bapto* which means to "dip" is never in any instance used as the word for baptism. *Baptizo*, which is the word used in the Scriptures for baptism, does not mean to "dip" and never lends itself to any special mode. It has one fixed meaning, but may be performed by a dozen different modes. It means *controlling influence* by which the *condition* of the object is thoroughly *changed*. It never has the significance of putting one into the water and taking him out. That would be "dipping," and the word for that act is *bapto*, which is never applied to baptism. If, however, one is put into the water and left till he is *drowned*, *baptizo* would express the act, because he is *changed* from a living man to a dead man. That, however, would be only one application



of the word. It was used freely by the Greeks for numerous acts, but never demands the suggestion of any mode. "Baptized with wine," used frequently by the Greeks, did not mean "dipped" into the liquid, but meant "drunken"—changed (by *drinking* wine) from a sober man to a drunken man. "Baptized by a drug" meant having poppy juice sprinkled in his face, or drinking an opiate, and thereby *changing* his normal condition into a stupor.

### Classic Baptism.

The following are specimens of usage in the Greek:

"Baptized by the same drug"; by drinking from a cup.—Tatius.

"Baptized by unmixed wine"; by drinking from a cup.—Athenaeus.

"Baptizing powerfully"; by drinking from a cup.—Athenaeus.

"Baptized Alexander"; by drinking from a cup.—Conon.

"Resembles one baptized"; by drinking from a cup.—Lucian.

"Baptized yesterday"; by drinking from a cup.—Plato.

"Baptized by yesterday's debauch"; by drinking from a cup.—Plutarch.

Christ himself used the word in this same sense: "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" This involved the baptism of martyrdom—*changed* from life to death. Paul used baptism in the same sense in Heb. 9:10; speaking of the ceremonial sprinklings in the Jewish Church, he called them "divers baptisms"—because they were *changed ceremonially* from uncleanness to cleanness. Any purification, no matter by what mode performed, was called baptism, because the condition of the person was *changed*. The early church fathers, dating back almost to Apostolic times, so used the word. Clement of Alexandria speaks of being "baptized a second time by tears"—*changed* from impenitence to penitence—but the penitent was not immersed in his own tears. Origen states, "For it is only the baptism of blood which renders us more pure than the baptism of water"—*changed* by the purifying process of martyrdom—but the martyr was not immersed in his own blood.

In the Greek, the word used for the Lord's Supper by the

Apostles is *deipnon*, which unquestionably means a "feast"; and yet as a symbolic act no one insists that believers to get the benefit of the Lord's Supper should eat a full meal, although that seemed to have been the practice of the church in the early days. The Apostle Paul rebuked the Corinthian Church for such celebration of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:22). If, therefore, a crumb of bread and a sup of wine are universally recognized as sufficient for properly celebrating this sacrament, it is highly inconsistent that the benefit in the other sacrament should be made by some denominations to depend upon the quantity of water. The symbolic usage should be the same in both sacraments.

Dr. James W. Dale, a man of great learning and research, has written voluminous and scholarly books on the meaning of the word *baptizo*—tracing it through the Greek literature as well as throughout the Scriptures—and reaches this conclusion, which no one has ever even attempted to refute: "Whatever is capable of thoroughly changing the character, state and condition of any object is capable of baptizing that object, and by such change of character, state or condition does, in fact, baptize it."

Based upon this conclusion, the result of preeminent scholarship, he challenges the world with this definition of baptism: "The Scriptures teach a baptism which is from Christ as an atoning Redeemer, and is effected in the soul through the Holy Ghost, so that the condition of the soul, in its own nature and its relation to law and to sin, is thoroughly changed, and new relations, in holiness, are established toward God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Scriptures further teach that this baptism of the soul through the blood of Christ received by repentance and faith, the work of the Holy Ghost, is embodied in a rite and symbolly exhibited by the application of pure water to the body, with the utterance of appropriate expository words. This is the doctrine of that 'one baptism' by Scripture in its reality by the Holy Ghost, and in that reality ritually symbolized by pure water."

## II.

### The Appeal to Scriptures.

#### Baptized in the Red Sea.

The first thing in the Word of God called baptism is the passage of the Red Sea by the children of Israel (1 Cor. 10:1, 2): "All our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The mode of this baptism can only be determined by reading the Mosaic account in Exodus 14:21, 22: "And the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea *upon the dry ground.*" Can there be the slightest reasonable doubt about the mode of that baptism? The Egyptians were immersed; but Paul does not say they were baptized. The Israelites were not immersed; and yet Paul affirms that they "were all baptized." If any water touched the Israelites, it must have been poured upon them from the cloud, or sprinkled on them by the spray; and yet Paul, inspired and infallible, pronounces it baptism. If we had nothing but the statement of Paul that they "were all baptized," that would be regarded sufficient proof of immersion by multitudes. All the world could not shake their belief that the Israelites were "buried in liquid graves"—if the Mosaic account did not bar the possibility of such an inference. Yet upon such insufficient evidence they dogmatize about the immersion of Jesus, simply because of the proximity of a river. But Paul tells of the baptism of multitudes "in the sea"; and yet Moses assures us they were not immersed.

Such an application of water as these Israelites received would not now be regarded as baptism by the advocates of immersion; but we must take our position by the side of Paul, and insist that this was baptism, although it was not immersion. It is curious to see how immersionists attempt to evade what Paul in this place distinctly affirms is baptism. Dr. Alexander Carson, in his herculean effort to prove that "baptism" means "dip" through the whole



range of Greek literature, says of the Israelites on this occasion that they got a "dry dip"! Dr. Broadus, in his tract entitled "Immersion Essential," says that this was "not a literal immersion; it was *only something like* baptism"! But Paul insists that it *was* baptism! "Baptized unto Moses" denotes *the change* in Israel's attitude toward Moses and from this moment their acceptance of his leadership of the Lord's hosts.

### Jewish Ritual Baptisms.

The next text of Scripture claiming attention is Heb. 9:10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings." The word translated "washings" in the Greek, as written by the inspired author, is "baptisms," alluding to those ceremonies practiced by the Jewish Church. It is again necessary to "search the Scriptures" of the Old Testament to determine the mode of these "divers baptisms." Leviticus 14:5-7 furnishes one of them, the ceremonial purification of the leper. "And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over *running water* . . . and he shall *sprinkle* upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean." Leprosy is universally acknowledged as the type of sin; the leper is the type of the sinner; and the cleansing of the leper typical of the sinner's cleansing. This sprinkling of the leper is one of the "divers baptisms" mentioned in Heb. 9:10. Still another may be found in Numbers 8:6, 7, and is the consecration of the Levites: "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them, and thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: *Sprinkle water* of purifying upon them." The ceremonial purification of one who was unclean from touching a dead body was a third instance of these "divers baptisms." Numbers 19:17-19: "And for an unclean person they shall take the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and *running water* shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water and *sprinkle* it upon the tent and upon all the vessels and upon the persons, . . . and the clean person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean."

Here are three illustrations—the sprinkling of the leper, the sprinkling of the Levites, and the sprinkling of the unclean—to which the inspired writer refers, when he speaks of “divers baptisms” among the Israelites. There is not one solitary instance among the Israelites where one person ever immersed another, and as there were no immersions, there can be no question but that the “divers baptisms” were these sprinklings. The context which follows leaves no room for doubt, for after alluding in verse 10 to the “divers baptisms,” Paul proceeds to enumerate at least two instances, mentioning in verse 13 that “the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh,” and in verse 19, alluding to the consecration at Sinai, he says: “For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, *with water*, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and *sprinkled* both the book and *all the people.*”

### Prophetic Baptisms.

Having by these texts exhibited the mode of baptism under the Mosaic law, let us examine the practice and usages of the prophetic age. In Isaiah 52:15, in the midst of the remarkable prophecy of the Messiah, which reads like history instead of prophecy, occurs the striking announcement: “So shall He *sprinkle* many nations.” Any reference Bible will refer to the day of Pentecost for its fulfillment, when three thousand were baptized in a day. Ezek. 36:24, 25, contains the prediction of the restoration and conversion of the Jews: “For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and bring you into your own land. Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.” The value of these prophetic references is twofold: (1) showing the mode of ceremonial cleansing practiced at that time; and (2) containing the prediction, incidentally, that these same practices will continue in the Christian dispensation. Will these prophecies never be fulfilled? Shall we affirm that all other predictions shall come to pass except those which foretell that the mode of Christian purification in the Christian dispensa-

tion will be by sprinkling? Bound up with the prophecy of the conversion of the Jews is their mode of purification. Will any one presume to separate them, and maintain the conversion of the Jews, but deny that part of the prophecy which affirms, "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you"? "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

Every type and shadow of the Old Testament is fulfilled in the New. All the blood-shedding and sacrifices found their fulfilment in the Cross, commemorated every Sabbath in a perpetual sacrament, the Lord's Supper. To what did the purifications with water so numerous in the Old Testament point in the New Testament? How are these sprinklings with water fulfilled except in the other sacrament of the Church, now called baptism? Throughout the whole Old Testament there is never one instance where one person is ever commanded to immerse another nor any record of an immersion ever having been performed; but, on the contrary, every command to purify with water is, without exception, by sprinkling. The mode of cleansing in the Old Testament, at least, is beyond dispute.

### **The Baptism of Christ.**

Proceeding in this inquiry to the New Testament, the first instance is John's baptism, and the most notable case is the administration of this baptism upon the person of our Lord Jesus Christ: "And Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." This is the favorite text of the immersionists. "If He came up out of the water He must have been immersed," is their argument. But they furnish no proofs. Immersion is nothing but their inference. They might just as well argue that the Israelites were immersed because they "were all baptized in the sea," and they would so maintain if the possibility of immersion were not barred by the Mosaic account. On the contrary, the proofs against immersion in the case of Christ's baptism are irresistible to an unbiased mind.

This was the baptism of a Jew by a Jew, and hence there is



the strongest reason to believe that it was according to the Jewish mode. Never was there a sect who clung with more tenacity to their forms and ceremonies than the Jews. The "hyssop," the "running water" and the "sprinkling" were as essential to their mode of baptism as immersion is to certain others. To ask the mode of Christ's baptism is simply to inquire the mode of baptism practiced by the Church of which Christ was a member; and whoever denies that it was according to the prevalent mode in the Jewish Church must give some better proof than an inference. If immersion had been the prevalent mode in the Jewish Church, and one should affirm that Christ's was by a different mode, the burden of proof would rest upon him to prove that a change of mode had taken place. "Why did they go to the river, if not for immersion?" is considered the unanswerable question, and yet no question admits of an easier solution. How else could they get the "running water" required in sufficient quantities for the multitudes except at the river? The Jews still practice the same mode of baptism that has been in existence since the days of Moses.

There is still another strong proof that Christ's baptism was by sprinkling. Why was Jesus baptized at all? Not being a sinner, He had no need of purification typified by baptism. John felt the weight of such a consideration, and only yielded when Christ removed his difficulty by affirming: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." What "righteousness" was fulfilled? What law was obeyed in His baptism? There has never been given but one satisfactory answer to these questions: The baptism of Jesus was His consecration to His priesthood at the beginning of His public ministry. That He was our High Priest is unquestioned; and being just thirty years old, exactly the age at which every priest was consecrated to his office, confirms the belief that this was the meaning of His baptism. The law of consecration to the priesthood is set forth in Numbers 8:7: "*Sprinkle* water of purifying upon them"; and to that law our great High Priest submitted in fulfilment of "all righteousness." This was the belief of the ancient church, as is seen by the oldest pictures of Christ's

baptism, representing Him standing in the water, and John pouring the water upon Him out of a shell.

### **New Testament Usage of Terms.**

Two passages of Scripture next claim attention, showing a similarity in the use of the word "baptize" by the inspired writers. Mark 7:4, "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not." Luke 11:38; "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner." In each of these texts the word translated "wash" is "baptize" in the Greek. The purification, which every Jew performed before each meal by handwashing, *sprinkling himself*, is called baptism by Mark and Luke. Even if it should be said the baptism had reference only to the hands, that would avail nothing, for the Jewish mode of handwashing was by pouring water upon them. Unless, then, it can be believed that the Jew immersed himself before every meal, we have these two sacred writers (in addition to Paul, Heb. 9:10, "divers baptisms") using baptism and sprinkling as synonymous.

### **Baptism by the Holy Ghost.**

The strongest class of texts yet examined is Acts 1:5, etc. "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Water baptism is then the symbol of baptism by the Holy Ghost. Baptism with water is the picture; baptism with the Holy Ghost is the original of the picture. Ritual baptism is the shadow, of which spiritual baptism is the substance. If the picture is to be perfect, it must conform as nearly as possible to the original. In what manner were the Apostles baptized with the Holy Ghost? Acts 2:3, 4. "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it *sat* upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." Peter explained the mode of this baptism more explicitly in Acts 2:17, as being the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will *pour out* of My Spirit upon all flesh," etc. Under the same figure of *pouring*, he announces in verse 33, "Having received of the Father the promise

of the Holy Ghost, He (Jesus) hath *shed forth* this." So, in like manner, the baptism of Cornelius with water was suggested by the baptism of the Spirit. Acts 10:44-48. "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost *fell* on all them. . . . On the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . . Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Peter's defence of his conduct in baptizing Gentiles was their baptism by the Holy Ghost. Acts 11:15, 16. "As I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell upon them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Is it not remarkable that in every instance where the baptism of the Spirit is spoken of, it is invariably under the figure of an outpouring; or in language which suggests pouring as the mode of baptism by the Holy Ghost? Is it not equally remarkable that the Spirit's baptism is never alluded to anywhere in Scripture under the figure of immersion; nor in any language which suggests immersion. It would be still more remarkable, if immersion should be the mode of water baptism, and pouring the mode of the Spirit's baptism! In that case the type and the anti-type, the symbol and the thing symbolized, would have no similarity! If, then, water baptism symbolizes the baptism of the Spirit, and the latter is everywhere in Scripture alluded to under the figure of affusion, it is perfectly manifest that water baptism can never so appropriately represent the baptism of the Spirit, as when performed by pouring the water upon the subject.

### Individual Baptisms.

Three special instances of baptism must now be considered. Acts 8:38: "And He commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and He baptized him." Seldom has an immersion ever been performed without reading this text as proof of its legitimacy; and yet never did so much confidence rest upon such a slender basis. The bone of contention is the Greek preposition translated "into." If it means "into" then the immersionist must prove that it was



not a Jewish baptism of going into the "running water" and sprinkling. If it does not mean "into," then the immersionist finds no support in this case. If any one will take the trouble to examine the preposition translated "into" he will find that it occurs about fifteen hundred times in the New Testament; about half of the number are translated "in" or "into", and the other half "to" or "unto." So that in this case a doubtful preposition is the strongest support the immersionist can bring to establish a still more doubtful mode. The fact that they went "down" does not imply that their object was to get "into water." Read in the Greek verse 31 in connection with verse 38, and the antithesis between "up" and "down" will be perfectly manifest. In verse 31, Philip is invited "up" into the chariot with the eunuch, and in verse 38 that action is reversed; they went "down" from the chariot. If this text proves anything about the mode of baptism, it lends its support to sprinkling; for the very passage of Scripture which the eunuch was reading at that time, and which he asked Philip to expound, was the celebrated prophecy of Isaiah concerning the Messiah, containing the prediction: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." (Isa. 52: 15.)

Acts 9: 18, 19: "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received his sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized. And when he had received meat he was strengthened." This was the baptism of Paul, a sick man. He was baptized standing, for the Greek translated "arose" is literally "having stood up." After his baptism he "received meat and was strengthened." If the mode had been immersion, the baptism would have been postponed (as is invariably done in these days) until he was restored to health; but the Scriptural mode of sprinkling does not endanger the health even of the sick; and hence it was performed immediately.

Acts 16: 33: "And he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes and was baptized he and all his straightway." This was the baptism of the jailor and all his children, at the strange hour of midnight, in an Eastern prison, and just after an earthquake that had shaken open the prison doors and had shaken off the prisoners' shackles. Those searching for immer-

sion "infer" or "suppose" that they all started off to a river, men, women and children, at such an hour, leaving a dismantled prison and prisoners at liberty to escape, for whom the jailor was answerable with his life! Nor is it very probable that the jailor would risk his life by permitting even Paul and Silas beyond the walls of the prison, after the significant charge "to keep them safely." Then the language of Paul in verse 37 could not have been used by an honest man, if he had already been ranging abroad, and yet affirming that having been illegally imprisoned, he would not leave that prison until justice had been done to his character. The necessary inference is, that the midnight baptism took place within prison walls, and by the only mode possible in such circumstances.

### Baptism Into Death.

It is necessary to consider only one more passage of Scripture—Rom. 6:3, 4: "Know ye not, that so many of us were baptized into Christ, were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism *into death*." Upon this passage are founded the "watery burials" and "liquid graves," which are never found in Scripture, but exist only in the imagination of immersionists. Was there ever a more striking contrast than that between the "watery burial" of the immersionist and the scriptural burial of this text? The element of the immersionist is *water*; the element of this text is Christ's *death*. The immersionist baptizes *into water*; but this text baptizes "*into death*." The immersionist buries the individual alone; this text describes a burial *with Christ* when He was buried. The immersionist performs a temporary burial; this text describes a permanent condition. The immersionist may say, "We *were* buried each one separately *in water*"; but this text describes those who can say "We *are* buried *with Christ* by baptism into death."

The mistake of the immersionist rests upon the error of supposing that our mode of burial was in the mind of Paul as the basis of the figure, whereas our mode of burial was not then in existence. There may be some slight resemblance between our mode of burial and immersion; but there was not the slightest

between the Jewish mode of burial and immersion. They did not lower a body into the ground as we do at present, but laid it on a shelf in a cave or sepulcher. Between burial in Paul's mind and a supposed "watery burial" there was no more resemblance than there is between a block of marble and the Colossus of Rhodes. Nor can it be said that Paul was writing to the Romans and alluded to their mode of burial, for their custom was to burn the dead.

If the immersionist undertakes to symbolize the burial of Christ, why not attempt also to represent his crucifixion, for in the same place where we are said to be "buried with Christ", we are also said to be "crucified with Christ"? Whatever interpretation we put upon "crucified with Christ", must of necessity attach to the similar expression, "buried with Christ." Such language everywhere else in Scripture is admitted to denote our union with Christ legally; so that when He was crucified, in the eyes of the law we were crucified with Him; when He was buried, we were "buried with Him." Baptism cannot represent a "burial" and a "cleansing from sin" at the same time. The two things are utterly incongruous—exactly opposites.

If baptism represents the burial and resurrection of Christ then we have two separate institutions, representing His resurrection, viz: The change of the Sabbath from the last to the first day of the week, and baptism. Nor is this all the confusion that would be produced by such a system, for there would be one sacrament in the church, representing the death of Christ, and the other representing His burial, and none to symbolize the work of the Holy Spirit. If the execution of redemption,—the work of Christ,—is symbolized by one sacrament, the Lord's Supper; the application of redemption,—the work of the Spirit,—must be symbolized by baptism, the other sacrament.

In conclusion, it is greatly to be regretted that Christ's church should be hopelessly divided by such antagonistic beliefs; but it is a matter of devout thankfulness, that if we must differ, the matter of dispute is as insignificant as the mode of applying the water. There is no difference on the fundamental doctrine of the necessity of the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, the only thing that



“cleanseth us from all sin.” We have “one Lord, one faith, one baptism”—“One Lord,” the Father of us all; “one fath” in Jesus Christ, His Son; and “one baptism” by the Holy Spirit.

## CHAPTER VII.

### **Presbyterianism and the Covenant.**

Before entering upon the Scriptural argument justifying infant baptism, allow me first to urge, by way of introduction, that a strong presumption in its favor arises (1) from a consideration of those principles or relationships in nature upon which society is built; and are recognized in human governments; and (2) from the fact that it has been almost the universal practice of the Church in every age, as may be shown by an appeal to church history.

#### **Human Relationships.**

The fact that men are members of the state guarantees to their offspring certain state privileges. Their children are born members of the state, entitled to its protection, government, and discipline. In his minority the infant member of the state is not invested with all the immunities of full citizenship, yet at the same time the state recognizes his citizenship as an inalienable birth-right, inherited from his parents. The state also recognizes and protects his rights to inherit his father's estate by virtue of the relationship between parent and child. Society still further identifies the child with parent, so that the very character of the parent, whether honorable or otherwise, casts a halo of glory or a shadow of gloom over the prospects of his offspring. Intemperate and wicked fathers entail suffering and shame upon their little ones; while industrious and godly parents endow their children with a heritage more precious than gold. Shall our children share with us all other blessings except those justly esteemed the greatest of earth? Shall father and child share alike the blessings of human government, the kingdom of man, and yet be separated only by the the Church, the kingdom of God? Can a father ask at the hands of the state the benefit of all its laws in behalf of his offspring in

his minority, and be denied the benefit of the divine laws in the church? Shall our children share our homes, our fortunes, and our misfortunes and be blessed or cursed with a portion of all that society gives to the parent and nothing to be withheld except the ordinance of our holy religion?

### **Historic Practice of the Church.**

This strong presumption is still further increased by the fact that infant baptism has been the prevailing practice of the church in every age. Opposition to it is only four hundred years old; for the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian era it was practiced by the church without its legitimacy being even questioned. Tertullian, about 200 years after Christ, is often quoted as one who opposed the practice, but the supposed opposition of Tertullian is proof positive of its prevalence in the early days of Christianity, and at the same time was not directed against it as such. He believed that sin committed after baptism was unpardonable, and therefore opposed infant baptism and adult baptism alike, and insisted that it should be postponed till the approach of death, so that no sin would be committed after the baptism. Origen, still earlier, the most learned of all the Church Fathers, was himself baptized in infancy, and says the custom of baptizing infants was received from the Apostles. It can be traced almost to the days of the Apostles by the writings of Irenaeus (about 120 A. D.), who says: "He (Christ) came to save, through means of Himself, all who through Him are born again to God—infants, children, and boys, and youths, and old men!" In the writings of Irenaeus "born again" and baptism are used synonymously, so that we have in these writings proof of infant baptism within a few years after the death of John, the last of the Apostles. In other words, infant baptism can be traced as far back in the history of the Church as we have any Christian literature. Now, these two introductory considerations are not adduced as an argument in themselves establishing the right of children to baptism and church membership, but as a presumption in their favor.



## The Covenants and the Children.

The baptism of children (which is not admitting them to church privileges, but is an acknowledgement of their birthright by the church) finds its basis in those covenant relations established by Jehovah in his moral government, whether the constitution of that government is "modified by the covenant of works" or "by the covenant of grace." This covenant is grounded in the everlasting promise of a "covenant-keeping God." Was there ever a covenant established that did not include children: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom. 5:19). If Adam could represent his posterity, so that his act entailed upon them the curse of sin, "and death by sin," and if Christ could represent his seed, and thereby confer righteousness, and with it eternal life, surely there can be nothing objectionable in that plan which makes the parental relationship the basis of certain blessings to his offspring; and, as a consequence, the faith of the parent a sound reason and solid ground upon which to rest the baptism of the child.

They who object to this principle must arm themselves against the divine economy in every age. It is beyond dispute that children were destroyed in the flood with their parents, and that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah overwhelmed in their ruin parents and children alike. Upon the same principle it was said to Noah, "Come thou and all thy house into the ark: for thee have I seen righteous." (Gen. 7:1.) The ark is usually regarded as the type of the church; and yet Noah's children are sheltered, not on account of their individual righteousness, but on his account alone. It matters not though it be urged that Noah's children were adults. That strengthens the argument; for if adult children shared his salvation on account of his righteousness, much more would they, had they been innocent babes.

The covenants made with Noah, Abraham, and Israel at various times invariably included their children. A specimen is furnished in the institution of the Passover. As the destroying angel passed

through the land on that memorable night, commissioned to smite the first-born in every house not protected by the blood-spot on the door, guaranteeing the fulfilment of the promise, "When I see the blood I will pass over you," the life or death of the child, though but an infant in the cradle, was dependent upon the faith of the parent, manifested by sprinkling the blood.

The same principle may be illustrated by cases furnished in the New Testament. By the faith of the Syrophenician woman her daughter was healed; by the faith of the nobleman of Capernaum his son was restored to health; by the faith of Jarius, to whom Christ said, "Only believe," his daughter was raised from the dead; by the faith of the father, whose struggle between faith and unbelief was so agonizing that he cried out, "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief," his son was delivered from the power of the demon. So likewise the spiritual blessing conferred by Christ upon the children of parents whose faith brought them to Jesus is a crowning proof of the principle stated; and which is further affirmed by Paul: "Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy" (1 Cor. 7:14).

### **The Abrahamic Covenant.**

"And I will establish My covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee . . . And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt Me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you." (Gen. 17:7, 11.) The circumcision, being the seal of the righteousness he had, was applied, not only to Abraham, but also to his children,—the "everlasting covenant" thus established being the charter of the Church of God. During the patriarchal dispensation the family contained in its bosom two institutions, the state and the church. From this period each is to appear distinct from the family; and now in the family of Abraham the church is to be visibly organized as a corporate body gathering into itself many families: "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Can any other transaction in the Scripture be found even resembling the organization

of the church? What various and discordant answers are given by those who attempt to discover the organization of the church elsewhere in Scripture. "The church was founded by John the Baptist," say some. Where is the proof? On the contrary, John attempted no organization of any kind, contenting himself with a call to repentance as a preparation for the coming Messiah. "The church was founded by Christ," say others. Where? Give us the chapter and verse showing anything resembling such an organization. Instead, Christ proclaimed that he had not come to "destroy" and establish something else, but to "fulfill," and on every occasion recognized the existing church with its ordinances. "The church was organised by the Apostles," is the last assumption as a dernier resort. On the contrary, they disclaimed establishing anything new, and at the Pentecost Peter points backward to the everlasting "promise"—the church established in Abraham's family,—and exclaims, "The promise is unto you and to your children." When Paul reminds the Ephesians of the time (as Gentiles) they were without church-membership and privileges, he does it in a language which shows that the church had previously existed among the descendants of Abraham: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise" (Eph. 2:12). To the Galatians he makes it even plainer, that Christians have not been gathered into a new church, but belong to that of Abraham. "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:29.) We insist upon the existence of the church under the Abrahamic charter, and that children were admitted to membership in that church with their parents. At eight days old they were circumcised and recognized as members of the visible church from the time of Abraham till Christ, a period of 2,000 years.

## II.

### **The Scriptural Warrant For the Baptism of Children. The Circumcision of Christ.**

"And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus" (Luke 2:21). Through-



out the Old Testament children were circumcised and endowed with many privileges of church membership. Now, the question is: Has infant membership been abolished in the New Testament? If so, where? By whom? Everything in the Old Testament not fulfilled or abrogated must stand. What precept or practice of the New Testament in the slightest conflicts with this principle? That would be a strong presumption of its continuance even if the New Testament were entirely silent about the matter—but, on the contrary the New Testament abounds with facts and precepts, supporting the right of the children to baptism and church privileges. First of all, we have the pious parents of Jesus with the seal of circumcision, recognizing his right to membership in the visible church as soon as he was eight days old. When so much is said about “following the example of Christ,” why not “follow Him” into the church in infancy, if we have pious parents to claim for us the privileges conferred upon Jesus when eight days old? Is it anywhere intimated that Jesus disapproved of what was done for Him by His parents by reason of their faith in a “covenant-keeping God”? Did it interfere with his piety or personal religion that He had been dedicated to God in His infancy and received upon His person the seal of the covenant? Is it possible to believe that He was never admitted into the Church till His baptism at thirty years of age, which was His consecration to priesthood? What, then, did He mean by reminding His parents when only twelve years old that He must be about his “Father’s business”? If it be said that circumcision only recognized His right to membership in the Jewish Church, we answer that the Jewish Church was the Church of God. God has never had but one church in this world. The Jewish Church and the Christian Church are but one and the same church under different dispensations.

If the church of the Old Testament and the church of the New have the same theology, the same instrumentality of salvation, the same sacraments and the same constitution, the conclusion is irresistible that it must be the same church, the Church of Christ under all dispensations and, consequently, if children had the privilege of church membership in the Old Testament, their rights must remain, unless it can be shown in the New Testament that

they are now for the first time in its history to be excluded from the church. There is a distinct record of the struggle with which the church resisted the giving up of circumcision. If they had been called upon to give up the privileges their children had always enjoyed in the church, would not there likewise have been some record of their protest?

### Christ and the Children.

“And there were brought unto Him also infants that He would touch them” (Luke 18:15). “Little children” (Matt. 19:13). “Young children” (Mark 10:13). “Suffer little children” (Matt. Mark and Luke). “And his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it He was much displeased, and said unto them . . . for of such is the kingdom of God . . . And He took them up in His arms and put His hands upon them and blessed them” (Mark 10:13-16). “Of such is the kingdom of Heaven” (Matt. 19:13). It is not claimed that it was some temporal blessing conferred or bodily infirmity healed, but it is universally admitted that Christ’s blessing in this case was spiritual. Then, after all, “unconscious infants” are capable of receiving the blessings of our Saviour. Are pious parents excluded from the privilege of now bringing their offspring to the Saviour for His benediction? Has He so changed since His ascension to heaven that He who “took them up in His arms,” has no longer any blessing for our little ones in their infancy?

If Christ rebuked his disciples for forbidding the approach of infants, who will merit today the rebuke of the Master for resisting the claims of the children? But some insist that these “infants” were the youth of the land, old enough to appreciate the blessing of Christ, just as if our Master could not bless “unconscious infants.” Such an explanation is, however, robbed of its force by the fact that Jesus “took them up in his arms,” which demonstrated beyond a doubt their infancy. It is not claimed that Christ baptized these children, for He did not baptize any, either children or adults (John 4:2), but He did distinctly and emphatically proclaim their church membership when he declared: “Of such is the kingdom of heaven.” What is the “kingdom of

heaven"? Is it the church on earth? If so, then we have the statement of the "Head of the Church" that children are included within the pale of His Church. Is it the church in heaven? If so, then the church of earth, which admits children to a place in the fold, is nearest in resemblance, at least in this respect, to the church of heaven. Does not the "kingdom of heaven" or "kingdom of God," include both, being the church on earth under all the various dispensations and the church in glory? All Christians sing:

"The saints on earth and all the dead,  
But one communion make,  
All join in Christ, the living Head,  
And of His grace partake.  
One family we dwell in Him,  
One church, above, beneath," etc.

This is Scriptural doctrine, for Paul announces: "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named" (Eph. 3:15). Christ is sufficient authority that children belong to this "family," "for of such is the kingdom of heaven." But we are told that this language does not mean that children belong to the church but that Christ only meant "such" characters: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein" (Luke 18:17). That would then be the most remarkable statement in all the Bible! It would be equivalent to saying the characters of those *within* the church must be like a certain class who are *without* the church! On the contrary, Christ makes two distinct statements, which must not for a moment be confounded: (1) He affirms of the children in his arms, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," thereby establishing their place in the New Testament Church as well as in the same church of a former dispensation. (2) He announces that these infant members of "the kingdom" furnish a type of character to which adult members must conform: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child," etc.

How can any one, therefore, for an instant twist the plain language of Christ into this shape: "Suffer the little children to come



unto me" for a blessing, because adults with child-like characters *alone* belong to "the kingdom"! And having made that statement should immediately proceed to draw an inference from the foregoing, which is identical with the first statement! What, then is the difference between the statement, "Of such (characters) is the kingdom of heaven" and the inference (from the statement) that such characters alone belong to the kingdom, "Whoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child"? The only way out of such a tangled maze is to keep distinct and unconfounded the two statements of Christ. (1) Infant membership in the kingdom, "Of such is the kingdom"; and (2) The child-like character required of adults, "Whosoever shall not receive . . . as a little child." If, then, Christ received and blessed the children, and recognized their privileges in His church, we have the same warrant as those parents for bringing our offspring for His blessing to that Jesus, who is "the same yesterday and today and forever."

### The Fold and the Lambs.

"And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (John 10:16). "Feed my lambs" (John 21:15). There can be no doubt in the minds of any that the "fold" is the church. The command given Peter by the Shepherd of the fold implies that Christ has "lambs." The command to the church through Peter to "feed" means something more than giving spiritual instruction, but includes all a shepherd's care of governing, guiding and feeding. Now the question is, are those "lambs" *within* the "fold" or are they *outside* of the "fold"? Does any shepherd erect a fold for the sheep and make no provision for the lambs? Is there no place in Christ's "fold" for the "lambs"? If "the Lord is my shepherd," is there no provision for my child, and must we for years be separated by the very walls of the "fold" itself? If the church is commanded to "feed" His lambs and to "feed" His sheep, are the sheep to be fed *within* the fold and the lambs to be fed *without*? Sheep are never lambs, but lambs are always sheep and entitled to all the privileges of the

sheep. Most of these arguments are intended to establish first of all infant membership in the church, because if they are in the kingdom, who shall forbid us applying the seal of the kingdom (the ordinance of baptism), which recognises their right to a place in the church? Infant church membership and infant baptism cannot be separated. Having then established conclusively by Scripture that God's Church has in every age included in its fold the children, that fact establishes their right to baptism.

### **Pentecost and the Promise.**

"Repent and be baptized, every one of you . . . for the promise is unto you and to your children" (Acts 2:38, 39). So spoke Peter at Pentecost, who had received from Christ the command "Feed my lambs." To what "promise" could Peter possibly refer, except that made to "Abraham and his seed"? In the very next chapter when he again commands to "repent" he quotes part of the "promise" to Abraham: "And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed" (Acts 3:25). According to Peter then, the Abrahamic charter of the church is not revoked, but the "everlasting covenant" remains in force. Paul asserts the same thing time and again: "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. 3:7). "So then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" (Gal. 3:9). "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3:29). But if the "everlasting covenant" still stands, then children still retain their privilege under that covenant. Peter's language at Pentecost is very striking and significant. In the very same connection in which he suggests baptism, he includes children: "Unto you and to your children." If a bequest were left us with the express provision—"unto you and to your children," there would be no difficulty in understanding that the children must share it. If then, Peter says, "Be baptized every one of you . . . for the promise is unto you and to your children," how can the conclusion be escaped that the children must share that baptism? What more "explicit command" could we desire than the plain statement of Peter, that the "everlasting covenant" with Abraham still exists;

and in the very command to "be baptized," Peter makes the application—"unto you and to your children."

But the objection is here raised, that it says "Repent and be baptized," and as the children cannot "repent," therefore they are excluded from baptism; and it is further said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16); and now as children cannot believe they therefore ought not to be baptized. The reply is, if that rules children out of the privilege of baptism, it also, for the same reason, would prevent their salvation, for it is said "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be *saved*; but he that *believeth not* shall be *damned*." So that if children cannot "believe" in order to be "baptized" neither can they "believe" in order to be "saved." If such texts,—which insist on faith and repentance, are quoted to prove the impossibility of believing, even in the face of "he that believeth not shall be damned"—is no barrier to their *salvation*, then we are compelled to admit that neither is the impossibility of believing any barrier to their *baptism*. If that text requires faith in order to baptism, it just as plainly requires faith in order to salvation. If, then that text will allow the salvation of infants without believing, it will also allow the baptism of infants without believing.

### Circumcision and Baptism.

"In whom ye are also circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, . . . buried with Him in baptism" (Col. 2:11). Paul here alludes to the identity of the two sacraments, circumcision and baptism. We have already spoken of the fact that they have the same significance,—circumcision teaching the necessity of regeneration and purification, and baptism signifying the same thing, "the washing of regeneration." The language of Paul plainly implies that circumcision gives place to baptism. Then we need only inquire who were circumcised, in order to determine who should be baptized; and as children were always included with their parents in one they should therefore share in the other.

Here another objection demands answer: "None except males were circumcised, therefore none but males ought to be baptized." That would be good logic, if we had nothing except an inference



warranting female baptism; but we have elsewhere in the New Testament other facts, which justify the baptism of females. The baptism of Lydia and others relieves us of all the force of this objection. Because one among the many arguments for infant baptism is the "good and necessary inference," that infant circumcision necessitated infant baptism, it is not therefore become null and void, because we learn elsewhere in Scripture that females share baptism. In England the eldest son inherits the title of the father, but if the law should be so enlarged as to include the other children in the title, that would not make void the rights of the first-born and all the rest to the title. The enlargement of the number does not vitiate the rights of all to the inheritance. The objection is really against drawing inferences from the circumcision of children to the baptism of children; and yet they who object to the inference cannot produce one of equal force for admission of females to the Lord's Supper. The Church universally admits females to the communion and their only warrant is an inference not so strong as that which justifies infant baptism. If the objector justifies females at the Lord's Supper by quoting: "Their is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28), then that same text will answer his own objection about baptizing none but males, and so he is made to devour himself.

### **The Status of Children.**

"Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy," (1. Cor. 7:14). If this language has any meaning at all, it plainly signifies that the ecclesiastical status of the parent determines that of the child. The meaning of this text depends upon the meaning of its two designations—"unclean" (*akatharta*) and "holy" (*hagia*). The first appears numerous in Scriptures, and is almost invariably used for what is ceremonially unclean, and for that reason excluded from the congregation; and the remedy for this uncleanliness was nearly always the application of water. So that when Paul says, "Else were your children unclean," it had exactly the same signification to a Jew as if he had said, else were your children unbaptized. So the other word "holy"

here used to describe children of church members is the identical word frequently employed for church members themselves, and translated "saints". It is thus used in the New Testament sixty-two times, and eleven of them in the Epistles to this Corinthian church. So if we were to translate this word, as it is so frequently translated in the New Testament, it would read, "But now are they saints," exactly what their parents are called. The same word "saints" being thus applied, not only to church members, but also to their children, shows that the relationship of the parent to the Church determines the relationship of the child to the Church.

### **The First Baptism.**

"And were all baptized unto Moses." (I Cor. 10:2.) This text is valuable, not only as furnishing an apostolic example of the use of the word "baptism" where immersion is out of the question, but also as furnishing unmistakable evidence of the baptism of children. If they were all baptized, were the children included or specially excluded? Or will some one undertake to say that there were no children in those "households" that crossed the Red Sea? At the Red Sea there is nothing indicating a figurative baptism. The Israelites—men, women and children—were the subjects. Were they figures of speech? The water was real, and not a figure. "Baptized unto Moses." Was he a figure of speech? If Paul had spoken of the immersed Egyptians as all being baptized, there would have been no effort then to force the language of Paul out of its natural and obvious sense into the constraint of figure. Paul was not indulging in "Figures of speech," but dealing with plain facts, when he asserts that they were "baptized unto Moses"—baptized into an acceptance of him as their divinely appointed leader. Whether "figurative" or not, the children shared this baptism with their fathers; and as infant baptism always means their instruction, in this instance they were trained in all that is implied in being "baptized unto Moses"; and they were the only part of that host "baptized" who reached the land of promise.

## Household Baptisms.

“And when she (Lydia) was baptized and her household” (Acts. 16:17). “And was baptized, he (jailor) and all his, straightaway” (Acts 16:33). “And I baptize also the household of Stephanas” (I Cor. 1:16). Here we have the word of God announcing the baptism of three entire families; and still another household, that of Cornelius, seems from the record to have been baptized, although not so plainly stated (Acts 10:44-48). Now, we are gravely told by some, that there were no children in any of these various households! Where is the proof? The probability that there were children is so strong that it falls little short of absolute certainty. It would not occur once in a thousand that you could take at random three or four families from among any people, and there be found no children in a single one of that number.

It is said the whole family were believers. For example, that the jailor “rejoiced, believing in God with all his house” (Acts 16:34). It does have that appearance, so long as we look only at the English translation, but such a consideration forever disappears the moment we look at the Greek as written by Luke. There we discover that “believing” is in the singular number, masculine gender, and can refer only to the jailor, so that according to Luke he alone is said to have *believed*. It matters not whether his children believed or not, the Word of God does not affirm that they did, but grounds their baptism solely upon the fact that *he* believed, and hence “all his” were baptized.

It is remarkable that nothing is said of household baptisms in the New Testament, until the Gentiles and heathen begin to be converted. Not until Peter admitted the Gentile Cornelius is it hinted. Not until Paul leaves Asia and preaches in Europe and Gentiles begin to come in, is it plainly stated. The Jews were familiar with the principle of children sharing with their parents church privileges, and among them it causes no astonishment, and only among the Gentiles is the matter considered of sufficient importance that Luke and Paul record the fact. These household baptisms are stronger proofs of the rights of children to baptism than any command which could have been given; for if it had been said, Baptize the children, every one knows that there is



not a word in Greek for "child," but may apply to youth. So it would be interpreted to mean children old enough to make a profession of religion, just as is attempted by some in reference to the children blessed by Christ. But when we have example after example in the Bible of household baptisms, we have proof of infant baptism in that fact, which cannot be set aside. The argument which has been accumulating at every step; as we witnessed the circumcision of children throughout the Old Testament—thereby guaranteeing to them membership in the visible Church; then with Christ Himself affirming the same, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"; with Peter at Pentecost, commanding baptism with the assurance; "The promise is unto you and to your children"; now reaches its complete demonstration in the baptism of various households.

When everything else fails the objector, then he raises the question: What good will a little water to an "unconscious babe"? This suggests that there has never been any objection to infant baptism, but may very appropriately be urged against their circumcision as well. Why not ask, what good will circumcision do the "unconscious babe"? We reply to the objector by saying, the baptism of the child does exactly the same amount of good that the baptism of the adult does. Water baptism is simply symbolical; and if it can represent the cleansing of an adult, why can it not just as appropriately symbolize the cleansing of the child? The regeneration of an adult is the work of the Holy Spirit, in which he is passive, as is the child in its regeneration by the Spirit. The adult regenerated becomes a "babe in Christ." The Spirit of God can and does regenerate children as well as adults, for children who die in infancy are regenerated for heaven. John the Baptist and Jeremiah were regenerated in infancy (Jer. 1:5, Luke 1:15). Whilst repudiating baptismal regeneration," we argue that if baptism symbolizes the regenerating work of the Spirit, and children are as often the subjects of regenerating grace as adults, then their baptism is just as appropriate, and does the same amount of good as the baptism of adults.

## Infant Baptism vs. Infant Salvation.

In conclusion the very same arguments which prove infant salvation, also establish infant baptism. The Scriptures do not assert the salvation of infants, but it may be proved by "good and necessary inferences" from Scriptures, and no one objects to the proof. Now let any one sum up the proofs for infant salvation, and every one will apply equally to infant baptism. The arguments for infant baptism and infant salvation stand or fall together; and the Scriptural proofs of infant baptism are an additional guarantee of their salvation.

Bring in then the children into their Father's house, that these infant plants may grow in the garden of the Lord into "trees of righteousness," bearing "much fruit." It is a difficult process to transplant a full-grown tree. "Those that be planted in the house of the Lord shall flourish in the courts of our God. They shall still bring forth fruit in old age; they shall be fat and flourishing; to show that the Lord is upright." (Psalm XCII, 13-15.)

## CHAPTER VIII.

### **Presbyterianism in Action.**

“By their fruits ye shall know them,” is the most reliable test of character,—enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount. Individuals must submit to this criterion at the bar of public opinion and eventually at the Judgment throne of God. Systems of philosophy and of religion are subjected to a similar test of the Master—“Wisdom is justified of her children.”

Presbyterianism most willingly accepts this challenge and submits its Calvinistic creed to this reasonable test. It is no untried modern system which has demonstrated its practical wisdom in a few favorable circumstances only or on some auspicious occasion. It belongs to the ages. It has won its way in all the countries of the globe. It has commanded the admiration of the profoundest students of God’s Word, commended by the greatest philosophers of the earth, and accepted by the most learned historians. Friends and foes have testified alike to its unrivaled achievements in every field of service and its unsurpassed attainments in the moral and spiritual spheres of being. Specimens of its achievement in civil and spiritual hemispheres are herein cited as illustrations; and testimonies of the most distinguished scholars are quoted in proof of its influence in shaping the destiny of individuals and of nations. The mass of material is, however, so vast and varied that the greatest embarrassment confronts in choosing between equally impressive facts and testimony.

#### **Creeds and Character.**

Ideas rule the world, Thought is more powerful than “an army with banners.” Creeds create character consistent with their ideals. It is not a mere coincidence that Calvinism has ruled the world. Cause and effect operate not simply in the physical world but as well in the metaphysical and in the spiritual. It is not accidental that Arminian theology is universally associated with



monarchy, while Calvinism, on the other hand, is the natural ally of the largest liberty of the individual.

Buckle, who, himself a fatalist, cannot be charged with partiality toward any church, says: "It is an interesting fact that the doctrines which in England are called Calvinistic have always been connected with a democratic spirit, while those of Arminianism have found most favor among the aristocratic, or protective, party. In the Republics, of Switzerland, of North America and of Holland, Calvinism was always the popular creed."

Very naturally, therefore, Arminianism, taking on an aristocratic form of church government, tends toward monarchy in civil affairs, while Calvinism, taking to a republican form of church government as inevitably tends toward a democracy in civil affairs. In the religious, as well as in the natural world, everything bears fruit "after its kind."

## I.

### Calvinism and Liberty.

The torch lighted by John Calvin gave to the world the twin product of republicanism in the state and the free Christian commonwealth in the church. On its political side, it found expression in the republicanism of Geneva, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain and America, and in its ever-widening influence has made itself felt even in autocratic Russia and despotic Turkey.

It was Calvinism which lifted Geneva from the depths of civic and moral degradation, and placed it, as a glittering gem of civil and religious liberty, on the brow of Europe,—the first fruits of a new philosophy destined to revolutionize society and human governments. It was Calvinism which, through the instrumentality of John Knox, awakened Scotland to a higher life; which hurled the stool of Jennie Geddes at tyrannical encroachments upon religious liberty, and made the sturdy Scotch character the staunchest and grandest national life the world has ever produced. It was Calvinism which took off the head of Charles I and gave England in the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell the first full breath of constitutional liberty, and at the same time

furnished that larger protectorate to struggling Protestantism throughout Europe, making that era the brightest chapter in English history. It was Calvinism which waged successfully under William the Silent, the unequal contest of Holland with Spain, and created the Dutch Republic, which eventually hurled the Stuarts from the throne of England, and guaranteed constitutional and religious liberty to the English-speaking world. It was Calvinism which founded in America the greatest of Republics, and made it the Liberator of Cuba and the Phillipines, and the protector of the weaker members in the family of nations. It is Calvinism which, through the agency of Robert College on the Bosphorous and Presbyterian missions in the East, is leavening the Ottoman Empire, and giving even the Turk a taste of constitutional liberty.

In the historic conflict of the ages, Calvinism was vanquished in France, in the defeat of the Huguenots; and as a consequence France, the Fatherland of John Calvin, descended almost to the level of Spain. If Spain had triumphed in Holland, in all human probability Calvinism would have perished from the earth, and Holland would also have joined France and Spain in a trio of reactionary nations. In that case, William of Orange would never have turned the scale against the Stuarts in Britain; and North America would read its fate today in the stagnation of South America. So that the glory of North America is due chiefly to the triumph of Calvinism, justifying Ranke, the historian, in speaking of Calvin as "virtual founder of America."

### France.

This claim, that it was the revolutionary principles of John Calvin,—first embodied and practiced in the Republic of Geneva,—which radiated into all the world, is abundantly substantiated by an appeal to history and to the testimony of the profoundest thinkers and students of all shades of opinion.

"Calvin's true home," as Schaff says, "was the church of God. He broke through all national limitations. There was scarcely a monarch or statesman or scholar of his age with whom he did not come in contact. Every people of Europe was represented

among his disciples. He helped to shape the religious character of churches and nations as yet unborn. The Huguenots of France, the Protestants of Holland and Belgium, the Puritans and Independents of England and New England, the Presbyterians of Scotland and throughout the world, yea, we may say, the whole Anglo-Saxon race, in its prevailing religious character and institutions, bear the impress of his genius, and show the power and tenacity of his doctrines and principles of government."

Its temporary defeat in France displacing the leadership of the Huguenots did not detract from the glory of their heroic struggle but simply transferred the fight to other fields. According to the eminent historian Lecky, himself a cold-blooded rationalist, the Huguenots were "the most solid, the most modest, the most virtuous, the most generally enlightened element in the French nation."

The furious persecution that raged against them—of which the massacre was a part and a sample—destroyed or exiled hundreds of thousands of Huguenots. The loss to France was irreparable. "It prepared the way," says Lecky, "for the inevitable degradation of the national character and removed the last serious bulwark that might have broken the force of that torrent of scepticism and vice, which, a century later, laid prostrate in merited ruin, both the altar and the throne."

"Freedom's battle once begun,  
Bequeath'd by bleeding sire to son,  
Tho baffled oft, is ever won."

## **Holland.**

In Holland the infamous Duke of Alva, backed by Spain, the greatest power of the day, slaughtered the Saints of God and oppressed the people according to his tyrannical will. In William the Silent, however, Calvinism was preparing a leader to fight the battles of freedom which not only liberated Holland, but made its heroic struggle the sublime inspiration to the oppressed of all the ages. In the siege of Leyden the beleaguered band reduced in numbers and suffering the pangs of famine, were sustained solely



by their invincible will and their Calvinistic faith. To the summons to surrender, undaunted they replied: "As long as you hear the mew of a cat or the bark of a dog you may know that the city holds out. And when all have perished but ourselves, we will devour our left arms, retaining our right to defend our women, our liberty, and our religion against the foreign tyrant." No wonder Campbell, writing of the Puritans in Holland, England and America, says of this struggle in Holland: "Out from this war of eighty years' duration emerged a republic, for two centuries the greatest in the world, a republic which was the instructor of the world in art, and whose corner-stone was religious toleration for all man-kind." Motley, the Historian, credits Calvinism with the victory, affirming: "The doctrine of predestination, the consciousness of being chosen soldiers of Christ, inspired the Puritans (Calvinists) who founded the commonwealths of England, of Holland, and of America, with a contempt of toil, danger, and death, which enabled them to accomplish things almost supernatural." It created, under God, the Dutch Republic, and made it "the first free nation to put a girdle of empire around the world." Is it any wonder that William the Silent, disciple of John Calvin, is regarded as the father of religious liberty?

### Scotland.

Into the School of Calvin at Geneva, with thousands of others came John Knox, who pronounced it "the most perfect school of Christ that ever was since the days of the Apostles." The advent of Knox into Scotland is termed by Carlyle "a resurrection from death" and without whom James Anthony Froude, says: "Scotland as the modern world has known it, would have had no existence. His was the voice which taught the peasant of the Lothians that he was a free man, the equal in the sight of God with the proudest peer or prelate that had tramped on his forefathers. He was the one antagonist whom Mary Stuart could not soften nor Maitland deceive; he it was that raised the poor commons of his country into a stern and rugged people, who might be hard, narrow, superstitious and fanatical, but who, nevertheless, were men whom neither king, noble nor priest could

force again to submit to tyranny. And his reward has been the ingratitude of those who should most have done honor to his memory."

Rev. Egbert W. Smith, Secretary of Foreign Missions, has well said "Knox made Calvinism the religion of Scotland, and Calvinism made Scotland the moral standard for the world. It is certainly a significant fact that in that country where there is the most of Calvinism there should be the least of crime; that of all the peoples of the world today that nation which is confessedly the most moral is also the most thoroughly Calvinistic; that in that land where Calvinism has had supremest sway individual and national morality has reached its loftiest level."

Buckle, in his "History of Civilization," attributes to this source the spirit of liberty: "In their pulpits, in their presbyteries, and in their general assemblies they encouraged a democratic and in-subordinate tone, which eventually produced the happiest results by keeping alive, at a critical moment, the spirit of liberty. At a most hazardous moment they kept alive the spirit of national liberty. What the nobles and the Crown had put in peril, that did the clergy save. By their care the dying spark was kindled into a blaze. When the light grew dim and flickered on the altar, their hands trimmed the lamp and fed the sacred flame. This is their real glory, and on this they may well repose. They were the guardians of Scotch freedom, and they stood to their post."

### **England.**

This spark of civil and religious liberty kindled in Scotland spread into England where it smouldered during the reign of James I, but burst into a flame under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell and the Puritans (strict Calvinists) against the encroachments of Charles I. Though by aid of the Scotch army it triumphed; yet the victory was but temporary and incomplete, owing to the restoration of the Stuarts to the throne. The final deliverance came through the agency of William, Prince of Orange, worthy successor of his great ancestor William the Silent. McFetridge, in "Calvinism in History," describes that which was for Protestantism the most important battle in the

world's history: "It was the battle of the Boyne (in Ireland, 1690) that decided the fate of Protestantism, not only for Great Britain, but for America; and for the world indeed, for had William been defeated there, Protestants could not have found a safe shelter on the face of the earth. 'Orangemen' may therefore be pardoned for their lively interest in that battle. On one side was James II, whom the poet Wadsworth appropriately calls 'The vacillating bondman of the pope,' with an army composed of his Roman Catholic and sympathizing subjects and allies. On the other side was his son-in-law, William, whom the Protestants had called from Holland for their deliverance—a little, but not a small man; pale and sickly; the world-acknowledged representative of the reforming cause, with an army much inferior in numbers to that of his royal father-in-law and opponent, but bound together as one man by a common faith and a glorious purpose. The world has never seen such another army. The entire Calvinistic world was represented in it.

"Less than four years before (October 22, 1685) Louis XIV of France had published the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, by which all the rights and privileges of his Calvinistic subjects, the Huguenots, were swept away. This drove thousands upon thousands of them to flee from their native land and seek safety and liberty in other climes. Multitudes of them fled to William in Holland, many of whom were of the best sailors and soldiers of France. This seems indeed to have been a providence by which Williams's army was to be reinforced and the great victory to be won. Under him, at the Boyne, there were Calvinists from England, Ireland, Scotland, Prussia, Finland, Sweden and Switzerland, in addition to his own staunch Hollanders and two hundred English Negro servants, as loyal to Christ and liberty as any under the Orange flag."

Taine, author of *English Literature*, commenting on this victory of the Calvinistic forces of the world, says: "These men are the true heroes of England; they display, in high relief, the original characteristics and noblest features of England—practical piety, the rule of conscience, manly resolution, indomitable energy. They founded England, in spite of the corruption of the



Stuarts and the relaxation of modern manners, by the exercise of duty, by the practice of justice, by obstinate toil, by vindication of right, by resistance to oppression, by the conquest of liberty by the repression of vice. They founded Scotland; they founded the United States; at this day they are, by their descendants, founding Australia and colonizing the world."

### America.

This victory forever purchased for England the priceless boon of liberty; but the cause was now transferred to another hemisphere. Under the tyrannical Stuarts of England and the bigoted Bourbons of France the noblest blood of both realms had been driven to seek refuge in America. Here followed them the strong hand of the oppressor, which made the American Revolution a dire necessity. Once more the sacrifice and the glory of the conflict must be awarded Presbyterianism. Both Ranke and Bancroft, two of the world's great Historians, credit John Calvin with the fatherhood of America. Presbyterians proclaimed the Mecklenburg Declaration at Charlotte, N. C., 1775, one year before the National Charter was signed. Presbyterians composed the larger part of the officers of the Continental army and the volume of troops which followed Washington from Valley Forge to Yorktown. Presbyterians fought Kings Mountain, recognized as the decisive battle of the war. McFetridge declares that "In the war for American independence the dissenting churches arrayed themselves on the side of the colonies, and the Anglican Church arrayed itself on the side of the Crown. The independent and democratic spirit of Calvinism, cherished in the hearts of its adherents and nourished by their mixed assemblies and free discussions, rose up in rebellion against all despotic measures, whether of church or state, and girded itself again for the great conflict on this western continent."

The famous Whig Club composed of the leadership of the nation, had for its avowed purpose the liberty of the Colonies and was so largely Presbyterian in its membership that it was dubbed the "Presbyterian Junta." Bancroft asserts that: "It was from Witherspoon of New Jersey that Madison imbibed the les-

son of perfect freedom in matters of conscience. When the constitution of New Jersey was formed by a convention composed chiefly of Presbyterians, they established perfect liberty of conscience without the blemish of a test." The Continental Congress, composed largely of Presbyterians, contained only one minister, Rev. John Witherspoon, *lineal descendant* of John Knox, President of Princeton College. At the critical moment when the fate of the Declaration hung trembling in the balance, because some members of Congress hesitated to risk affixing their signatures, it was Witherspoon, the Presbyterian minister, who turned the scales in its favor in the following language: "That noble instrument upon your table, which ensures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning by every pen in the house. He that will not respond to its accents, and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the name of a freeman. For my own part, of property, I have some, of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that property is pledged, on the issue of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather they should descend thither by the hands of the public executioner than desert at this crisis the sacred cause of my country."

Dr. McFetridge, in "Calvinism in History," is authority for the following:

"When Generals Washington, Charles Lee and Schuyler were on their way to assume command of their respective armies, in 1775—Washington and Lee going to Boston, and Schuyler to Albany—they arrived in New York on a Sabbath morning in the month of June. And by whom were they met and welcomed to the city? By the volunteer companies, the members of the Provincial Congress of New York, the members of the City Committee and the pastors of the dissenting churches. Washington and Lee were members of the Episcopal Church, but there was not a clergyman of the Church to bid them welcome. These others, the Calvinists, met them and conducted Washington to the house of a Calvinist, Mr. Lisenard, where he and his staff were bountifully entertained. But on the same day and in that same city another high officer arrived—General Tryon, the king's governor

of the colony. And by whom was he met and welcomed? By all the king's officers and scores of his loyal subjects, prominent amongst whom were the clergy of the Episcopal Church. Nothing could more clearly mark the difference in political sentiment of these different clergymen and their churches. From that time Washington was about as much of a Presbyterian as an Episcopalian. When afterward he was commander in New York he made his headquarters with William Smith, a prominent Presbyterian. He himself attended, and ordered all his men to attend, the services of his chaplains, who were dissenting clergymen; and he elsewhere attended the dissenters' service and communed with them. He gave forty thousand dollars in bonds to establish a Presbyterian college in his native state, which took his name in honor of his munificent gift, becoming Washington College."

Rufus Choate, eminent Jurist, ascribes to Calvinists the civil liberty of the world: "In the reign of Mary, from 1553 to 1558, a thousand learned Englishmen fled from the stake at home to the happier states of continental Protestantism. Of these, great numbers—I know not how many—came to Geneva. I ascribe to that five years in Geneva an influence which has changed the face of the world. I seem to myself to trace to it, as an influence on the English character, a new theology, new politics, another tone of character, the opening of another era of time and liberty. I seem to myself to trace to it the great civil war in England, the republican constitution framed in the cabin of the Mayflower, the theology of Jonathan Edwards, the battle of Bunker Hill, the Independence of America."

## II.

### **Presbyterianism and Martyrdom.**

In all the ages Presbyterianism has been in the fiery furnace of persecution for loyalty to Christ and for testimony to the truth. "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ not only to believe in Him, but also to suffer for His sake," was enunciated by Paul as a glorious privilege, accepted by the ancient church, who counted it joy that they were accounted worthy to suffer for



His name," and who "loved not their lives unto death." In suffering martyrdom no one can dispute its claim that the Presbyterian Church enjoys the honor of apostolic succession. No other historic church has been so continuously in the flames and no other body of Christians has contributed so largely to the number of those "who have come out of great tribulation and washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." If it be true of a church as well as of individuals that "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," then the Presbyterian must of all churches be the beloved of the Lord. If the rage of Satan against one body of people indicates his bitter enmity, then the Presbyterian must of all denominations be the object of Satanic malice. So constantly has Presbyterianism been called to suffer for the faith that the motto of the Huguenot, "*Nec tamen consumabatur*"—"Nevertheless, it is not consumed"—has become the insignia blazoned not only on its crest, but wrought into its experience through all the ages.

### Historic Proofs.

In the early days of Christianity, before the simplicity of its Presbyterian faith had given place to the sacerdotalism of later centuries, it gave to the world startling exhibitions of martyrdom in men who kissed joyously the chains that bound them to the stake and sang hallelujahs as their souls departed in chariots of flame. The Calvinism of that first century was as unquestioned as that of Paul himself, and it poured its blood more freely than water, giving rise to the proverb: "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." The Apostles themselves led the van of the heroes of faith to the stake, who sealed their testimony with their blood. Historians have vainly sought to estimate their number. John, the last survivor of the Apostles, describes them as "a great multitude which no man could number of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues before the throne and before the Lamb clothed with white robes and palms in their hands" . . . "which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

“The Son of God goes forth to war,  
A kingly crown to gain,  
His blood-red banner streams afar:  
Who follows in His train?  
Who best can drink His cup of woe,  
Triumphant over pain,  
Who patient bears His cross below,  
He follows in His train.

“That martyr first, whose eagle eye  
Could pierce beyond the grave;  
Who saw His Master in the sky,  
And called on Him to save;  
Like Him, with pardon on His tongue,  
In midst of mortal pain,  
He prayed for them that did the wrong:  
Who follows in His train?

“A noble band, the chosen few,  
On whom the Spirit came,  
Twelve valiant saints, their hope they knew,  
And mocked the torch of flame;  
They met the tyrant’s brandished steel,  
The lion’s gory mane,  
They bowed their necks the stroke to feel;  
Who follows in their train?

“A noble army, men and boys,  
The matron and the maid,  
Around the throne of God rejoice,  
In robes of light arrayed.  
They climbed the steep ascent of heaven  
Through peril, toil and pain;  
O God, to us may grace be given  
To follow in their train.”

### **Waldensian Martyrs.**

Next in order of time come the Waldenses. Their history is written in blood. Pope Innocent VIII fulminated against them

his infamous bull—in striking contradiction to his name “Innocent”—and invited all Catholics to take up arms against them, “absolving from all ecclesiastical pains and penalties, general and particular, those who should take up the cross; releasing them from any oaths they might have taken; legitimizing their title to any property they might have illegally acquired; and promising remission of sins to such as should kill any heretic.” It annulled all contracts in favor of the Waldenses; ordered their domestics to abandon them, forbade any persons to give them any aid whatever, and empowered all persons to take possession of their property.

While multitudes died, the remnant “kept the faith” till the next great persecution came and with it their new baptism of blood, as Francis I of France, and the Duke of Savoy attempted their extermination in vain. One hundred years later the storm of persecution burst out with still greater fury. Of the massacre that year an eye-witness and chief sufferer writes: “All the echoes of the valleys and of the Alps made such piteous response to the lamentable cries of these poor victims, and to the frightful shrieks raised by so great a company of martyrs, that you would have said that the rocks could hear and had pity at the cries for mercy and the beatings of the breast, while these murderers were utterly unmoved thereat.”

Only the recording angel can count up the number of these ancient Presbyterian people, in whose behalf John Milton invoked the aid of Oliver Cromwell and of heaven in the well-known sonnet:

“Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints whose bones,  
Lie scattered on the Alpine Mountains cold,  
Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,  
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones.”

### **Huguenots of France.**

Next in the order of the Apostolic Succession of Suffering, the Huguenots bore aloft the Standard of the Faith. Truly has this Church been called “The Church under the Cross.” It had two



emblems—"The Burning Bush," and the "Anvil," smitten again and again, wearing out many hammers, yet never destroyed, made only the harder for the many strokes upon it. The Protestants bound themselves by a solemn oath to stand by each other, and so came to be known as Huguenots, a kind of nickname which came to mean "comrades of the oath." Condé was miserably assassinated after a battle, and Coligny met a similar fate in the memorable massacre of St. Bartholomew, on the 24th day of August, 1572. At one time, at a signal from the bell of St. Germain l'Auxerrais, seventy-five thousand Protestants,—men, women and children,—were butchered in cold blood in their homes and in the streets of Paris and other cities. The person most responsible for this colossal infamy was an Italian woman, Catherine de Medici, queen regent, and mother of the boy king, Charles IX. She deliberately decoyed the Protestants to Paris for this purpose, and turned loose upon them her brutal minions. The Seine was crimsoned and the streets of Paris flowed in blood. To commemorate the event, the Pope ordered medals to be struck, having on one side the Pope's head, with this inscription, "Gregorius XIII, Pont. Max., An. I"; on the other a destroying angel, holding a cross in one hand, while with the other, he slew the Protestants with a sword. On this side were inscribed the words, "Hugonotorum strages" (slaughter of the Huguenots), "1572." Special services of thanksgiving were also held in the churches of Rome.

Jonathan Edwards, in his "History of Redemption" says: "It is reckoned that about this time, within thirty years, there were martyred in this kingdom (France) for the Protestant religion, 39 princes, 148 counts, 234 barons, 147,518 gentlemen, and 760,000 of the common people."

### **Martyrs of the Dutch Republic.**

Motley, noted Historian, states: "The Reformation had entered the Netherlands by the Walloon gate (that is, through the Calvinists). The earliest and most eloquent preachers, the most impassioned converts, the sublimest martyrs, had lived, preached, fought, suffered and died with the precepts of Calvin in their hearts."

The persecutions they endured make one of the darkest pictures in history, and with them will be associated forever, covered with obloquy and execration, the name of the Duke of Alva. He was sent, in 1567, by his master, Phillip II, King of Spain, a bigoted Roman Catholic, to extirpate heresy in Holland, which country was at that time held in subjection to the Spanish crown. His army numbered ten thousand men, mostly mercenaries, and he was clothed with full powers for this nefarious mission. He established a tribunal that soon became known as the "Court of Blood," which was to try and condemn the offending Protestants. Many cities openly declared against the oppressive measures of Alva, and combined for their common defense. The States-General, assembled at Dordrecht, marshaled under the leadership of "William the Silent," Prince of Orange. This wonderful man, who became a strong Calvinist, occupied, for a long time, the most prominent place among the Protestants of his day.

The object of these pages is not the narration of events, but a summary of martyrs furnished by the Presbyterian faith, and consequently only a passing allusion need be given to the martyrs of Bohemia, followers of John Huss, and the sufferers of Hungary—historic churches identified to this day with the Presbyterian and Calvinistic forces of the world. Not so spectacular, not so brilliant with the galaxy of illustrious names, yet none the less heroic was the struggle in these Germanic and Slavic countries which dragged its weary length through the ages, as myriads of martyred saints went from their midst to swell the number, around the throne, of the great white robed throng "with palms in their hands."

### **The Covenanters of Scotland.**

From the Continent of Europe the scene of martyrdom shifts to Scotland's heath covered hills, sequestered glens and historic battlefields, where Presbyterianism attained its loftiest heights and fought its most glorious conflicts in the defense of "the faith once delivered to the Saints." The Solemn League and Covenant was the instrument by which Scotland bound itself to be faithful to Christ's crown. In Greyfriar's historic churchyard, upon the tomb-stones for tables, the people after listening to a stirring ser-

mon from Alexander Henderson, affixed their names, many of them opening their veins and signing with their own blood, typical of the streams which would later be shed in its defense. It is not our purpose to tell of the awful period that followed, known as the "killing time." During these twenty-eight years eighteen thousand persons were put to death. The sod of Scotland was crimsoned with the blood of its noblest and best. Another Marquis of Argyle, son of the former, was beheaded in Edinburgh, before St. Giles Cathedral. Men and women throughout the kingdom were shot, put to the sword and tied to the stakes fastened in the edge of the sea, that a slow tide might torture them before death relieved their sufferings.

In old Greyfriar's Churchyard, Edinburgh, convenient to the Grassmarket, where many martyrs perished, is the famous "Martyrs Monument." In quaint rhymes the tourist reads with deep emotion the record of heroic men and noble deeds, beginning :

"Halt, passenger, take heed ! What do you see?  
This tomb doth show for what some men did die.  
Here lies the dust of those who stood  
'Gainst perjury, resisting unto blood."

This is concluded with the following inscription :

"From May 27th, 1661, that the most noble Marquis of Argyle was beheaded, to the 17th of February, 1688, that Mr. James Renwick suffered, were, one way or other, murdered or destroyed, for the same cause, about eighteen thousand ; of whom were executed at Edinburgh, about an hundred of noblemen, gentlemen, ministers, and others ; noble martyrs for Jesus Christ. The most of them lie here."

### **Modern Persecution.**

Are not these citations sufficient proof that the Presbyterian has been the martyr Church of the ages. It has not only furnished the vast throng of martyrs now in glory, but it still elicits the bitterest hostility from the enemies of God and the truth. Critics and skeptics vie with each other in hurling their keenest shafts of wit, ridicule and sarcasm at its devoted head. Rationalistic pulpits,



sensational novels, popular magazines, are the vehicles of modern venom. It is the same spirit that prompted martyrdom of the past which now continues the persecution in other forms. No wonder Dr. McFetridge testifies: "For the courageous morality of the Calvinists one has only to look at the doings of the Inquisition in the Low Countries and at the martyrdoms of Cambray and the fires of Smithfield. Who were the martyrs but Calvinists? There is no other system of religion in the world which has such a glorious array of martyrs to the faith. Almost every man and woman who walked to the flames rather than deny the faith or leave a stain on 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." It is the glory of Presbyterianism that God has accounted it worthy to bear testimony for Christ during the ages, and that it still bears the brunt of the attack.

"Faith of our fathers living still,  
In spite of dungeons, fire and sword,  
Oh, how our hearts beat high with joy,  
When-e'er we hear that glorious word.  
Faith of our fathers, Holy Faith,  
We will be true to thee till death."

### III.

## Presbyterianism and Moral Character.

If "Wisdom is justified of her children," Presbyterianism can furnish the evidence of its divine wisdom in the contribution it has made to the moral character of the world. This is the grandest of all its products, its noblest adornment. Scholars and historians testify alike to the influence of Calvinism in the grandeur of moral character produced, whether considered in the individual or national life of its devotees. Quotations establishing this contention must be limited to a few selections largely confined to those who are in no way attached to this system and not even friendly to it.

## Individual.

James Anthony Froude, Professor of History at Oxford, brilliant essayist, enters the list of its eulogists, not from partiality but as an honest judge of its merits:

“I am going to ask you to consider, if Calvinism be, as we are told, fatal to morality, how it came to pass that the first symptom of its operation, wherever it established itself, was to obliterate the distinction between sins and crimes, and to make the moral law the rule of life for state as well as persons? I shall ask you again, why, if it be a creed of intellectual servitude, it was able to inspire and maintain the gravest efforts ever made to break the yoke of unjust authority? When all else has failed; when patriotism has covered its face, and human courage has broken down; when intellect has yielded, as Gibbon says, ‘with a smile or a sigh’, content to philosophize in the closet or abroad worship with the vulgar; when emotion, and sentiment, and tender imaginative piety have become the handmaids of superstition, and have dreamt themselves into forgetfulness that there is any difference between lies and truth, the slavish form of belief called Calvinism, in one or other of its many forms, has borne ever an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence or melt under enervating temptation.

“The Calvinists abhorred, as no body of men ever more abhorred, all conscious mendacity, all impurity, all moral wrong of every kind so far as they could recognize it. Whatever exists at this moment in England and Scotland of conscientious fear of doing evil is the remnant of the convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people’s hearts.”

As illustrating the type of character produced by Calvinism, Froude names William the Silent, Luther, Knox, Andrew Melville, the Regent Murray, Coligny, Cromwell, Milton and Bunyan. “These were men,” he says, “possessed of all the qualities which give nobility and grandeur to human nature—men whose life was as upright as their intellect was commanding and their public aims untainted with selfishness; unalterably just where duty required

them to be stern, but with the tenderness of a woman in their hearts; frank, true, cheerful, humorous, as unlike sour fanatics as it is possible to imagine any one, and able in some way to sound the keynote to which every brave and faithful heart in Europe instinctively vibrated."

To this list of illustrious men might be added a catalogue of the greatest names of America such as Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Grover Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Stonewall Jackson, James Henley Thornwell, etc.

Henry Ward Beecher was never accused of orthodoxy according to the Calvinistic standard, yet its most ardent advocate could scarcely pronounce more eloquent panegyric than this illustrious preacher uttered in his Plymouth pulpit:

"There is no system which equals Calvinism in intensifying, to the last degree, ideas of moral excellence and purity of character. There never was a system since the world stood which puts upon man such motives of holiness, or which builds batteries which sweep the whole ground of sin with such horrible artillery. Men may talk as much as they please against the Calvinists and Puritans and Presbyterians, but you will find that when they went to make an investment they have no objection to Calvinism or Puritanism or Presbyterianism. They know that where these systems prevail, where the doctrine of men's obligation to God and man is taught and practiced, there their capital may safely be invested. They tell us that Calvinism plies men with hammer and with chisel. It does; and the result is monumental marble. Other systems leave men soft and dirty; Calvinism makes them of white marble, to endure forever."

Wilson's "Theology of Modern Literature" asserts: "The world has never known," says an able modern scholar, "a higher type of robust and sturdy manhood, nor a gentler, purer or more lovable womanhood, than have prevailed among those peoples who have imbibed the principles of Calvinistic creed, with its commingled elements of granitic strength and stability, and of supreme, because Divine, tenderness and grace."



## Nations.

According to the testimony of competent and scholarly men, Calvinism not only produced great men of high moral standard, but created equally unrivaled standards in national life.

James Russel Lowell, diplomat and poet, affirms: "If the Calvinistic churches are to be judged by the results of their teaching upon character and conduct, as seen in Scotland and New England, then these churches are entitled to the highest praise. For the superiority is not solely in morality and intelligence, but in the prevalent sense of duty in high ideals and inflexible principles, and in short, in the consciousness of the spiritual world that is an 'eternal now' with believers. After due allowance made for time-servers and hypocrites, I think there are among the Calvinists more godly men, each living 'As ever in his great Taskmaster's eye,' than in any other branch of the Christian Church."

This is confirmed by Thomas Carlyle, universally recognized for his genius and his rugged honesty: "Calvinism had produced in all countries in which it really dominated a definite type of character and conception of morals which was the noblest that had yet appeared in the world."

Samuel Smiles, noted essayist, emphasizes the fact that Calvinism bears the same noble purity regardless of nationality: "What the Puritan was in England," he says, "and the Covenanter in Scotland, that the Huguenot was in France; and that the system of Calvin should have developed precisely the same kind of men in these three several countries affords a remarkable illustration of the power of religious training in the formation of character."

With pardonable pride Calvinism points to one illustration of its blessed results—par excellence—and universally admitted. It has had absolute control of the moral and religious life of but one country. Scotland owes its national character alone to Presbyterianism. For integrity, for scholarship, for high moral standards, for conscientious devotion to duty, for undaunted heroism, for deep spirituality, no country of the globe would be so presumptuous as to claim to stand on the same plane with Scotland.

## Conclusive Summary of Achievement.

In the Supreme Court of Kentucky, while adjudicating a case, involving the legal rights and status of the Presbyterian Church, Judge Henry S. Baker in rendering a decision took occasion to pay a splendid tribute to the work and worth of Presbyterianism, which is hereby reproduced as a comprehensive summary of its achievements recorded on the pages of History throughout the ages:

“The history of the Presbyterian Church is the history of a very large part of what we know and enjoy of civil and religious liberty. The teachings of her faith are such as have always attracted to her the most lofty minds and the noblest spirits. In following her path through the pages of history, whether her votaries be called Lutherans (Reformed) as in Germany, Huguenots, as in France, Covenanters, as in Scotland, or Puritans, as in England,—they will always be found to be among the bravest and the best.

“As a religious organization, it had no compromise along the lines of conscience to make with power; and it could be deflected from the path of rectitude neither by the frown of authority nor the blandishments of corruption.

“With the same indomitable courage, it confronted the haughty princes of the House of Tudor and the crowned weaklings of the House of Stuart; with the same words of scornful condemnation it rebuked the sins of Messalina on the throne and the wanton in the street.

“Her path has led her oftner into exile than into favor with the great; oftener to the dungeon and the stake than to the pleasure of kings' houses or the friendship of courtiers.

“But under her searching gaze shackles have fallen from the human mind, and the divine right of kings has shrunk to the mean thing it now appears.

“Wherever a battle was to be fought for human liberty, whenever a forlorn hope was to be led, or a mind braved for conscience sake, whenever the blood of a martyr was needed as testimony to truth, her answer was always that of the prophet of old: ‘Here am I; send me.’”

“And of Zion it shall be said, this and that man was born in her, and the Highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count when He writeth up the people, that this man was born there.”

Rival Philosophies may enumerate each its distinguished adherents, Science may claim its illustrious devotees, schools of divinity may count each its worthy sons, patriotism may exhibit with pride its noblest heroes; but when Calvinism calls the roll of the ages, they come flocking to its standard, arrayed under its blue banner—that has waved over many lands and in all ages,—the noble army of the Martyrs outnumbering all other faiths combined; saints of God, Paul, Augustine, John Calvin, John Knox, Andrew Melville, George Gillespie, John Milton, James Henley Thornwell, Robert J. Breckinridge, Robert L. Dabney, John L. Girardeau, Benj. M. Palmer, Jas. Woodrow, accompanied by a mighty host which no man can number—Waldenses, Huguenots, Jansenists, Culdees, Covenanters, Puritans,—Calvinists all,—“Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy): they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.”

Let the detractors of Calvinism, before being accounted worthy to substitute for it some other system, first match it in worthy deeds and in illustrious heroes of faith.

Verily, “Wisdom is justified of her children.”



## CHAPTER IX.

### **Presbyterianism and Catholicity.**

The inherent strength of Presbyterianism is the scriptural character of its doctrine and polity. Its crowning glory is the catholicity of its spirit toward evangelical Christendom. It stands firm as Gibraltar on its Biblical base, but is characterized by no bigotry which claims sole prerogatives as "the" Church, to the exclusion of all others. It extends the hand of fellowship to all the followers of Christ regardless of creed or historical affiliation. If smitten on one cheek by the uncharitable club of the sectarian, it turns the other cheek,—though in firm protest,—to the fist of the smiter in the confident trust that love will eventually win in the conflict between truth and intolerance.

#### **Its Historic Creed.**

In the whole realm of literature there is no more broadminded statement and liberal spirit toward fellow Christians of other faiths than its Chapter on the "Communion of Saints" in which it affirms: "We are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, which communion as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who in every place call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Presbyterianism is the only system which officially and unequivocally recognizes as a distinct and unmistakable part of the visible Church, all other denominations, "whate'er their name or sign." For nearly three centuries the banner of Presbyterianism has been flung to the breezes with its definition of the Church inscribed which should challenge the admiration of Christendom: "The visible Church before the law, under the law and now under the gospel, is one and the same, and consists of all those who make profession of the true religion, together with their children. This visible unity of the body of Christ, though obscured, is not

destroyed by its division into different denominations of professing Christians; but all of these which maintain the Word and Sacraments in their fundamental integrity are to be recognized as true branches of the Church of Jesus Christ.”

Though possessing the most logical, systematic and scriptural creed—well nigh universally so admitted—it is rather remarkable that it is the one creed which acclaims the fact that it requires no subscription and refuses to bind the individual conscience. On the contrary, it guarantees the right of private judgment, affirming that “God alone is Lord of the conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men.” It does require, however, subscription to the Confession on the part of its ministry and officers in their representative character as the official exponents of its faith. But for the individual seeking admission to its fold there is absolutely no test except the scriptural requirement of “repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” It protects each member of its fold in his divine right of determining for himself his beliefs and practices in his private interpretation of Scripture under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Its Confession of Faith confirms its scriptural System; and its pulpits expound officially its distinctive principles, but whether the individual accepts immersion or sprinkling as the mode of baptism, whether he accepts Calvinism or Arminianism as his personal creed, is his exclusive privilege and sole responsibility. The door of the Presbyterian Church is as wide as the gate of Heaven, and its “Communion of Saints” is as broad as evangelical Christendom.

### **The Proofs of Its Catholicity.**

Notwithstanding the foregoing claims of broad-mindedness and notwithstanding these published official statements of its Confession of Faith, yet in many quarters, due to ignorance or prejudice, there have been persistent and unchristian charges of narrowness lodged against this historic and long suffering body of worthy Christian people, who have adorned the faith throughout the ages. Their high standard of Christian character, their unrivaled achievements in benevolences and in missions are their noblest defense; yet we may be indulged in the recitation of some of the

practical proofs which seemingly are so apparent they might be justly and confidently trusted to carry conviction to the minds of reasonable men.

## I.

### **Presbyterian Recognition of Other Faiths.**

Not simply in its Confession of Faith theoretically, but in practical deeds and ways, Presbyterianism acclaims all Christians as brethren. Its scriptural Presbyterate constitutes no barrier to the cordial recognition as brethren those in the communion of the historic episcopate. If Episcopal canons exclude Presbyterians from their pulpit and close the door of their churches against holding Presbyterian services in their houses of worship, the Presbyterian Church does not retaliate, but cordially offers its churches to homeless Episcopal flocks, and unreservedly places its pulpit at their disposal. If immersionists exclude Presbyterians from the church and from their communion table, Presbyterians announce the terms of their communion as broad as Christianity, and invite all disciples of Christ "to the table of the Lord." If others reordain Presbyterian ministers and rebaptize their members, Presbyterianism retaliates by extending the hand of fellowship, whether others take it or reject it. The Presbyterian Church never reordains any ministers coming from any evangelical church, and never rebaptizes those who have been baptized by other modes. It receives members from other denominations by certificate from any as freely and as cordially as from other Presbyterian Churches. It cheerfully grants letters of dismission to any other "Christian Communion" as readily as to those of its own faith and order. This is no mere sentiment, for it not only preaches but practices the principles of fraternity in its effort to realize the communion of Saints.

## II.

### **Presbyterian Cooperation.**

Presbyterianism undeniably leads the hosts of God's people in its financial and moral support of all great undenominational enter-



prises and charitable institutions. The "Ben Adham" whose "name leads all the rest" is usually Presbyterian. It is the denomination that "sows beside all waters" and whose hand of sympathy and generosity is extended to every worthy cause. The familiar and oft quoted statement of Dwight L. Moody has never been challenged, that in his great undenominational enterprises he always counted on Presbyterians for 80 per cent. of the total cost. No wonder some one has said: "They are the financial backbone of all American benevolence. They make possible the success of every great 'drive.' The nation knows it and is grateful."

Dr. Irenaeus Prime, Corresponding Secretary of the American Bible Society,—the outstanding undenominational institution which has in good works and far-reaching influence led all religious non-sectarian forces of the world,—made a careful examination of the gifts of the New York Bible Auxiliary, and found that the contributions of the Presbyterian Church during a period of fifty years were five times greater than the combined gifts of all other denominations. At the first Pan-Presbyterian Council he was quoted as saying: "An analysis of the sources of contributions to the Bible cause in any other city or part of the country, out of New England, will show that the Presbyterian Church contributes to this great national society in about the same proportion."

Dr. Hays in his book on "Presbyterianism" states on the authority of an executive officer of one of the great non-sectarian enterprises, that if the support of Presbyterians were withdrawn from the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society and the American Sunday School Union, it would force them out of business. No body of Christian people has established and is maintaining a larger number of hospitals, orphanages and philanthropic institutions, which are open to the public regardless of race or creed. Dr. Hays discovered in one of these great Presbyterian hospitals that seventy-four inmates out of every hundred come from Methodists, Lutherans and Romanists, while only eight were Presbyterians. Jews, Unitarians and Friends largely accounted for the rest. The philanthropies of the Presbyterian Church, representing an investment annually of millions of dollars free to all classes and creeds, for the relief of suffering

humanity, are her efforts to re-incarnate the helping hand and loving heart of Christ as vital forces in the life of the world today. Christ, who lived *among* men two thousand years ago, who still lives *for* men on the throne of the universe, is also living as well *in* men, visibly revealed in the life of His Church.

### III.

#### **Presbyterian Preeminence in Federation.**

The sectarian exclusiveness which has been the reproach of Christendom in the past is gradually but surely yielding to the impact of fraternity and Christian charity. The visible manifestation of the new spirit is expressing itself in the closer relation and growing federation of the churches for mutual sympathy and friendly coöperation. The Federal Council of Churches, the Students' Volunteer Movement, the Home Mission Council, the Conference for Foreign Missions, are some of the great inter-denominational organizations of the day which give expression to the principle of the spiritual unity of Christendom. Some of the larger denominations have steadfastly declined to enter or take any part in these great federations of the Christian forces and of the visible unity of the Church. The Presbyterian Church has without exception not only extended her hand and heart to each and all of them, but has taken a leading part in their formation and in their operation. Such is her preëminent part and active influence that withdrawal from either would seriously embarrass the organization. With confidence it may be affirmed and the statement will scarcely be challenged, that no denomination in existence sustains such vital relation to all these federations as the Presbyterian Church. It is the supreme evidence of the liberal and catholic spirit of the System of Presbyterianism, not only throughout Christendom but in all the affairs of men.

### IV.

#### **The Community of Faith and Life.**

In all its fundamental beliefs and essential features it has a community of faith and life shared by evangelical Christendom,

which is the surest witness of its own catholicity. In its entire system it has nothing exclusively distinctive, but every fundamental principle is endorsed and shared by one or more historic Faiths. In the great Reformation, Martin Luther, representative of one of the largest Protestant bodies of the world, stood with John Calvin for the vital evangelical principle of justification by faith. In the English revival as a protest against dead formality, Calvinistic Whitefield and John Wesley, founder of the Methodist Church, stood side by side for the evangelistic spirit of Christianity. In its theology, Presbyterianism shares its Calvinistic system with the great Baptist forces of the world. In the spontaneity of its religious experiences under the immediate and direct influences of the Holy Spirit, it joins with William Penn and George Fox of the Quaker faith. In its scriptural mode of baptism and its practice of infant baptism, based upon the promises of the covenant-keeping God, Presbyterianism is reinforced by the overwhelming majority of the hosts of the Israel of God throughout Christendom. Presbyterianism teaches and practices its theology of Christian unity. It extends the right hand of fellowship to all believers of all Faiths, saying with Paul: "So we, being many, are one body in Christ and every one members one of another." Embodied in modern terms and figures of speech is the same thought: "Many as the waves, one as the sea"; many as the stars, one as the firmament; many folds, but one flock; many organizations, but one Church. Presbyterianism, the system that more than all others embodies the fundamentals common to all, is the connecting link that allies itself to each and insists on the Communion of Saints on the principle of a community of faith and life, maintaining: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

This unique position as the only Church which in her creed teaches the unity of the Church and advocates that the Communion of Saints be extended to all those who in every place call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, surely entitles her to the eulogy so eloquently pronounced by Dr. Charles A. Briggs in "American



Presbyterianism": "The Presbyterian Church has the true apostolic succession in striving after the apostolic faith in its purity, integrity and fulness. Presbyterianism is a real Christianity which rejects everything which is not a product of the Christianity of Jesus Christ. It appropriates everything in every age of the Church which bears the impress of Christ and which represents the power of His Spirit. Presbyterianism belongs to the modern age of the world, but it is not a departure from the Christianity from the times of the apostles until the present day. It comprehends the genuine Christianity of all ages. It conserves all the achievements of the Christian Church. It leads the van of the advancing host of God. It makes steady progress towards the realization of the ideal of Christianity in the golden age of the Messiah."

## V.

### **Conforming to the Presbyterian Type.**

After the battle of Salamis, the Greek Generals, thirty in number, met to award the mead of praise to that one of their number justly entitled to the honor by reason of his part and distinguished services in winning the brilliant victory. Each was instructed to vote for his first and second choice. In counting the ballots it was discovered that they had received one vote each for first place, while Themistocles received thirty votes for the second choice. It was the most overwhelming testimony that he was entitled to the honor of having rendered the most distinguished services in achieving the victory. If in like manner the denominations were given the opportunity of selecting one as the church upon which all could unite, being allowed to vote for first and second choice, it is almost a moral certainty that each would vote for itself as first choice and the overwhelming majority would cast their ballot for the Presbyterian as second choice. The truth of this contention can be verified by making the experiment of testing a very large number of persons in all denominations and tabulating the result.

Still more conclusive would be the test of a study of the modern movements and gradual developments now taking place under our

very eyes in the ecclesiastical world. The tendency in modern church life is the conformity of others to the Presbyterian type. The Congregational, which was once ruled by the popular vote of the local church, independent of all others, now has its "Associations" or "Councils," which are assuming more and more ecclesiastical authority, and whose decisions have come to possess such sufficient moral force and to make them differ very little from our Presbyteries. The Methodist Church, as late as the Civil War, did not admit the laity, and was ruled chiefly by Bishops; but it has now admitted laymen in its conferences, and is practically Presbyterian in government. The Lutheran is as Presbyterian in form of Government as the Presbyterian itself in everything except in name. The Baptists, closer akin to Presbyterians in their theology than any others, who once were the staunchest advocates of Independency, are now drifting nearer to Presbyterianism in their form of government. In theory their churches have been quite independent in the past, and many are still as independent as ever, yet their "Associations," while claiming no sanction than moral suasion, do not hesitate to exclude from their "fellowship" such churches as are recalcitrant to advice, which gives these voluntary Associations practically all the influence and the authority of Presbyteries. Is it any wonder, in view of these facts, that the author of the sixth volume of "American Church History" affirms that "As a whole the Protestantism of America has become Presbyterian in substance, though not in name."

## VI.

### **Catholicity in the Extent of Empire.**

The catholic and Ecumenical character of Presbyterianism is displayed in the growth of its membership and the vastness of its constituency. At the Eleventh General Council of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance in Pittsburgh, Pa., the following statistics were officially submitted with the statement that they were "the most reliable ever published of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of the World."

TABLE.

CHURCHES	Congregations	Ministers	Elders	Communicants	Pupils in S. S.	S. S. Teachers
European Continent.....	6,549	5,872	23,590	2,010,999	579,844	4,847
United Kingdom.....	5,850	5,596	37,029	1,654,219	850,155	78,996
Asia.....	2,895	1,395	1,410	304,326	88,116	3,887
Africa.....	1,516	694	4,071	454,453	56,146	2,341
North America...	21,607	17,908	83,395	3,287,494	2,795,787	.....
South America...	189	150	492	27,812	15,176	833
West Indies.....	160	97	650	18,943	17,506	1,044
Australasia.....	854	826	4,738	121,565	111,967	11,909
Totals....	39,620	33,538	155,375	7,879,811	4,414,797	362,718

This table does not include Germany, Switzerland and some other countries on the Continent of Europe, owing to the impossibility of separating communicants from constituency. A conservative estimate for these would increase the number to over 8,000,000. The total constituency of Presbyterianism throughout the world is generally estimated at 40,000,000.

### Presbyterian Empire, World-Wide.

Dr. Egbert W. Smith, Secretary of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, U. S., rendered splendid service to the cause, by publishing many of the best testimonies to the worth and achievements of Presbyterianism in his valuable treatise entitled "The Creed of Presbyterians." No more appropriate conclusion can enforce the contention of this chapter on Presbyterian Catholicity than an apt quotation from this book as to the numerical strength of Presbyterianism and wide extent of its empire:

"It is inspiring to remind ourselves that ours is a historic Church. Our present millions are the children and successors of millions upon millions, seated now in the galleries of History's vast coliseum, tier above tier, generation upon generation, of those who through ages of toil, trial and triumph, 'subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.'



“More catholic and imposing even than the Presbyterian numbers is the world-wide range of the Presbyterian empire. While the adherents of other Protestant communions are more or less massed in single countries,—the Lutherans in Germany, the Episcopalians in England, the Methodists and Baptists in the United States,—the line of the Presbyterian Church is gone out through all the earth. She thrives this hour in more continents, among a greater number of nations and peoples and languages, than any other evangelical church in the world. As her witnesses in Continental Europe, she has the historic Presbyterian Reformed Churches of Austria, Bohemia, Galicia, Moravia, of Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, of Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, of Russia and Switzerland and Spain. She is rooted and fruitful in Africa, in Australia, in Asia, in Great Britain, in North America, in South America, in the West Indies, in New Zealand, in Malanesia,—the people of this faith and order gird the earth. Presbyterianism possesses a power of adaptation unparalleled by any other system. It holds in steadfast array a great part of the intelligence and moral vigor of the Christian world, and from its abounding spiritual life are going forth the mighty forces of Christian missions into all the heathen world.”

## CHAPTER X.

### Presbyterianism and Missions

#### PRESUMPTION IN ITS FAVOR.

The essential principles of Calvinism would lead us beforehand to infer that it would furnish the strongest incentive to successful missionary effort. Nothing is more reassuring and better calculated to arouse the supremest effort for the advancement of the kingdom than a profound belief in the divine sovereignty of God, who "sits on no precarious throne" and sends His servants on no uncertain mission. In human governments, that army will struggle most valiantly which has implicit confidence in the competency of the government to direct its affairs, and its ability to execute its purposes. Calvinism enthrones God in His sovereign Omnipotence, directing all the events of the universe according to a divinely appointed plan, arranged in the councils of eternity.

Is it any wonder that His subjects, persuaded that they are executing the designs of God himself, toil in the strength, born of the conviction that though their immediate designs may fail, and they themselves perish, yet God himself lives and reigns, and will in His own sovereign wisdom and appointed time bring to pass His purposes of grace? Missions may challenge their faith, and make unrelenting draughts on their resources and activities, but what matters it, if it be the sovereign purpose of God?

Distrust of self would ordinarily weaken and paralyze all effort, were it not for the fact that such distrust flings the soul back upon God in its weakness, and by an abiding faith in Him, obtains a strength that is invincible. "When I am weak, then am I strong," is the paradox of Calvinism. Will the impulsive, spasmodic zeal springing from self-indulgence and reliance on human means, stand the strain of long-continued effort so well as one who makes God his confidence, and "endures as seeing Him who is invisible"? The firm conviction, that we rest not on human but divine efficiency, gives stability to our vacillating efforts, and makes us

strong by "the mighty hands of the God of Jacob." These "shall mount up on wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, and they shall walk and not faint,"—in the Hurculean task of bringing the world to Christ.

Not simply viewed from the standpoint of belief in the divine sovereignty, does Calvinism thus evince its superiority as a potent influence in world-wide evangelization, but it is equally evident from the human standpoint of the perseverance of the saints. If the stereotyped objection to Calvinism were true, that it is cold, calculating, lacking in fervor, it would be more than counterbalanced by the steady, persistent, unflinching, perseverance of an undaunted faith, which holds on the even tenor of its way in the face of opposition, despite difficulties and discouragements, till it wrings victory out of defeat. The fevered brain may produce momentarily an unnatural strength, born of delirium; but will it endure the trials and press on in the race with the steady gait of one in the full possession of robust health.

Calvinism finds its analogy, not in the "whirlwind" of impetuosity, not in the "fire" of religious fanaticism, nor in the "earthquake" of spasmodic upheavals, but in the "still small voice" that speaks conviction in the silent depths of the soul. If, in the sphere of missions, failure and disaster overtake his best efforts, and success be long delayed, the Calvinist undeterred sees in the analogy of nature how slowly and silently she elaborates the best and grandest results of her mighty plan by gradual processes and takes comfort in the thought, that in the Kingdom of Grace, God works by the same methods and executes His largest purposes by the steady, irresistible perseverance of the saints, remembering that though "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation," it comes none the less surely.

## I.

### Results, the Practical Test.

Tested by practical results, will an appeal to the history of missions justify this contention, that the principles of Calvinism pre-eminently qualify its adherents for leadership in evangelizing the world?



## The Early Days of Christianity.

In its theological aspect, Calvinism, existing ages before Calvin, had its influence in the early days of Christianity on the life and activity of the church. In character it made men conspicuous in their differentiation from other classes. In zeal and activity, it enlisted the rank and file of the church in a religious enthusiasm, which went from house to house, and carried the Gospel "to the uttermost part of the earth."

The Apostle Paul is the classical illustration of the spirit of the ancient church. Is it a mere coincidence that Paul, recognized as the profoundest exponent of Calvinism, is at the same time regarded next to the Master himself, as the type and model of all missionary effort. Opponents of Calvinism have not hesitated to charge Paul with the responsibility of giving the Calvinistic cast to the theological thought of the church. Yet this same Paul is always exalted as the greatest and grandest of all missionaries.

The Calvinism of the first century was as unquestionable as that of Paul himself, who gave cast to the thinking of the first century. Sacred history, ere closing, itself gives significant glimpses of the missionary spirit of the church while under the dominating influence of Calvinism. That was an exquisite touch which records in the language of the church's enemies, the estimate of apostolic success, complaining: "These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also." It was not an ardent admirer of Paul who testified to his credit, "That not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people from idolatry." Paul himself gives a suggestive hint of the missionary propaganda of the age by asserting, that they had preached the Gospel "to every creature which is under heaven." (Col. 1:23.)

The remarkable characteristic of the evangelism of ancient Christianity was its propaganda in the face of persecution, and even at the cost of martyrdom. The Calvinism which made heroes and martyrs of men gave also through them such an exhibition of missionary zeal and successful propagation of the Gospel in those

early days of Christianity as has never since been paralleled in the history of the world.

### **John Calvin, the Father of Modern Missions.**

In the *Christian Retrospect and Register*, Robert Baird, upon the authority of the "*Historie Universelle*," gives the following account of the first mission undertaken by Protestantism:

"To Calvin, the Reformer of Geneva, belongs the credit of having first attempted, in the Protestant churches, to excite interest in behalf of a heathen nation. An expedition was fitted out in the year 1555 by Villegagnon, a Knight of Malta, under the patronage of Henry II of France, with the view of establishing a French colony in the New World. The approbation of the monarch was secured through the medium of the excellent Admiral De Coligny, whose favor Villegagnon propitiated by the secret understanding that the projected colony should protect the Reformed religion. Accordingly, Calvin was applied to, in order to obtain ministers to embark with the expedition.

"After consultation with the other pastors of Geneva, he sent two—Guillaume Chartier and Pierre Richier,—who were afterwards joined by several others. Their object was, at once, to labor among the colonists and to evangelize the heathen aborigines. The expedition reached Fort Coligny, as it was named, on the Rio De Janeiro, Brazil, in March, 1556. On their arrival, the Genevan ministers proceeded to constitute a church, according to the forms and rites of the Reformed churches, and celebrated the Lord's Supper. But Villegagnon soon betrayed his true character and disposition, and after cruelly maltreating the missionaries, forced them to reëmbark and return to France."

One can scarcely avoid speculation as to what "might have been," if the unfortunate mission had not thus been prematurely wrecked. As Calvin's name is associated with Augustine, the great theologian, might it not also have been linked with Augustine the missionary in the conversion of a continent? If the seeds of Protestant Christianity planted by him in South America had germinated, who can say if the glory of that misguided continent might not have shown with all the lustre of Protestant North

America? But, alas! his missionary venture served no useful purpose, except to exhibit his Christian spirit and benevolent attitude toward world-wide evangelization in obedience to the great Commission.

Just as a premature blossom in the treacherous Indian summer, though nipped by the early frosts of winter, is nevertheless a prophecy of the coming spring; so Calvin's ill-timed evangelism was but the guarantee of the evangelistic spirit of Calvinism, when the springtime of favorable seasons should furnish opportunity to flower out in the glorious harvest of the world's conversion.

In the providence of God, his missionary zeal was confined to the work of laying foundations in practical home mission work, while foreign missions was rather the future outcome of his spirit and principles. Though the foundation of an edifice may not be as ornate and attractive as the superstructure, yet it must be even more substantial by reason of its supreme importance. The glory of Calvin in the sphere of missions is the glory of laying foundations; and he must also share the glory of the magnificent superstructure, supported by so substantial a basis. If some twentieth century Apostle Paul should convert South America to Protestantism, and place a new continent in the galaxy of evangelical Christianity, would that be more glorious than the transcendent work of Calvin, whose well-nigh inspired genius laid the foundations of North America's future greatness, and made it such a potent factor in the evangelization of the world as to justify the rallying cry, "As goes America, so goes the world"?

## II.

### **Calvinism Inherently and Intensely Missionary.**

In its primitive purity and reaction from Catholicism as the result of the Reformation, judged by its flaming zeal and in the number of churches which is established, Calvinism demonstrated itself as the most powerful evangelistic force since the Apostolic age. With amazing rapidity it overspread Europe, mustering to its support countless thousands in a living and aggressive Christianity. In twenty-five years after Calvin began his cam-



paign there were two thousand places of Calvinistic worship with a half million of worshippers in France alone. Before his death the Calvinists numbered one-fourth of the entire French population.

“The Lutheran Reformation,” says Dyer in his History of Modern Europe, “traveled but little out of Germany and the neighboring Scandinavian kingdoms; while Calvinism obtained a European character, and was adopted in all the countries that adopted a reformation from without, as France, as the Netherlands, Scotland, even England; for the early English Reformation under Edward VI was Calvinistic, and Calvin was incontestably the father of our Puritans and dissenters. Thus, under his rule, Geneva may be said to have become the capital of European Reform.”

In his History of Reformation, D'Aubigne pays a tribute to its propagating power, saying: “The reformation of Calvin was addressed particularly to the people, among whom it raised up martyrs until the time came when it was to send forth the spiritual conquerors of the world. For three centuries it has been producing in the social condition of the nations that have received it, transformations unknown to former times. And still at this very day, and now perhaps more than ever, it imparts to the men who accept it a spirit of power which makes them chosen instruments fitted to propagate truth, morality, and civilization to the ends of the earth.”

### **Calvinism and Modern Revivals.**

Credit must be accorded the Methodist Church as a tremendous evangelistic force, but its impetus was not due to its Arminianism. John Wesley was characterized not only by his saintliness, but by his genius as an organizer. His magnificent system accounts largely for the marvelous success of that noble Church, but it was Calvinistic George Whitefield that imparted to the movement its evangelistic spirit, which has not yet spent its force. It was Whitefield who lead Wesley into field preaching and into “revival” methods, and who so dominated the movement that Mant, in his Bampton Lectures for 1812, characterizes Methodism as an entirely Calvinistic affair, and asserts that in the popu-

lar language of the day Methodists were designated as "another sect of Presbyterians." Without in the slightest detracting from the great honor which the world must ever accord John Wesley, still it must in justice be admitted that George Whitefield was the flaming evangelist of his day and must be acclaimed as the father of modern revivals.

### **The World's Greatest Evangelists, Calvinists.**

Arminianism has produced many local revivals and must be credited with the salvation of millions, but it has never inspired a nation-wide movement. The revival which swept New England and until that time the greatest in the history of the American Colonies resulted from a series of Calvinistic sermons by Jonathan Edwards. The men who have awakened the consciences of men and swept countless multitudes into the Kingdom were Calvinists almost to a man, such as John Knox, Thomas Chalmers, George Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, David Brainard, Wilbur Chapman, Tennent, Griffin, Nettleton, Daniel Baker, Moody, Torrey, Spurgeon and W. A. Sunday.

## **III.**

### **The Missionary Spirit of Presbyterianism.**

The Presbyterian Church not only leads the world in per capita gifts for missions, but its spirit and example have been the inspiration of Christendom.

Among the Reformers, who led the way of Protestantism in the first missionary venture, but the Calvinists of Geneva? Who penetrated first the trackless forests of the New World, carrying the gospel to its untamed savages, but Brainerd and Eliot. Who led the missionary movement, which is awakening all Christendom to the task of making Christ known throughout the world? If the roll were called of the Calvinists who have led the advancing hosts of the Church, in its attack on heathenism, it would include well-nigh all the great names of history conspicuous for missionary enthusiasm and achievement. Time would fail to enumerate William Cary, Henry Martyn, David Livingstone, Robert Moffatt, Alexander Duff, Adoniram Judson, Robert

Morrison, John G. Paton, John Leighton Wilson, William H. Sheppard; and a vast host of others who, "through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight." etc.

According to Dr. Moses D. Hoge, "the first missionary since the Reformation sent forth by any church in its corporate capacity, and ordained to labor in the foreign field, was Alexander Duff (commissioned by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland), whose name stands as a synonym of whatever is heroic, self-sacrificing and saintly in missionary character and achievement.

At the meeting of the Alliance of Reformed Churches in Glasgow, Prof. Lindsay informed that august and venerable body, representing the larger part of the Calvinistic forces of the world, that "The Presbyterian churches do more than a fourth of the whole mission work among the heathen that is done by all the Protestant churches together," and mentioning three of the greatest denominations, asserted that, "The Presbyterian Church is doing more in the foreign field than all of them combined."

At the same meeting of the Alliance, representatives of the Eastern Section of the Ecumenical Methodist Conference appeared and made a most cordial and pleasing address, expressing their fraternal good will and appreciation of our principles and work in the following complimentary language:

"Taking the world over, Presbyterianism in the future must be looked to as one of the greatest and most beneficent forces for the conversion and evangelization of the generations of mankind on every continent. We do unfeignedly rejoice as we behold your goodly array of churches, giving the noblest of their sons, and consecrating their vast resources of learning and wealth to the greatest, the mightiest of all enterprises, the conversion of the world to Christ," and the address closes with the prayer that our "cherished ideal of 'a free church in a free state' shall in every nation under heaven be an accomplished fact, and every citizen be taught that the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever."



## American Presbyterianism and Missions.

Intense enthusiasm has not always characterized the Presbyterian Church of America during the entire century of its organized missionary effort. The modern spirit of missions was of slow growth among all branches of the Church. Nearly one hundred years ago the famous overture of Dr. John H. Rice, the founder of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, was presented to the General Assembly of 1831, in which he challenged the Assembly to recognize more emphatically the evangelistic mission of the church. It seems almost incredible to us in this age of missionary zeal that this overture was not immediately adopted by the Assembly. Nevertheless it stirred the Church and had the effect of committing it to a distinctive missionary career in the following terms:

“First, that the Presbyterian Church in the United States is a missionary society, the object of which is to aid in the conversion of the world; and that every member of the Church is a member for life of the said society, and bound in the maintenance of his Christian character to do all in his power for the accomplishment of this object. Second, Ministers of the gospel in connection with the Presbyterian Church are most solemnly required to present this subject to the members of their respective congregation, using every effort to make them feel their obligation and to induce them to contribute according to their ability.”

Since that overture was proposed the Presbyterian Churches in America have grown from an insignificant host of 135,000 communicants to an aggregate strength of 12 denominations and 3,000,000 communicants,—their representatives preaching the gospel among nearly all the nations of the globe.

At its organization in 1861 into a separate religious body, the Presbyterian Church, U. S. —popularly known as the Southern Church,—gave the world a heroic spectacle of its faith in God and a sublime exhibition of its missionary spirit. Amid the throes of Civil War, the bitterness of sectional feeling and the agony of a disrupted Nation, the first General Assembly of the Southern Church rose sheer above the awful conflict to the contemplation of the Saviour’s last command and accepted its missionary responsibility—obedient to the great Commission—in the follow-

ing striking language: "The General Assembly desires distinctly and deliberately to inscribe on our Church's banner as she now unfolds it to the world, in immediate connection with the headship of her Lord, His last Command. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, regarding this as the great end of her organization."

The organic life of the Presbyterian Church U. S. began in 1861 with 10 Synods, 47 Presbyteries, 700 Ministers, 1,000 Churches and 75,000 Communicants. After the lapse of sixty years it now numbers 2,000 Ministers, 3,500 Churches and 400,000 Communicants, and contributed in 1920 to Foreign Missions, \$1,153,629; to Home Missions, \$1,436,986; and a total to all purposes of \$12,124,891. It supports 400 Foreign Missionaries and 3,000 native helpers and more than 1,000 Home Missionaries. During 1920 its net growth was 5½ per cent.—about double that of any other large denomination—and for ten years it has lead all denominations in the United States in net gains, aggregating 39 per cent.

### **Presbyterianism, Cosmopolitan.**

The Presbyterian Church is the most cosmopolitan of Protestant Christendom. Others are largely national. A religious periodical recently carried the following striking statement: "Denominations are not equally scattered over the world. Investigations show that three-fourths of all the Baptists of the world live in the United States south of a line run across the country along the northern boundary of Virginia to the Ohio River and extending westward from its mouth to the Pacific. Three-fourths of the Methodists of the world live in the United States. But there are more Presbyterians outside of the United States than there are in its borders. Presbyterians, Reformed and Lutherans—all of whom have the same form of Church government,—constitute three-fifths of all the Protestants of the world."

That was not a vain-glorious boast of the American Presbyterian Church in its report to the Alliance of the Reformed Churches: "The missionary heralds of our Pan-American Pres-

byterian alone, which is but a branch of the catholic Presbyterian Church, are scattered from British Columbia to Yucatan; they are in Central America and in Columbia; Venezuela, British Guiana and Brazil; they are on the African Coast from Liberia to the Ogowe, and in the heart of the great Congo basin; they are strong in Syria and Persia, and side by side in India our separate columns are advancing under one Captain; we are proclaiming glad tidings in Siam and Laos, in Hainan and the Philipines, in Cuba and Formosa; we have long since 'partitioned China,' not for political spoil, but for her salvation; our united forces are teaching the Hermit Nation that, as no man, so no nation, liveth to itself; we have proclaimed to the Sunrise Kingdom the Sun of Righteousness whose rising shall know no setting. Our strategic points are taken, our stations occupied, our watch towers girdle the globe."

#### IV.

### **Calvinism the Guarantee of Victory.**

Calvinism furnishes the only guarantee of the ultimate triumph of the Gospel in extending the sceptre of Christ, till "The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." Others may indulge a well-grounded hope based upon an abiding faith; but Calvinism plants itself on "The sure word of prophecy" and maintains that the conversion of the world is one of "the eternal decrees of God," revealed as "Foreordained for His own glory," and must therefore surely "come to pass." It has been prophesied "that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow . . . and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father," and it could not be prophesied unless it had been predestinated; for contingent and doubtful events cannot be prophesied. Prophecy is always and everywhere based on foreordination, and not upon mere foreknowledge; for prophecy is foreknowledge revealed, which presupposes the event, as a fixed and unchangeable decree.

The Son of God, in the Second Psalm, encouraged himself in the predestined triumph of His Kingdom: "I will declare the



decree, the Lord said unto Me, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of Me and I will give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession." Let the heathen rage, and the world in arms combine; let the evil powers of the Kingdom of Darkness assault the Citadel of Faith; let all the world join in a universal rebellion against the Lord of Glory; nevertheless the eternal decree shall stand; for "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision." The Lord God Omnipotent proclaims from His eternal throne in the heavens: "Yet have I set my King on My holy hill of Zion," and that king though still uncrowned and at the moment in the weakness of the flesh, even with the cross confronting him, yet could proclaim: "Upon this Rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

    "Waft, waft, ye winds, His story,  
    And you, ye waters, roll,  
Till, like a sea of glory,  
    It spreads from pole to pole;  
Till o'er our ransomed nature,  
    The Lamb for sinners slain,  
Redeemer, King, Creator,  
    In bliss returns to reign!"

# Questionnaire

## CHAPTER I.

### Presbyterianism—A System.

1. What is one characteristic of Truth?
2. What constitutes a System?
3. What is characteristic of Presbyterianism?
4. What is its first Distinctive Principle?
5. Illustrate the variations of this principle?
6. What is the Supreme Authority of the Catholic Church?
7. What is the function and limitation of Reason in Religion?
8. Name the Second Distinctive Principle in Presbyterianism?
9. What is the relation of Predestination and Providence?
10. Illustrate the Relation of Sovereignty and Free-Agency.
11. Give Scripture quotations including both in the same Text.
12. Illustrate their connection by the story of Joseph.
13. In the parable of the Lost (Luke XV) what represents the Divine aspect of Salvation?
14. What represents the Human Side?
15. Illustrate by Analogy of Architecture.
16. What is the Third Principle of Presbyterianism?
17. Name the three Primary Forms of Church Government.
18. What is the essential element of each?
19. What is the first element of the Presbyterian Form?
20. Quote Scripture texts or examples in proof.
21. Name the second element.
22. Give Scripture references showing Elders and Bishops were the same.
23. What is the third element?
24. Give Scriptural proofs.
25. Name the fourth element?
26. Quote proofs texts.

27. What is the fifth element?
28. Establish it by Scripture references.
29. What is the last Distinctive Principle of Presbyterianism?
30. Show that Church and State function in separate spheres.
31. Why are you a Presbyterian?



## CHAPTER II.

### Presbyterianism in History.

1. What may be said of its Antiquity?
2. State the difference between Genuine and Spurious Apostolic Succession.
3. Which preceded Denominational Principles, or Names?
4. State the Historic Development of the Church.
5. Quote proofs of Presbyterianism in the early days of Christianity.
6. Who were the Waldenses?
7. Were they Presbyterian in all their parts?
8. What proof that they are now Presbyterian?
9. Give account of the origin of Celtic Christianity.
10. Explain its existence in Wales, Ireland, Scotland.
11. Why did England revert to Paganism?
12. What type did Augustine carry to England?
13. Show that St. Patrick in Ireland and the Culdees in Scotland were Christians before Augustine landed in England.
14. Show that Celtic Christianity was not Roman Catholic.
15. Describe the conflict between Celtic and Latin Types.
16. Why did the Reformation flourish in Scotland?
17. Describe the conflict with Episcopacy.
18. Give account of the Covenanters' struggle.
19. Name some of the Consequences of the Restoration of the Stuarts.
20. Why did the Westminster Confession fail in England?
21. Was the Conflict transferred to America?
22. Was the War of the Revolution for Civil Rights alone?
23. What part did the Presbyterians play?
24. What was the chief victory obtained?
25. What is the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance?
26. What Historic Churches are represented in it?

## CHAPTER III.

### Presbyterianism and Calvinism.

1. Explain the difference and relation of these Terms.
2. What Kindred Philosophies correspond to Fatalism and Arminianism?
3. What is the strongest support of Calvinism?
4. Give proof texts from sayings of Christ.
5. Give quotations from Paul, from Peter and John.
6. Give similar testimony of other inspired Writers.
7. How is Calvinism sustained by the Logic of Philosophy?
8. Demonstrate by the Consistency of the Divine Attributes.
9. Unless events are unchangeably fixed, could they be foretold by Prophecy?
10. Show that Conditional Decrees are contradictory.
11. How does Science bear blind Testimony to Truth?
12. In what way does Literature lend Assent?
13. What is the Calvinism of Presbyterianism?
14. Show that Calvinism is not Fatalism.
15. Show that Sovereignty and Free-Agency both taught.
16. Give illustrations from Analogy.
17. What influence has Calvinism on Moral Character?
18. Prove this contention by illustrations.
19. How does Calvinism vindicate the Justice of God?
20. How does it magnify the grace of God?
21. Why is Calvinism revealed, if it be not a practical guide in life?

## CHAPTER IV.

### Presbyterianism and Church Polity.

1. What is the first chapter of Church History?
2. Explain the difference between historic and scriptural.
3. What is the keystone of Church government?
4. Show that the Prelatic Theory is untenable.
5. Refute the Congregational Theory.
6. What is the Presbyterian Interpretation?
7. Name some of the principles practiced.
8. Show that rulers and not the people acted.
9. Prove this principle by other scripture.
10. By names of rulers and distinctions between the classes.
11. By directions how to rule.
12. By instructions to obey rulers.
13. By plurality of elders in every church.
14. Did the Apostles exercise more authority than elders?
15. Show the equality of elders.
16. How does this Council exhibit the Unity of the Church?
17. What figures applied to the Church are expressions of Unity?
18. Did the decision affect only part of the Church?
19. Show that it exhibits the right of appeal.
20. Show that the Council appealed to the Word of God.
21. Has any church court the right to make law for the Church?
22. Who is the sole Ruler and Head of the Church?
23. How can the Church today ascertain the mind of the Spirit?



## CHAPTER V.

### Presbyterianism and the Sacraments.

#### *The Lord's Supper.*

1. What is the order of the Sacraments?
2. What bearing have they on the Identity of the Church?
3. What is the purpose and significance of a Sacrament?
4. What were the Sacraments of the Old Testament?
5. What are the Sacraments of the Church today?
6. Show that they are the same as in Old Testament.
7. What are the two elements in every Sacrament?
8. Define the Lord's Supper.
9. What is the Catholic Interpretation?
10. Show that it contradicts our Senses and Reason.
11. What is the Lutheran Interpretation?
12. How does it contradict the laws of Nature?
13. What is the Zwinglian Theory?
14. What is its Defect?
15. What is the Calvinistic?
16. What is the purpose of the Lord's Supper?
17. Why is it a Symbolic Ordinance?
18. What do its Symbols teach?
19. What is the Significance of a Sealing Ordinance?
20. Illustrate by the threefold uses of a Seal.
21. What does it Commemorate?
22. What does it Anticipate?
23. What is meant by a gracious ordinance?
24. What Exercises does it awaken in a Believer?
25. How may its observance be improved?
26. Will it be observed in Heaven?

## CHAPTER VI.

### Presbyterianism and the Sacraments.

#### *Baptism.*

1. Define Baptism.
2. Is the mode Essential?
3. What is the difference between Bapto and Baptizo?
4. What is the classic use in Greek Literature?
5. Were the Israelites baptized in the Red Sea?
6. Were they Immersed?
7. What Jewish Ceremonies were called Baptisms?
8. What terms did the prophets use for Ceremonial Cleansing?
9. Was Christ baptized by the Jewish Mode?
10. What Ceremonies among the Jews were called Baptisms in the New Testament?
11. What was the Mode of Baptism by the Holy Ghost?
12. If the Spirit was "poured out," what mode would that imply?
13. If Sinners are cleansed by "the Sprinkling of blood," how should that be represented symbolically?
14. Show that the circumstances attending the Baptism of the Eunuch were not favorable to Immersion.
15. What do the circumstances in Paul's Baptism indicate?
16. Do the circumstances in the Jailor's case make Immersion practically impossible?
17. Does "buried in baptism" indicate the element was "water," or "death?"
18. Did the mode of burial among the Ancients have any resemblance to "Watery graves?"
19. What is the significance of being "Buried with Christ"?
20. How were we crucified with Christ?

21. **W**ould “crucified” be used in a Spiritual sense and “buried” be used in a literal sense?
22. **W**hat is the significance of “One Lord, one Faith and one Baptism?”



## CHAPTER VII.

### Presbyterianism and the Covenant.

#### *Infant Church Membership and Baptism*

1. Are Children involved in Human Relationships?
2. What has been the Historic Practice of the Church?
3. Did the Covenant of Works include Children?
4. Name other Covenants involving Children?
5. What are included in the Abrahamic Covenant?
6. Are heirs of Christ also the seed of Abraham?
7. Does the Circumcision of Christ warrant Infant Church Membership?
8. Did Christ include Children in the Kingdom?
9. If the Church is the "fold" of Christ, should the "Sheep" be included and the "Lambs" excluded?
10. Did the Pentecost invitation with its "Promise" include children?
11. Are Circumcision and Baptism identical?
12. What status does Paul assign to children?
13. Were Children included in the First Baptism?
14. Name the various Household Baptisms mentioned in New Testament.
15. Are children a part of a household?
16. Why are no Household Baptisms mentioned except among Gentile Converts?
17. Is there any stronger argument for Infant Salvation than for Infant Baptism?
18. Are the arguments for the two practically identical?
19. Do Churches which forbid the Baptism of children produce a higher type of Christian Character than others?

## CHAPTER VIII.

### Presbyterianism in Action.

1. What is Christ's Criterion of Character?
2. What influence do Creeds have on Character?
3. Who is credited as the Author of Modern Liberty?
4. Narrate Some Achievements of Calvinism.
5. Give account of the Struggle in France.
6. Who was the Founder of the Dutch Republic?
7. Quote some of the Tributes paid Scotland.
8. Give account of the Conflict in England.
9. What was the Issue in the Battle of the Boyne?
10. Who proclaimed the First Declaration of Independence in the United States?
11. What part did Presbyterians play in the Revolution?
12. What Church has furnished the Martyrs of the Ages?
13. Give some account of the Early Ages.
14. Tell of the Waldensian Martyrs.
15. Give account of St. Bartholomew's Day.
16. Narrate the Persecutions in Holland.
17. Describe "The Killing Time" in Scotland.
18. What are some modern forms of Persecution?
19. Illustrate the influence of Calvinism on Individual Lives.
20. Who was William the Silent? John Knox? Andrew Melville? Coligny? Stonewall Jackson? Woodrow Wilson?
21. Illustrate Influence on National Life.
22. Give Summary of Achievements of Calvinists.

## CHAPTER IX.

### Presbyterianism and Catholicity.

1. What is the Teaching of its Confession on the Communion of Saints?
2. Does its definition of the Church include others?
3. Does it guarantee the Right of Private Judgment?
4. Does it recognize others in dismissing members or receiving them from other Christian Bodies?
5. Are its gifts confined to itself?
6. Name some of its liberality to other enterprises.
7. Show its preëminence in Federation Movements.
8. Are its fundamental principles shared by others?
9. In what way are others beginning to conform to its Type?
10. Show its Catholicity by extent of its numbers.
11. Show this by the extent of its Territory.
12. In what sense is it World-Wide?



## CHAPTER X.

### **Presbyterianism and Missions**

1. What is the chief Mission of the Church?
2. Show that the essential principles of Calvinism are calculated to promote Missions.
3. What are the practical proofs of the Missionary Spirit?
4. What was the chief characteristic of the First Century?
5. Who was the greatest Calvinist and Missionary—Why?
6. Give account of the First Protestant Mission undertaken.
7. What was the character of Calvin's Missionary Work?
8. Show that Calvinism was inherently Missionary.
9. What part has Calvinism had in Modern Revivals?
10. Name some of the greatest Calvinistic Missionaries of the World.
11. Show the Missionary Spirit of Presbyterianism.
12. Recite some of the Testimonies to that effect.
13. Give account of American Presbyterianism in Missions.
14. Show the Cosmopolitan Character of Presbyterianism.
15. What is the guarantee of Victory?
16. Demonstrate it by Prophecy.
17. Show that the Eternal Decree of God guarantees the triumph of Christ and His universal reign.



## INDEX

- Achievements, Presbyterian, 138, 139  
 Adams, John, President, quoted, 40  
 America, Conflict in, 39, 125  
 Ancient Church and Missions, 152  
 Anglo-Saxon, Reversion to Paganism, 28  
 Apostolic succession, 19, 20  
 Arnaud, Henri, quoted, 24  
 Arminianism, 42  
 Attributes, Divine, and Calvinism, 48  
 Augustine, Missionary, 28  
  
 Baker, Judge Henry, quoted, 138  
 Bancroft, quoted, 125  
 Baptism and Circumcision, 107, 112  
 Baptism, Classic, 89  
 Baptism, Definition, 87  
 Baptism, Individuals, 97  
 Baptism into death, 99  
 Baptism, Jewish, 92  
 Baptism, Mode not essential, 88  
 Baptism, New Testament Usage, 96  
 Baptism of Children Scriptural, 106  
 Baptism of Christ, 94  
 Baptism of Holy Ghost, 96  
 Baptism of Infants Historic, 103  
 Baptism, Prophetic, 93  
 Baptism, Red Sea, 91, 114  
 Baptisms, Household, 115  
 Bapto vs. Baptizo, 88  
 Barnes, Albert, quoted, 42  
 Beecher, Henry Ward, quoted, 136  
 Bible, Only Rule of Faith, 3, 75  
 Bohemia, Martyrdom, 132  
 Boyne, Battle of, 124  
 Brevard, Ephraim and Declaration, 40  
 Briggs, Chas. A., quoted, 145  
 Britannica Encyclopedia, quoted, 74  
 Buckle, quoted, 119, 123  
  
 Calvin and Missions, 153  
 Calvinism, Achievements, 139  
 Calvinism and Liberty, 119  
 Calvinism and Missions, 151, 154  
 Calvinism and Revivals, 155  
 Calvinism differs from Fatalism, 43, 51  
 Calvinism, Guaranty of Victory, 160  
 Calvinism, Influence on Moral Character, 55  
 Calvinism, Keynote, Grace, 44  
 Calvinism magnifies grace, 44, 56  
 Calvinism of Presbyterianism, 51  
 Calvinism, Philosophy, 6, 43  
 Calvinism, Scope of, 6  
 Calvinism vindicates justice, 56  
 Calvinism, Why Revealed, 57  
 Carlyle, Thomas, quoted, 137  
 Catholicity, Presbyterian, 140  
 Campbell, quoted, 122  
 Celtic Christianity, 26, 27  
 Children and Christ, 108  
 Children and Kingdom, 109  
 Children, Status of, 113  
 Choate, Rufus, quoted, 127  
 Christ and Calvinism, 45  
 Christianity, Early Days of, 22  
 Christianity, Celtic, 26  
 Church, Being vs. Well being, 2  
 Church Courts, Graduation of, 16  
 Church Government, Forms of, 11, 12  
 Church, Identity of, 77  
 Church Polity, Scriptural, 59  
 Church, Right of Appeal, 74  
 Church, Spiritual Character, 17  
 Church, Unity of, 71-74  
 Circumcision and Baptism, 107, 112  
 Clark, Adam, quoted, 48  
 Columba, St., quoted, 29  
 Community of Life, 144  
 Conformity to Presbyterian Type, 146  
 Co-operation, Presbyterian, 142  
 Cosmopolitan Presbyterianism, 159  
 Covenant and Children, 102  
 Covenant, Abrahamic, 105  
 Covenanters, 33-36, 132  
 Council, Advisory, inadequate, 63  
 Council, Jerusalem, Keystone, 60  
 Council, Prelacy untenable, 61  
 Council, Principles Presbyterian, 65  
 -68



# Analysis

## CHAPTER I.

### PRESBYTERIANISM—A SYSTEM.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. Kindred Principles form a Complete System.
2. Basic Principle in Nature, Philosophy and Religion.
3. Presbyterianism, a Distinctive System of Truth.

#### I. THE FIRST PRINCIPLE.

*The Word of God, the only Rule of Faith and Practice.*

1. Variations Illustrated.
2. Presbyterianism Insists on the Whole Bible.
3. Its Principles Interwoven Throughout the Scriptures.

#### II. THE SECOND PRINCIPLE.

*Emphasizes Divine Sovereignty and Human Free-Agency.*

1. A System of Theology and a Type of Philosophy.  
Solution of the Universe and Explanation of Providence.  
Predestination, the Purpose of God in Eternity.  
Providence, the Unfolding of That Purpose.
2. Sovereignty, and Free-Agency Illustrated.  
Old Testament Illustration—Joseph.  
New Testament Illustration—Parable of the Lost.
3. Analogy of Nature, Architecture, Pattern.

#### III. THE THIRD PRINCIPLE.

*Presbyterianism, A Government by Elders.*

1. Three Primary Forms of Government.
2. The Elements of the Presbyterian Form:
  - (1) Election of Representatives by the People.
  - (2) Identity of Elders and Bishops.
  - (3) Plurality of Elders in Every Church.
  - (4) Ordination by a Church Court.
  - (5) Gradation of Courts from Lower to Higher.

#### IV. THE FOURTH PRINCIPLE.

*The Spiritual Character of the Church.*

1. No Commission to Function in Civil Affairs.
2. The Mission of the Church is Evangelistic.

## CHAPTER II.

### PRESBYTERIANISM IN HISTORY.

#### INTRODUCTION.

*The Antiquity of Presbyterianism.*

1. Apostolic Succession,—Spurious vs. Genuine.
2. Principles Precede Denominational Names.
3. Historic Development of the Church.

- I. **THE EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY.**
  1. Presbyterianism, Historic and Scriptural.
  2. Testimony of Edward Gibbon and Jerome.
- II. **THE WALDENSES.**
  1. Principles, Not Always, Nor in All Parts, Presbyterian.
  2. Through Persecution "Kept the Faith."
  3. Represented in Pan Presbyterian Alliance.
- III. **CELTIC CHRISTIANITY.**
  1. Ancient Origin Unaccountable.
  2. Reversion to Paganism in England.
  3. Christianity Restored by Augustine the Monk.
  4. St. Patrick in Ireland Preceded Him.
  5. Iona and the Culdees.
  6. Type Not the Modern Papal System.
  7. Huguenots, Dutch and Hungarians Had Same Conflict.
- IV. **CONFLICT BETWEEN PRESBYTERY AND EPISCOPACY.**
  1. The Westminster Confession of Faith.
  2. The Covenanters "Kept the Faith."
  3. The Heroic Struggle in Scotland.
  4. The Restoration of the Stuarts.
    - (1) Political Consequences.
    - (2) Religious Disaster.
- V. **THE CONFLICT TRANSFERRED TO AMERICA.**
  1. War of the Revolution Not for Civil Rights Alone.
  2. Presbyterians Played the Larger Part.
  3. Chief Victory Was Religious Liberty.

## CHAPTER III.

### PRESBYTERIANISM AND CALVINISM.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. Relation Between These Terms.
  2. Kindred Principles of Philosophy.
- I. "TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY."
    1. The Testimony of Christ.
    2. The Theology of Paul, Peter and John.
    3. Statements of Other Inspired Writers.
  - II. **THE LOGIC OF PHILOSOPHY.**
    1. The Nature of the Divine Attributes.
    2. Contingent Events Cannot Be Predicted.
    3. Conditional Decrees—A Contradiction.
  - III. **SCIENCE AND LITERATURE.**
    1. Science—Blind Testimony to the Truth.
    2. Literature Lends Its Assent.
  - IV. **THE CALVINISM OF PRESBYTERIANISM.**
    1. Calvinism, Not Fatalism.
    2. Sovereignty and Free-Agency Alike Taught.
      - Illustrations Support the Truth.

3. Influence of Calvinism on Character.
4. Calvinism Vindicates the Justice of God.
5. Magnifies the Grace of God.

## CHAPTER IV.

### PRESBYTERIANISM AND CHURCH POLITY.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. The Historic Appeal vs. Scriptural Appeal.
2. The Council at Jerusalem, Keystone of Church Polity.

#### I. THE PRELATIC THEORY UNTENABLE.

1. There Were Apostles at Antioch, If Inspiration Needed.
2. Arguments in an Inspired Council, Out of Place.

#### II. ADVISORY PRINCIPLE INADEQUATE.

1. Refuted by Composition—"Apostles and Elders."
2. By the Binding Authority of the Decrees.
3. By the Extent of Its Jurisdiction.

#### III. THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM SUSTAINED.

##### *Established by the Principles Practiced.*

1. Rulers, Not the People, Acted.
  - (1) Confirmed by Other Teachings and Acts.
  - (2) Names and Distinctions Indicate Two Classes.
  - (3) Directions, How to Rule, Imply Two Classes.
  - (4) Instructions to the People to "Obey" Rulers.
  - (5) Plurality of Elders Cannot Otherwise Be Explained.
2. Disproves the Claims of Prelacy.
  - (1) Decision, Not by "Apostles" Only But Includes "Elders."
  - (2) Apostles Present as Ruling Elders.
  - (3) Elders Present in the Capacity of Rulers.
3. Equality of the Eldership.
  - (1) Associated with Apostles on Equality.
  - (2) Decree Published in Name of Elders as Well.
4. Exhibits the Unity of the Church.
  - (1) Affected Not Antioch Alone But Whole Church.
  - (2) Name "Church" in the Singular, Expressing Unity.
  - (3) Figures Employed—"Family," "Temple," "Body."
5. Exhibits the Right of Appeal.
  - (1) Trouble at Antioch Settled at Jerusalem.
  - (2) Furnishes Precedent for Similar Cases.
6. Shows Scriptures as the Sole Authority.
  - (1) The Council Appealed to Scriptures.
  - (2) Not Legislative But Declarative.

## CHAPTER V.

### PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE SACRAMENTS.

#### The Lord's Supper.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. The Identity of the Church.
2. The Proofs of That Identity.



- (1) Church in All Ages Had the Same Theology.
- (2) Salvation by Faith Under Each Dispensation.
- (3) Sacraments, the Same in Both Testaments.
- (4) Constitution, the Same—Government by Elders.

**I. THE SIGNIFICANCE AND PURPOSE OF A SACRAMENT.**

1. Definition of the Lord's Supper.
2. Diverse Interpretations.
  - (1) Roman Catholic Contradicts Senses and Reason.
  - (2) The Lutheran Contradicts Law of Nature.
  - (3) The Zwinglian Inadequate.

**II. THE CALVINISTIC INTERPRETATION.**

1. Symbolic of Redemption.
2. Sealing Ordinance.
3. Commemoration of Calvary.
4. Anticipation of Second Coming.
5. Gracious Purpose.

**CHAPTER VI.**

**PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE SACRAMENTS.**

**Baptism.**

**INTRODUCTION.**

1. Definition of Baptism.
2. Mode, Not Essential.

**I. THE MEANING OF THE WORD.**

1. Classic Meaning in Greek Literature.
2. Difference Between Bapto and Baptizo.

**II. SCRIPTURAL USAGES DETERMINE THE MODE.**

1. Baptized in the Red Sea, But Not Immersed.
2. Jewish Ritual Baptisms.
3. Prophetic Baptisms.
4. The Baptism of Christ—Jewish.
5. New Testament Usage of Terms.
6. Baptism by the Holy Ghost.
7. Individual Baptisms.
8. Baptism "Into Death"—Not Water.
9. Sprinkling, Common to Both Testaments.
10. "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism."

**CHAPTER VII.**

**PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE COVENANT.**

**Infant Church Membership.**

**INTRODUCTION.**

1. Human Relationships.
2. The Historic Practice of the Church.

**I. THE COVENANTS AND THE CHILDREN.**

1. The Covenant with Adam for His Posterity.
2. The Abrahamic Covenant.

## II. SCRIPTURAL WARRANT FOR BAPTISM OF CHILDREN.

1. The Circumcision of Christ.
2. Christ and the Children.
3. The Fold and the Lambs.
4. Pentecost and the Promise.
5. Circumcision and Baptism Identical.
6. The Status of Children.
7. The First Baptism.
8. Household Baptisms in New Testament.
9. Infant Baptism vs. Infant Salvation.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### PRESBYTERIANISM IN ACTION.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. "Wisdom Justified of Her Children."
2. Creeds Influence Character.

#### I. CALVINISM AND LIBERTY.

1. The Huguenots of France.
2. The Dutch Republic.
3. The Covenanters of Scotland.
4. The Puritans and Presbyterians in England.
5. The Heroic Struggle in America.

#### II. PRESBYTERIANISM AND MARTYRDOM.

1. The Early Days of Christianity.
2. The Waldensian Martyrs.
3. "The Burning Bush" in France.
4. The Duke of Alva in Holland.
5. "The Killing Time" in Scotland.
6. Modern Persecutions.

#### III. PRESBYTERIANISM AND MORAL CHARACTER.

1. Individual Illustrations.
2. National Character.
3. Summary of Achievements.

## CHAPTER IX.

### PRESBYTERIANISM AND CATHOLICITY.

#### INTRODUCTION.

1. The Confession of Faith Recognizes "Communion of Saints."
2. Guarantees "Right of Private Judgment."

#### I. THE RECOGNITION OF OTHER FAITHS.

1. Dismisses Members Freely to Other Denominations.
2. Accepts Certificates From All Evangelical Churches.

#### II. PRESBYTERIAN COOPERATION.

1. Liberal Support of Udenominational Enterprises.

#### III. PRESBYTERIAN PREMINENCE IN FEDERATION.

1. Commends and Enters All Joint Organizations.

- IV. COMMUNITY OF FAITH AND LIFE.
  - 1. In Some Form All its Principles Endorsed by Others.
  - 2. Its Spiritual Life Shared by Various Others.
- V. CONFORMING TO THE PRESBYTERIAN TYPE.
  - 1. Many Others Incorporating its Essential Features.
- VI. CATHOLICITY IN EXTENT OF EMPIRE.
  - 1. In the Multitude of its Numbers.
  - 2. World Wide Extent of its Territory.

## CHAPTER X.

### PRESBYTERIANISM AND MISSIONS.

#### INTRODUCTION.

- 1. The Mission of the Church.
  - 2. Presumption in Favor of the Missionary Spirit of Calvinism.
- I. RESULTS, THE PRACTICAL TEST.
    - 1. Missionary Spirit of First Century.
    - 2. Paul, the Model Missionary.
    - 3. John Calvin and Missions.
    - 4. Father of Evangelical Missions.
    - 5. First Effort of Protestantism in Missions.
  - II. CALVINISM, INHERENTLY MISSIONARY.
    - 1. Successes in Europe.
    - 2. Calvinism and Modern Revivals.
  - III. THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT OF PRESBYTERIANISM.
    - 1. Leads in Gifts and Missionary Heroes.
    - 2. Testimonies to its Achievements.
    - 3. American Presbyterian Effort.
    - 4. Cosmopolitan Character of Presbyterianism.
  - IV. CALVINISM, THE GUARANTEE OF VICTORY.
    - 1. Prophecy, the Assurance of Triumph.
    - 2. The Divine Decree Guarantees Christ's Victory.