ADDRESSES

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

WINCHESTER PRESBYTERY

HELD AT

FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA,

APRIL 29, 1897.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PRESBYTERY.

NEW MARKET, VA.:
HENKEL & CO., STEAM POWER PRINTERS.
1897.

ADDRESSES

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

WINCHESTER PRESBYTERY

HELD AT

FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA,

APRIL 29, 1897.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PRESBYTERY.

NEW MARKET, VA.:
HENKEL & CO., STEAM POWER PRINTERS.
1897.

PREFATORY REMARKS.

These Addresses were delivered in commemoration of the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the closing of the labors of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and in accordance with the action of the General Assembly of our ("Southern Presbyterian") Church, recommending such celebration, in its meeting at Memphis, Tennessee, May, 1896.

COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION
WINCHESTER PRESBYTERY.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

THE PECULIAR CONDITIONS IN CHURCH AND STATE, WHICH LED TO THE CALLING OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY: ITS PERSONNEL AND WORK.

By F. M. Woods, D. D., Martinsburg, West Virginia.

This great Assembly of divines is the culmination of a long series of events. It stands out in history like some great mountain peak, lifting its snow capped pinnacle to the heavens, whilst its approaches reach far away into the dim distance, descending now by abrupt and precipitous gorges, and then by gentler slopes, until at last they die away into the monotonous level of plain or sea-coast. This meeting at Westminster was not the product of local excitements in English politics. Nor was it the result of a temporary ebullition of religious zeal or fanaticism. Great forces had long been in motion, that were irreconcilable and irrepressible. The collision could only result in a furious crash and a terrific wreckage.

A long dismal winter night, as if borne from the polar circle, had ages ago settled down upon the spiritual world. Superstition and ignorance were breathing the cold winds of the arctic zone over the habitations of Europe, chilling the vitals of all true religious life. Babylon had transferred her seat and her great power and her worship from the shores of the Euphrates to the banks of the Tiber. The gods of the heathen had adopted the speech of heaven and imposed their rites and regalia upon the worship of the cross. Idolatry had become sanctified under sacred names and emblems. Jesus was obscured by the shadow of Mary, and the sacrifice of Calvary was supplanted by the sacrifice of the mass. During these weary ages of darkness, which hung like a death-pall over the nations of Europe, the faith of the Gospel was almost lost to view. The bondage of the masses of men was absolute. For centuries there was scarcely a star to be seen in the firmament.

England had early been made acquainted with the Gospel, perhaps through mercantile enterprise from Greek shores, and also by Christian soldiers in the Roman armies. But upon the withdrawal of the Romans and the abandonment of their scheme of conquest, the island relapsed into its native heathenism, except as relieved by missionary effort from Iona and Scotland. The Saxon invaders drove the Britons westward into Wales and destroyed their churches, and their priests fled before them.

For 150 years darkness reigned over the old homes of the early Christians. This darkness was destined to receive but slight relief from the baleful light that was brought across the channel from beyond the Alps and the Apennines. For the withering touch of popery was as fatal to the Gospel as the blight of paganism. The mission of the monk, Augustine, proved only too successful in quenching the flickering torches of truth here and there struggling for existence, and in persuading the people to exchange heathenism, for heathenism baptized into the Triune Name and masquerading in the cloak of Christianity. This gloomy night must hold sway for many ages. The chains of bondage must become very galling before the dawn should arise. Despotism must become more despotic.

But after these weary centuries of oppression, the minds of men began to show signs of an awakening. The blind began to see men as trees walking. Activity, restlessness, rather than any clear discernment of truth, characterized these first movements.

With the closing of the fifteenth century and the opening of the sixteenth, the revival of letters proved to be a potent factor in calling men to the exercise of independent thought. So long had the masses been kept in a groveling subserviency to priestly domination and taught to reverence ignorance as an essential element of salvation, that education and knowledge were regarded with pious horror. Erasmus was consequently looked upon as a dangerous innovator whom it was the solemn duty of the hierarchy to silence. Though innocent of any special religious designs, yet his literary tastes led him to appreciate the New Testament as a classic worthy to be read and studied. His was the task of clearing out the rubbish of folly and indolence, which had filled the old wells of learning during the centuries of mental lethargy, so that the fresh waters might once again flow

full and free, to slake the thirst of those who were perishing for lack of knowledge. This awakening in the world of letters, spread like a contagion to other minds and to other lands. Intelligence began to catch the inspiration—the heavenly afflatus. Mind began to hunger for truth. Men were inquiring. And in the councils of the Vatican, this was a deadly sin. For the spirit of inquiry refuses to recognize an officer whose prerogative it is to consider all reasons and to answer all questions of conscience. Already they were beginning to grasp in some measure the dignity of the thought that man is an individual being, not simply an element in the conglomerate mass of humanity. Each man is a separate and distinct personality. But individuality carries with it personal responsibility and the distinct consciousness of an accountability. Therefore the church cannot be sponsor for us nor can the civil power crush the sense of stewardship. No despotism, whether of church or state, can protect men from the pangs of guilt and the judgment of righteousness. And in such conditions men can no longer be held in subjection as the pliant tools of tyranny. These new born ideas, now struggling into being, received a further and powerful impulse by the grace and providence that loosed the seals and opened the Book of Life. John Wycliffe, in 1383, gave to the people an English Bible, to the great scandal of popish religion and priestcraft. A century and a half later William Tyndale gives to England the New Testament complete and much of the Old in their own tongue, when on the 6th of October, 1536, he was rewarded for his heavenly labors of love by being first strangled and then burned in his prison at Vilvorden. Other translations followed. The value of the Reformation in England may be judged by the treatment which the king accorded to Tyndale. But Wycliffe and Tyndale are to be reckoned among the great powers by which God was working out the emancipation of Anglo Saxon Britain from the remorseless evils of the serpent of popery. The renaissance of letters opened the minds of men. The unsealing of the Scriptures unfettered conscience. The one led them to see better things, and in some measure to desire better things. The other laid the authoritative hand of obligation—of oughtness—upon their souls, and aroused the resistless forces of a deadly determination to have better things—to be better. This awakening of the purer religious sense

throughout the island was at once a stern challenge to "the powers that be," to surrender their victims and to open their prison doors. It was a summons like the voice of the earthquake, which heeds not battleships, fortifications, ramparts, or dungeon walls. "How can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." "And as he was yet coming, the devil threw (dashed) him down, and tore him (grievously) (and he wallowed, foaming). And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit and healed the boy." The very presence of truth—of Him who is the Truth—arouses the convulsive spirit of antipathy in the powers of darkness. So it came to pass that when the Gospel had spread extensively among the people, and they began to question and to discuss: lo, an uproar like that of the Ephesian mob resounded throughout the land. The greatness of Diana was threatened, and Demetrius too was endangered. War unto the knife was declared. Falsehood would not down, and truth could not be suppressed.

Two nations were embraced within the womb of the English Reformation, and two manner of people were to be separated therefrom. On the one hand there was a true Bible work of grace which found its field of operation in the homes of the humble among the people. It was in this sense a popular movement. It did not descend from the throne, through the ranks of the nobility and the aristocracy to the level of the unlearned. This movement finds its representatives and leaders in the noble martyrs whose burning bodies did light such a candle, by God's grace, in England as should never be put out. Thos. Bilney, William Tyndale, John Rogers, Latimer and Ridley nobly illustrated the true grace of God and bore a brave testimony for truth and the crown rights of our glorious Redeemer.

But unfortunately for England and for Protestantism there was an entirely different kind of reformation going on upon English soil. This pseudo-reformatory movement unsheathed its sword, but it was destined to be so draped with the pretty ceremonialisms and the gaudy trappings of transplanted Romanism, as to render its keen edge unable to pierce to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow—of opening up to view the thoughts and intents of the heart. There was a great conflict between the Roman pope and the English pope, whilst both made

war upon the true Protestantism of the island. The fury of the contest was greatly intensified by the intermixture of the politics of the day with their religion. Henry and Clement reversed the order in their compound, but both clung to the amalgam. With the one the state is above the church. With the other the church dominates the state. But both state and church must enter into the adulteration. So long had the land groaned under the despotic tyranny of the Italian priest, that the change to a home-born and a home-made despotism, after a political and not after a religious model, seemed to be a refreshing prospect. But the prospect of relief proved to be as untrustworthy as "the stuff that dreams are made of." The steps which led to the rupture between the English throne and the Vatican are too familiar to need more than mention. The exhibition of deceit, lying, lust and murder by which Henry finally reached his independence of the pope is too revolting to be noted, except to indicate the wisdom of the providence that could overrule even this to the accomplishment of some good, to prevent much evil. The divorce from Catharine brought about very promptly the severance of the ancient ties between the temporal and the priestly courts. Hitherto the people had been ridden by a pontifical despot. Now they were to taste the luxury of a royal pontiff. The English reformation as embodied in this unique transaction, involved no radical change—scarcely a change, except in the exchange of heads. What is called the "clergy," in a convocation held at Canterbury, agreed upon a petition to be offered to the king, in which they address him as "The Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England." This was in January, 1531. On the 20th of March, 1534, the bill was passed by Parliament abolishing papal supremacy in England and declaring the King the Supreme Head of the Church of England.

It is probable that the ministers who betrayed their Divine King by exalting Henry VIII. to the headship of the church, did not expect their fulsome adulation to be anything more than a dead letter. But their cowardly sycophancy fastened upon the Anglican body a burden under which it labors to this day, with every indication of indefinite continuance. Instead of letting the suggestion of his supremacy die "unhonored and unsung," the King was highly delighted with it. And he used it with fine effect.

Thus the church of England accepted as her spiritual head a man who had never been either Cardinal, Archbishop, Bishop, Suffragan, Priest, Presbyter, or Deacon ; never ordained—not even a licentiate, not even converted. Yet constituted, not by ecclesiastical authority, but by act of Parliament, the supreme head of a national church.

This unification of power, civil and religious and ecclesiastical in the hands of one man, was placing him on the throne of "the god of forces," and making him an object greatly to be dreaded. For it divested the church of the power to protect its own purity of life. Discipline was completely taken from it and lodged in the courts of the realm. The spiritual independence of the church of Jesus Christ was surrendered to this moloch of ambition and voluptuousness. The church was rendered unable to cleanse its courts and its communion table from the unholy contact of the profane. And if such thing might be, the scheme made possible a more tyrannical absolutism than that of unadulterated popery. It was destructive of liberty, both to the citizen and the Christian.

Little wonder that under these conditions the people should become restive and, in time, rebellious ! Oppression often overreaches itself, and in its greed reaps only poverty. In its conflict with the spirit of inquiry and the open Bible it found its methods to be only provocative of more determined, because a more enlightened, resistance. A pliant clergy was a fit tool for an intolerant monarch. And the less of conscience and intelligence the people had, the more could kingly priestcraft domineer over them. Hence, Bible translation was not in favor with Henry. All religion must be subject to the scrutiny of the supreme head of the church. The government of the kingdom of Christ must be at his dictation. The methods of worship must be determined by this earthly head of the church, not by the Divine Head. A fixed rule, a standard must be established, and all the people must conform under heavy pains and penalties. By means of this powerful thumbscrew obedience must be yielded or ejectment, imprisonment or death was the alternative at the discretion of the supreme head. In 1662 and after the restoration, about 2000 Presbyterian ministers were cast out of their homes and their pastorates, because of their refusal to make conformity to man's rules instead of Christ's, the test of their right to preach the Gospel. It was this

spirit that convinced James I. that Presbyterian church government was not suitable to the training of pliant subjects for an exacting monarchy. Hence his dictum: "no Bishop no King." These persistent attempts to compel the nation to adopt the Episcopalian vestments—the "scenic apparel" and "fopperies," as Bishop Jewell called them, only served to arouse a more resolute opposition to the whole hierarchical system.

What the Puritans demanded was a purer, simpler worship. The court reformers were intent only upon pomp and show. So miserably ignorant and unfit for their duty had the larger part of the country ministry especially become, that it was necessary to prepare written prayers and homilies for their use. To relieve this state of things the Puritan divines were accustomed to hold what they termed "prophesyings" for the purpose of instructing the poor, ill-fed people who were hungry for the bread of life. But these meetings for prophecy or instruction (1 Cor. 14, 31—"you may all prophesy one by one that all may learn and all be comforted") were exceedingly offensive to Elizabeth, in whose reign they originated and led to severe measures for their suppression. On the 20th of November, 1572, the first Presbytery was formed in England. The Queen, the Bishops, and the Court of High Commission took prompt action for its prevention. But they failed. Other Presbyteries were organized. The spirit of dissent and non-conformity ran higher with each succeeding act of tyranny. Arrogance provoked contempt. The fanaticism of prelatic bigotry and insolence became more marked with the successive sovereigns. Each seemed more firmly bent upon over-riding all opposition and crushing all the spirit out of the hearts of the people.

The idea of forcing the prelatical type of religion upon England had been the grand object of Henry and his successors, with the effect of stirring in the popular mind an intense antipathy to their mongrel state-church, king-pope religion. Charles however felt moved to go a step beyond this, and would make the attempt to fasten this detested yoke, this mass of prelatic rites and ceremonies upon Presbyterian Scotland. It was dropping, not a spark, but a blazing meteor into a magazine of powder. In an instant the nation was up in arms against it, and entered into a solemn national covenant in defense of their religion and liberties. The King raised an army to subdue them. But his discre-

tion came to his rescue, and brought forth an evasive truce. His treasury being depleted by this heroic assault upon his Scotch subjects, he finds it necessary to call his Parliament together after a vacation of twelve years. But the harvest time is approaching. The mutterings of doom are making themselves heard. Charles demands money to prosecute his schemes. The Commons demand redress of grievances, and they refused to grant him a subsidy till he had given them satisfaction. The King in his rage dissolves the Parliament and throws the leaders into prison. He devises methods of his own for raising money without the aid of Parliament. Forced loans, shipmoney, granting monoplies, were among the desperate shifts. The Bishops were very pliant to the royal will. They preached diligently the divine right of kings, the duty of passive obedience, the King's superiority to law. And Archbishop Laud, seeing the importance to the royal-prelatic cause of having the people as degraded and brutalized as possible in both mind and morals, persuaded the King to revive the infamous book of Sunday sports. Evidently there is no hope of any compromise or reconciliation. The Court reformers and the Puritan reformers are radically antagonistic. The Parliament summoned again to meet on the 3d of November, 1640, came fresh from the people and fired with their spirit. It very soon gave evidence of design to meet the impending exigencies with a firm hand. Laud, as chief instigator of all the present trouble, and Strafford, his co-conspirator, were both committed to the tower and finally executed. The King and his Parliament came to an open rupture. The people of England were wearied and worn out with the petty tyranny and the gigantic despotism of prelatic bigotry. In 1588 Bancroft had startled the religious thought of the day by propounding the divine right of episcopacy. This claim had never before been made. It was very popular with those who were glad to have the Lord behind them in their efforts to oppress all dissenters from their authority and their methods. Both the English and the Scotch felt the need each of the other's aid. The King and his allies would surely make a desperate struggle to hold their ground. The Scotch Presbyterians felt that their religious liberty could not be held safe whilst an intolerant prelacy held sway south of the Tweed. They were therefore more than willing to make common cause with the Parliament in the en-

suing conflict. But the alliance must be for the defense of religious liberty as well as political. In July, 1642, the Parliament sent a letter to the Scotch General Assembly, sitting in Edinburg, setting forth the state of affairs and expressing their desire to avoid civil war and to promote reformation in both church and state. The Assembly replied, August 3d, and expressed its sympathy with their sufferings and dangers and recommending unity of religion, that in all his Majesty's dominions there might be one Confession of Faith, one Directory of Worship, and one public Catechism, and one Form of Government, accusing the prelatical hierarchy of being the great impediment against obtaining that desirable result. This advice and desire of the Assembly were warmly reciprocated in England. In September following an act was passed by both Houses of Parliament for the "utter abolishing and taking away of all Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, Commissaries, &c., ordaining that after the 5th of November, 1643, there shall be no Archbishop, &c., including the whole array of dignitaries and cathedral functionaries; and that all their titles; jurisdictions, and offices, "shall cease, determine and become absolutely void. That their possessions should return to the King; that the property of cathedrals should be vested in trustees, who should give a stipend to their late possessors, and out of the remainder support preaching ministers, both in towns and through the country where required." The Parliament which passed this act, was still favorable to episcopacy. Nor had any determination as yet been reached as to the kind of government which should be substituted in the place of that which was now abolished. For the present both Lords and Commoners give voice to their thorough disgust at what has hitherto been. The design of Parliament was not to formulate some government for the church upon its own responsibility, but to call an assembly who should recommend a suitable scheme, for their approval. The calling of this assembly had been under consideration since December, 1641. The delay had been due to fruitless negotiations with the King. It was now decided to proceed without the King's signature, and on June 12th, 1643, the "bill," rejected by Charles, was changed into an ordinance summoning such Synod or Assembly as they proposed. "An ordinance of the Lords and Commons in Parliament for the calling of an Assembly of

learned and godly divines and others, to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the settling of the government and liturgy of the church of England; and for the clearing and vindicating of the doctrines of the said church from false aspersions and interpretations." The ordinance sets forth the object to be for securing a church government more agreeable to the Word of God. It gives the names of all those who shall be members, including 121 ministers of the Gospel, 20 Commoners, and 10 from the House of the Lords. To this number were added five Scotch divines of whom one never sat, and three Ruling Elders, only two of whom attended. One of these two was the zealous Maitland who afterwards became the infamous Earl of Lauderdale. Thus the Assembly was constituted of 125 ministers and 32 lay-members—157 in all. "Admitted to sit and hear in October, 1644, the Prince Elector Palatine, and on one occasion, permitted to speak."

The Assembly was summoned to meet July 1st, 1643, in Westminster Abbey, Western Monastery, which stands upon the sight of an old Saxon church within the socalled Thorny Isle, built under King Sebert in the seventh century. Long before the Norman conquest, 1066, it was connected with a Benedictine monastery, called "Western," to distinguish it from St. Paul's, which was east.

On the 22d of June, the King by proclamation forbade the meeting for the purpose named in the Parliament's ordinance, declaring that no acts done by them ought to be received by his subjects, and threatened to proceed against them with the utmost severity of the law. The effect of this was to prevent the greater part of the Episcopalian ministers from obeying their summons to attend. Dr. Wm. Twiss was named by the ordinance as prolocutor of the Assembly. After his death which occurred 20th of July, 1646, Charles Herle succeeded to that dignity. Dr. Cornelius Burgess, of Waterford, and Mr. John White, of Dorchester, were appointed assessors to the prolocutor. Baillie regarded Twiss as an exceedingly unfit man for the position he held, though good and very learned and beloved of all, and expressed the opinion that his appointment to the chair was due to the "canny convoyance" (good management) "of those who guide most matters to their own interests."

On Saturday, July 1st, the members of the two Houses of Parliament, named in the ordinance, and sixty-nine of the

selected ministers, together with an immense congregation, met in the Abbey church, Westminster. Dr. Twiss preached a very elaborate sermon from the text, John 14, 18: "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." After the sermon the members present adjourned to Henry VII.'s chapel, where the permanent organization was formally effected, and there being no specific business prepared for them, they adjourned until the following Thursday. Of the divines originally appointed, the average attendance was from sixty to eighty. Not more than from a dozen to a score spoke frequently, many very learned and able men being contented to listen, to think and to vote. Three scribes were appointed, who however were not allowed to vote, being sufficiently occupied with their duties.

Three points may be noted in relation to this Assembly.

1. It was only an advisory body. It was not clothed with any independent ecclesiastical authority. It was not able to determine any matter.

2. It was called together, not by any ecclesiastical court or by any one having a proper ecclesiastical authority, but by Parliament.

3. It was not an ecumenical assembly, nor a quasi-ecumenical, like that of Dort, 1618. Yet was it truly a catholic body, embracing men of all shades of opinion. There were four bishops appointed, one of whom attended the first day, and a second excused his non-attendance on the ground of other pressing duties. Archbishop Usher, of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, was among the number named in the call. Many untitled Episcopalians were named, as also Puritans and Independents. The more decided Episcopalians refused to attend after the King's condemnation of the Solemn League and Covenant. Some twenty-five refused to attend because the Assembly was called by secular not spiritual authority. Of those who attended five afterward became bishops. Among the lay assessors were Selden, Rouse, the two Vanes, Pym, Sir Matthew Hale, Oliver St. John, Whitelock. The Scotch commissioners to this Assembly did not appear until the middle of September. They were men of great ability and wielded a controlling influence over that Assembly of giants. Before the Scotch commission was appointed the Solemn League and Covenant (an instrument drawn up by a committee of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in confer-

ence with a committee of the English Parliament, and composed by Alexander Henderson, was approved by Parliament and the Assembly at Westminster. It was publicly taken and sworn to with great solemnities by the House of Commons and the Assembly on the 25th of September, 1643, and by the House of Lords, October 15th. The King denounced it, but in February, 1644, Parliament ordered all to take it.

The Assembly divided itself into three committees for the greater expedition of its business. They received from Parliament a body of rules for their direction wherein the members were required to give a solemn protestation not to give their assent to anything which they did not believe to be truth. The thirty-nine articles of the Church of England were then given to them for examination and revision. To the first committee, 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th articles. To the second the 5th, 6th, 7th, and to the third the 8th, 9th, 10th. They met separately, and held their meetings from 9 to 12 every day in the week except Saturday. They had only gone as far as the 16th article, however, when they received an order from Parliament to drop the thirty-nine articles and take up Discipline and Government, the latter first. There was but little divergence of views among the members of the Assembly upon questions of doctrine. But they differed most radically in regard to discipline and government. This will not be a surprise when we recall the three great parties into which the Assembly was divided, viz.: Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians. Gillespie among the Presbyterians; Philip Nye among the Independents; and the "learned Selden" among the Erastians, were leaders that came forth from the chambers of the Divine Presence, each rejoicing as a strong man to run a race. The conflict was long, and every weak point was detected and exposed. Great though both Nye and Goodwin and Lightfoot and Selden were, both in the breadth and depth and solidity of their learning and in their dextrous skill in debate, yet was the "young man" Gillespie more than a match for them upon their own chosen grounds. At the close of his speech in reply to Selden, upon the interpretation of Matthew 18, 15–17, "moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee," &c., the latter is reported to have said: "That young man, by that single speech, has swept away the labors of ten years of my life." Selden attempted no reply.

Good Dr. Twiss, who died in July, 1646, was buried in St. Peter's, Westminster, but his bones were dug up, by order of council, September 14, 1661, and thrown along with those of several others, into a pit in St. Margaret's churchyard. Neal, Vol. II.

The Independents and Erastians were but a mere handful in the Assembly, but they had powerful support outside, both in Parliament and in the army. Church government was not to their taste. They had been cursed and crushed by it in its prelatical forms. They were not anxious to try any other type—or if any, let it be Erastian, with the civil power still holding the reins. Next to this Independency seemed least to be dreaded. Presbyterianism was open to grave suspicion. It meant government and strength.

Finally the work of this immortal Assembly of divines began to draw to completion. The Confession of Faith, with the Scripture proofs, was sent to Parliament on the 29th of April, 1647.

According to Hetherington, the Shorter Catechism was reported to Parliament, November 5th, 1647, (November 25th, on page 368), and the Larger, April 14th, 1648.

But Prof. Mitchell's printed Minutes of the Assembly show that the Larger Catechism was first prepared. October 15th, 1647, Mr. Tuckney, as convener, reported the completion of the Larger Catechism, and being thus set free from his labors in connection with the Larger Catechism, he was appointed, four days afterwards, convener of a committee to prepare the Shorter.

The Assembly continued its formal existence till the 22d of February, 1649, having held 1163 sessions, and sat five years, seven months, and twenty-one days. From this time on the Assembly was changed into a committee for conducting the trial and examination of ministers, and continued to hold meetings every Thursday morning for this purpose, until March 25th, 1652, when Cromwell having forcibly dissolved the Long Parliament, by whose authority the Assembly was convened, that committee also broke up and separated without any formal dissolution and as matter of necessity.

The offspring of "troublous times," and called to be a breakwater against the mighty floods, and a refuge from the pelting storms of unbelief and irreligion, this Assembly stands, ever lifting up its massive walls of truth and sound

doctrine, bidding the baffled souls of men who are drifting to ruin or driving before the tempest, to enter within her doors, and find rest behind her bulwarks. Her firm foundations can never be moved, for they are laid upon the eternal Rock.

May its influence ever flow on, and its power to mould and establish strong character, imbedded in deepest moral principle, be multiplied, until all the world shall have caught the heavenly strain, and all the hosts above, with all below, shall voice forth as a mighty anthem, the noble, the grand, the sublime truth—"MAN'S CHIEF END IS TO GLORIFY GOD AND TO ENJOY HIM FOREVER!" Amen.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AS CONTAINED IN SCRIPTURE AND FORMULATED BY THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

By H. M. White, D. D. Winchester, Va.

Our Lord Jesus, when on earth, said, "I came not to send peace but a sword." He looked upon this world as the enemy's country, under the power of the Wicked One, and came to deliver His people from this estate of sin and misery. The war began at once. He was led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil, whom he overcame with "the sword of the Spirit." "It is written" were the words that disarmed the enemy. The life of our Lord Jesus can be understood only in the light of a continued conflict with the chief priests and rulers of the Jews. They seemed to have triumphed when they nailed Him to the cross. But when He arose from the dead, set up His church, gave the great commission, and ascended visibly into heaven, his followers, who had been hiding in secret places, came forth with the courage of lions. They stood up boldly everywhere, arraigning the rulers and charging them with the murder of the Prince of life.

Thus the conflict was renewed, and with great violence. According to tradition, all of the Apostles, save one, paid the penalty of their courage with their death. The greatest of them all, he who was born out of due time, carried the war into Greece, Asia, and the Roman Empire. His life was a perpetual conflict. Reviewing it from the grave's mouth, he said, "I have fought a good fight."

Once begun in Europe, its fury increased. The sword of the civil magistrate was employed against the sword of the Spirit. A more unequal conflict was never waged. The infant church, composed of the poor and illiterate, few in

numbers, was attacked by all the wealth and intelligence of hoary heathenism, supported by the whole power of the great Roman Empire. In ten bloody persecutions, waged by Roman Emperors, uncounted multitudes of Christians sealed their testimony to the faith with their blood. For nearly three hundred years these persecutions continued, with a cruelty which can neither be expressed nor imagined.

When Constantine was made Emperor and learned to admire the Christian religion, he embraced it and proclaimed full liberty to all who professed its principles. By its union with the state, the church grew with great rapidity and became very strong. A new danger arose: differences sprang up among the Christians about doctrine: dissensions arose and the church was rent in twain. Controversies now broke out, the weapons in which were not material but spiritual. Not only was this true of the Eastern and Western churches, but also in Africa. Athanasius contended with Arius concerning the divine nature of Christ. This led to the first great church council — that of Nice—whose creed settled the dispute. In the fifth century, one hundred years later, Augustine contended with Pelagius concerning human depravity. A great conflict followed, which was settled at last by the third general council—the Ephesine.

Thus council after council was held to settle disputes as they arose, until the Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the fires of these controversies, it has been said, were forged the great historical creeds of Christendom. The last of which was "The Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly," the 250th anniversary of whose adoption we celebrate today.

The reformation in England was not led by learned and godly men, filled with zeal for the true faith, but by King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, who strove more for political independence of the Roman pontiff than for true doctrine. This so complicated politics with religion that the history of the English reformation is a little hard to be understood.

The Assembly was convened by a joint resolution of the two houses of Parliament, June 12th, 1643, which reads as follows: "An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, for the calling of an Assembly of learned and godly divines and others, to be consulted with by the

Parliament, for the settling of the government and liturgie of the Church of England : and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said church from false aspersions and interpretations."

This Assembly was composed of Erastians, Episcopalians, Independents and Presbyterians. The first two withdrew before the end, and the Confession of Faith, prepared by the Independents and Presbyterians, was adopted by the vote of the two houses—Lords and Commons,—and was made the constitution of the Church of England, June 28, 1648. The Larger and Shorter Catechisms had been approved April 14, 1648. This continued to be the constitution of the Church of England until 1660, when, King Charles II. being restored, he and his party, offended by the loss of his royal prerogative taken away by this Confession, set it aside and re-established prelacy.

The Presbyterian churches of England and Scotland adopted it as their constitution, and have retained it as such until the present time. Of this Confession of Faith the following things are true :

It was not a new creed, compiled for the first time. The ordinance reads,— . . . "And for *vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said church* from false aspersions and interpretations." "The said church" was the church of England, and "the doctrine of the said church" was that of the thirty-nine articles which had been in vogue since the days of Edward VI. and Charles I. This Confession was therefore designed to be a vindication of the faith of the church of England. And the Assembly began its work with this end in view. Meantime the struggle for civil liberty in England against the usurpations of Charles I. having been settled for a time by a solemn league and covenant between the English and Scotch, the Assembly was directed to frame a constitution for the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. But this change of work did not affect its result. It was, to all intents and purposes, an enlarged statement of the Faith of the Church of England.

Not only so, but it was a restatement of the faith of the whole church as it had been held for sixteen hundred years. It was the same for substance with that held by other churches in England at the time of its adoption—the Baptist, Congregational, and Quaker. The Irish and Scotch churches held the same. Across the channel, the Synod of

Dort, the Augsburg Confession, and the thirty Reformed Confessions were all Calvinistic. The Waldensian, Bohemian, Helvetic, and Mennonite Confessions agree with the foregoing. The creeds of the Roman and Greek churches contain this system of doctrine. Their faith was sound until they added tradition to the inspired Word of God. After this, after the creed of Pope Pius IV., it was corrupted by the addition of many new and very pernicious dogmas of human invention.

The Nicene creed, used in the Catholic, Lutheran, and English churches, drawn up by the second general council of Constantinople A. D. 381, was the basis of all "the creeds of Christendom" until A. D. 1618, when the Synod of Dort restated "The Five Points of Calvinism" in refutation of Arminius. From that time there have been two, and only two, distinct, competing systems of doctrine in the Christian church. Calvin had no hand in making the Westminster Confession, as some ignorantly suppose. He lived about one hundred years before that. (The same is true of Knox). In his Institutes he restated the faith of the church, as Augustine had done in the fifth century. It is therefore not without good reason that Presbyterians sometimes laughingly say, "Calvin was our father, Augustine our grandfather, and Paul our great-grandfather."

If therefore "The Westminster Confession of Faith" was not "the faith once delivered to the saints," then the church had no formulated faith for sixteen hundred years, and all her councils and controversies were worse than vain.

This Confesssion is very comprehensive. It contains thirty-three chapters, the first of which treats of "The Holy Scripture;" the second "Of God and the Holy Trinity;" and from the third, which sets forth "God's Eternal Decree," it sweeps the whole gamut of Theology to the doctrine "Of the last Judgment," in chapter 33. No other Confession equals it in this respect unless it be "The Augsburg Confession," which is the faith of the Lutheran church.

Although so comprehensive, we do not think it is the last Confession the church will make. It will not probably be recast, but will stand through all time as a most venerable monument to the consecrated learning of the church of the seventeenth century. Neither will its line of doctrinal belief be exchanged for another. But as the church goes on down through the centuries, the providence of God, or "God

in History," will continue, as in the past, to throw new light on old truths and thus bring new methods of work into practice. For instance, the doctrine and duty of Foreign Missions has never been seen and applied as now in this century. The Scriptures are now seen to be full of it. The prophecies and the Psalter abound in statements which, if perceived, were not applied as they are in our time. God in His providence illustrates the doctrines of His Word. The doctrine of the "second coming" and "the last days," is now studied as never before. Nor is the faith of the church on this subject permanently settled. The sentence has not yet been written on which the Pre- and Post-Millennialists can agree. Nor is there "one faith" as to "the anti-Christ." Dr. Charles Hodge (Theology, Vol. III., p. 844) writes as follows: "There is every reason to believe that the predictions concerning the second advent of Christ, and the events which are to attend and follow it, will disappoint the expectations of commentators, as the expectations of the Jews were disappointed in the manner in which the prophecies concerning the first advent were accomplished."

It is to be hoped that, as the end approaches, God, in his providence, may throw so much light on these things, that the church may write new chapters on them, as she is prepared to do on the doctrine of Foreign Missions. And so it is seen that Theology is a fixed science in one sense and progressive in another. Much of it lies latent in the Scriptures to be brought to light in time.

Our Confession is very logical. Each article, being founded on Holy Scripture, leads the mind forward to the next. It is a literary vertebrate and not a mollusk, an organism and not a manufacture, a tree and not a bureau or chest of drawers. Its whole system of doctrine grows out of the doctrine of "God's Eternal Decree," as the tree grows out of the acorn. The acorn is in the tree, and the tree in the acorn. The Confession is in the Bible, and the Bible in the Confession. He who masters this book, will be mastered by it. It will teach him how to think, as well as right thoughts.

Dr. N. L. Rice, in his little book, entitled, "God sovereign and man free," says, "Another fact illustrative of the true character of the Calvinistic doctrines . . is, that those doctrines have never been found associated with fundamental error" (p. 18). He challenges the finding of a man who,

holding these doctrines, ever embraced ruinous error. The hold it takes on the heart is such as to bind it closely to God and the word of His grace. Uncounted multitudes have died for it: and millions are now living who would lay down their lives for it. For, although it grows out of God's eternal decree, this decree is the expression of His boundless love to man. Redemption is founded on love, and love is seen in every part of it. The Confession often uses such phrases as,—"The rich and unchangeable love of God"; "most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin"; "out of his mere grace and love"; "the infinite goodness of God"; "the covenant of grace"; "full of grace and truth"; "free grace"; "rich grace of God"; "the free and unchangeable love of God the Father."

These are a sample of the forms of expression which run throughout this book in developing the purpose of God towards His church. What are called "the hard views of God" are found in it only by those whom it condemns.

Josephus, writing his well known tract against Apion about A. D. 90, in the eighth chapter of the first book, says, "It is no new thing for our captives, many of them in number, and frequently in time, to be seen to endure racks and death of all kinds upon the theatres, that they may not be obliged to say one word against our laws, or the records that contain them: whereas there are none at all among the Greeks who would undergo the least harm on that account: no, nor in the case if all the writings that are among them were to be destroyed." If this reasoning for the divine origin of the Old Testament is correct, then is it true that the system of faith we hold is also divine. "The slaughtered hosts on Alpine mountains cold," the blood reddened Seine on Bartholomew's eve, the ensanguined Netherlands, the Smithfield fires, and the blood-curdling sights in Grass Market Square in Edinburgh, Scotland, show how Calvinists have ever resisted unto blood striving against sin.

Nor has its hold on the heart of those who receive it in our time relaxed. The present influence of the Confession of Faith is as great as its past influence. In his great book —the "Creeds of Christendom"—Dr. Philip Schaff, although himself not in full sympathy with the Confession, having been a Roman Catholic in Germany, and joined the Reformed Church when he came to America, writes of it as follows:

"Whether we look at the extent or ability of its labors, or its influence upon future generations, it stands first among Protestant councils. . . . The Confession and Shorter Catechism of Westminster are as much used now in Anglo Presbyterian churches as ever, and have more vitality and influence than any other Calvinistic confession" (p. 728). "He also quotes Hallam as saying that the Assembly was perhaps equal in learning, good sense, and other merits, to any Lower House of Convocation that ever made a figure in England"; and adds the opinion of "one of the best informed German historians, expressed in these words: 'A more zealous, intelligent, and learned body of divines seldom ever met in Christendom.'" (Dr. Peck's Miscellanies, Vol. 2, p. 251.)

This faith has been preserved from age to age by "the saints" to whom it was "delivered" from the first for this purpose. (Jude 3.) "The saints" composed that body of believers who had been called out of the world into the kingdom of God by the powerful voice of the Holy Spirit. This is the uniform meaning of the word in the New Testament. (Rom. 1, 7; 1 Cor. 1, 2; 2 Cor. 1, 1; Gal. 1, 1, 2; Eph. 1, 1; Phil. 1, 1; Col. 1, 2; 1 Thess. 1, 1; 2 Thess. 1, 1; Philemon 2; Rev. 1, 4)

Thus the church became the trustee to hold the Scriptures and "the faith" which is in them. They were given to her in documentary form to be preserved pure and entire through all time. The Old Testament was given likewise to the Jews (Rom. 3, 2). And the faithfulness with which they guarded this sacred treasure through so many ages, is still the chief glory of that most renowned of all races of people.

In like manner the New Testament Oracles are given to "the saints," or members of the Christian church. And we have seen at what a cost she has kept that which was "delivered" unto her.

They were "delivered once" ("for all." R. V.) That is to say, in a complete form, a definite and sufficient faith. Whether we have the exact text in the documents, may be disputed in some very minute and unimportant particulars. But there is no doubt about our having "the faith" in the text—the whole faith. The casket may have suffered some immaterial abrasions, but the jewel it contains is absolutely perfect.

This has been done by contending earnestly for it. As

we have seen, this faith has been in the fires of controversy from the beginning. It has been assailed by Jews and infidels of all shades. The war made upon its Author when He came into the world, has never ended. The enemy, though often beaten, driven, and routed, reform on new lines and renew the conflict. The church has always stood for "the faith" against enemies without and within. The latter have always been the most dangerous—the Judaizing Christians of the times of Paul and Jude, and the literary critics of our day. They are "the certain men *crept in unawares*, who were of old ordained to this condemnation" (Jude 4). And as Paul and Jude took up "the sword of the Spirit" and made battle for the truth, so must we. To do otherwise would be to lower, in the presence of the foe, the banner of the cross which the faithful of all ages have borne aloft in the thickest of the fight. The enemy are still in the field, and will be till He comes again. "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet."

THE INFLUENCE OF THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS UPON RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL LIBERTY.

By A. C. Hopkins, D. D., Charles Town, W. Va.

The Westminster Assembly was itself an effect. The irrepressible force of truth was, under providence, the efficient cause; but the instrumental causes which produced it, were the theological instructions of Luther in Germany, of Calvin in Geneva, and Knox in Scotland—all during the preceding century. The occasion that demanded it was the principle announced by James I. at Hampton Conference, and afterwards so offensively practiced by himself and Charles II., No bishop, no king. The result was a creed and a formula for the advocates of liberty.

One notable article, recommended by that Assembly, and adopted by the civil Parliament, contained this: "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience, and reason also." (C. of F., Chap. XX., Art. II.)

This doctrine was not new, but was most unpalatable to those who then ruled in both church and state. Upon this issue was the battle fought in England with varying success for forty years from the Westminster Assembly between Hierarchy and Puritan—between monarchy and freedom. In 1661 under Charles II. the Act of Uniformity was passed, requiring all to worship according to the amended Book of Common Prayer. This act was to go into effect on St. Bartholomew's day, 24th of August, 1662, by which day 2,000 ministers left the Episcopal church, and were added to the Calvinistic ranks. This persecution continued till the revolution of 1688, which placed William of Orange (a liberal king) and Mary his wife upon the throne; who being Calvinists established toleration for all Protestants.

Concerning the early effects of the Westminster Standards, *Baillie*, who was a Scottish commissioner to the Assembly, and whose pen has preserved much of its history and that of those times, says, "Episcopal courts were never fitted for the reclaiming of minds. Their prisons, their fines, their pillories, their nose-splittings, ear-croppings, and cheek-burnings did but hold down the flame to break out in season with greater rage. But the reformed Presbytery doth proceed in a spiritual method eminently for the gaining of hearts; they go on with the offending party with all respect; they deal with him in all gentleness from weeks to months, from months sometimes to years, before they come near to any censure." (Mitchell's Westminster Assembly, p. 210.)

McCrie in his Annals of English Presbytery says, "In point of fact it never led them to persecute, it never applied the rack to the flesh, or slaked its vengeance in blood, or in maiming the body." (Mitchell, p. 210.)

To exhibit the spirit of the leading Presbyterians of that time I quote from several of them.

Gillespie, a Scottish member of the Assembly, in a sermon to the House of Commons, said, "Let that day be darkness, let not God regard it from above, neither let the light shine upon it in which it shall be said that the children of God in Britain are enemies and persecutors of each other." (Mitchell, p. 205.)

Dr. Reynolds, another member, in two sermons before Parliament after Cromwell's death: "In case of the unavoidable differences of good men, 'there ought to be mutual charity, meekness, moderation, tolerance, humanity used, not to judge, despise, reject, insult over one another, not to deal with weaker brethren . . . as with aliens, but as brethren.' . . . 'In differences of an inferior nature which do not touch essentials . . of religion, mutual tolerance, meekness, and tenderness are to be used.' . . . Brethren must mutually bear with one another and pray for one another, and love one another." (Mitchell, pp. 207–209.)

Ministers of Essex, while pleading for the ratification of the Confession of Faith and its church government, "judge it to be most agreeable to Christianity that tender consciences of dissenting brethren be tenderly dealt withal." (Mitchell, p. 206.)

In order to estimate these sentiments at their proper worth

we must remember how long and how completely the thought of the world had been enslaved by principles of monarchy in state and hierarchy in church; and that only the morning star of the Reformation had yet risen to chase away the shades of tyranny. Considering these facts and the provocations of the times, these sentiments may be regarded as prophecies of the coming day when monarchy should be stripped of its power to oppress, and hierarchy of its right to persecute, for conscience and freedom.

For forty cruel years after the dispersion of the Assembly the Calvinists continued an unsuccessful contention for freedom of conscience. During that period oppression under James II. expelled streams of exiles from England; and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Lewis XIV., 1685, expelled multitudes of Huguenots from France.

These refugees sought tolerant homes in Switzerland, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, and America. James was alienating all classes of the British from him. William of Orange, a most decided Calvinist, had married his cousin Mary, daughter of James II., and was stadtholder of Holland. Many refugees from Britain had found asylum in William's land. A combination of political influences pointed to William as the hand to strike the shackles from Protestantism and from freedom. In 1688, he with 15,000 men landed at Torbay, in England, and marched upon London. A bloodless revolution was wrought. James, affrighted, fled to France. But the next year with an army furnished by Lewis XIV. he returned to Ireland, and advanced towards England. William's army advanced to meet him. Next in command to William was Marshal Schomberg, a Huguenot refugee from France, who had organized for William's army a division of Calvinistic refugees in Holland. When William's army reached the Boyne, James' army was strongly intrenched upon the opposite bank. William must cross the river and make the attack. His Huguenot marshal was killed in the middle of the stream, but his troops assaulted and carried the enemy's position, and their victory sent James flying back to France. The watchword of William's army was "WESTMINSTER."

When, on the morning after Stonewall Jackson had fallen, J. E. B. Stuart led the fallen hero's corps into battle at Chancellorsville, he turned their wills into irresistible engines and their nerves into iron by the battle cry, "Forward,

and remember Jackson." When Schomberg led his Calvinistic troops into the chilly waters of the Boyne, he nerved them for the baptism of water and of fire by the charge, "Come on, my friends! Summon your courage and your resentments! Behold your persecutors!" Stuart's charge made sure the victory that sent Hooker reeling across the Rappahannock. Schomberg's charge secured the victory of the Boyne, and secured civil and religious liberty for Britain and ultimately for America.

Macaulay says, "This revolution, of all revolutions the least violent, has been of all revolutions the most beneficent." The highest eulogy which can be pronounced on the revolution of 1688 is this, that it was our last." . . . "What has made us differ from other nations? It is because we had a preserving revolution in the seventeenth century that we have not had a destroying revolution in the nineteenth century." (Vol. II., p. 196–7.)

This unique revolution was the achievement of the Calvinistic party of Holland reinforced by Calvinistic refugees from France and England and Scotland, bringing succor to their brethren of like faith in England, all following the banner of the Prince of Orange, a most pronounced Calvinist, shouting as they marched the immortal watchword "Westminster."

Again *Macaulay* (himself not a Calvinist) testifies, "The princes of Orange had generally been the patrons of the Calvinistic divinity, and owed no small part of their popularity to this zeal for the doctrine of election and final perseverance, a zeal not always enlightened by knowledge or tempered by humanity. William had been carefully instructed from a child in the theological system to which his family was attached, and regarded that system with even more than the partiality which men generally feel for an hereditary faith." . . . "He had found in the austere and inflexible logic of the Genevese school something which suited his intellect and his temper. That example of intolerance, indeed, which some of his predecessors had set, he never imitated. For all persecutions he felt a fixed aversion, which he avowed, not only where the avowal was obviously politic, but on occasions where it seemed that his interest would have been promoted by dissimulation or by silence. His theological opinions, however, were more decided than those of his ancestors. The tenet of predestination was the key-

stone of his religion." (Vol. II., p. 49.) Thus forty years after dissolution the Westminster Assembly developed in Holland an illustrious exemplification, and on British soil a defendant and conqueror for protestantism and liberty.

As germane to this topic, I may quote what *Michelet* says in his Life of Lewis XIV.: "The army of William was strong precisely in that Calvinistic element which James repudiated in England." (Calvinism in History, p. 56)

"Let another man praise thee and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." (Prov. 27, 2.)

I am proceeding in the trial of my cause by the mouths of witnesses, rather than by my own declarations. Those whom I put upon the stand are, with a single exception, either positively opposed to Calvinism, or are reluctant witnesses of its power and achievements. Macaulay was not a Calvinist. The next one I summon is

DAVID HUME, the historian, who discredited revelation and hated Calvinism. He shall testify as to the relation between Puritanism or Presbyterianism and liberty of conscience. Says he: "It was to this sect (the Puritans) the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution."—(Calvinism in History, pp. 57–58.)

This Presbyterian "form of ecclesiastical government is more favorable to liberty than to royal power." (Vol. VI., p. 10.)

Again, even while condemning the Puritan party, "Charles I. was a tyrant, a Papist, and a contriver of the Irish massacre; the church of England was relapsing fast into idolatry; Puritanism was the only true religion and the covenant the favorite object of heavenly regard." (Vol. VI., p. 365.)

Respecting the revolution of 1688 he says, "The revolution forms a new epoch in the constitution, and was probably attended with consequences more advantageous to the people than barely freeing them from an exceptionable administration." . . . "It may be justly affirmed, without any danger of exaggeration, that we in this island have ever since enjoyed, if not the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty, that ever was known amongst mankind." (Vol. VI., p. 363.)

BUCKLE, the historian, shall be our next witness. He was not in sympathy with the Westminster Standards; yet treating of the fierce struggle for freedom in Britain in the

seventeenth century, he says: "Who then sustained the cause of liberty in those sore and protracted days? Who, but the Calvinists, known as the Puritans, the Covenanters, the Roundheads, the Presbyterians, the Independents? When the people were abandoned to the lawless fury and wrath of their rulers, when they were ruthlessly plundered, murdered, and hunted like wild beasts from place to place, the Presbyterian clergy never wavered, but were always steady to the good cause, and were always on the side of the people." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 50–51.)

MOTLEY says: "To the Calvinists more than to any other class of men the political liberties of Holland, England, and America are due." (Calvm. in Hist., p. 37.)

D'AUBIGNE: "This chiefly distinguishes the reformation of Calvin from that of Luther, that wherever it was established, it brought with it not only truth, but liberty, and all the great developments that these two fertile principles carry with them." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 34–35.)

BANCROFT, by no means a Calvinist: "The political character of Calvinism, which with one consent and with instinctive judgment the monarchs of that day feared as republicanism, is expressed in one word,—*predestination*." . . . "The martyrdoms of Cambray, the fires of Smithfield, and the surrender of benefices by 2,000 non-conforming Presbyterians attest their perseverance." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 24–25.)

JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, the historian and lecturer, was certainly not a Calvinist, and in my judgment should be classified as either a free-thinker or an agnostic. Hear at some length his testimony, evidently given with reluctance in his lecture upon Calvinism:

"The practical effect of a belief is the real test of its soundness." (P. 14). "If Arminianism most commends itself to our feelings, Calvinism is nearer to the facts, however harsh and forbidding those facts may seem." (P. 12.) . . . "I am going to ask you to consider how it came to pass that if Calvinism is indeed the hard and unreasonable creed which modern enlightenment declares it to be, it has possessed such singular attractions in past times for some of the greatest men that ever lived; and how, being as we are told fatal to morality because it denies free will, (?) 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 for states as well as persons. I shall ask you again, why, if it be a creed of intellectual servitude, it was able to inspire and sustain the bravest efforts ever made to break the yoke of unjust authority'' . . . ''When all else has failed . . . patriotism . . . human courage . . . intellect . . . when emotion and sentiment, and tender imaginative piety have become the handmaids of superstition, and have dreamt themselves into forgetfulness that there is a difference between lies and truth—the slavish form of belief called Calvinism, in one or the 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.'' . . . (P. 13.)

How can the freest nations of Europe ever discharge their debt to Calvinism? While Pelagianism enslaved the intellect, enervated the will, and destroyed personal responsibility and liberty of conscience, the *Netherlands* could never oppose successful resistance to Spanish power; but when William the Silent became a thorough-going Calvinist, and imbued his people with the same code of opinion, the Netherlanders were able to beat off the Spanish legions, and to form a Republic that is today a monument to the invigorating power of Calvinism.

CASTELAR, the Spanish statesman, says: ''The Anglo-Saxon democracy is the product of a severe theology learned by the few extra fugitives in the gloomy cities of Holland and of Switzerland, where the morose shade of Calvin still wanders. . . . And it remains serenely in its grandeur, forming the most dignified, most moral, most enlightened, and richest portion of the human race.'' (Calvm. in Hist., p. 99.)

What is it, which like an aureole encircles the historic names of Conde and Coligny of France, but their splendid devotion to the Calvinistic principles of freedom, which a hundred years later were embodied in the Westminster Standards? The impress of these principles is seen today in the free institutions of England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Holland, France, Australia, and America.

Let us again call our witnesses to the stand and learn from them something of the *Sort of People* made by these scriptural doctrines when the abstract truth passes into the concrete form.

BUCKLE: "It is observable also that the church of Rome, whose worship is addressed mainly to the senses, and which delights in splendid cathedrals and pompous ceremonies, has always displayed against Calvinists an animosity far greater than she has done against any other Protestant sect." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 18–19.)

FROUDE: "It is enough to mention the name of William the Silent, of Luther, of Knox, of Andrew Melville, and Regent Murray, of Coligny, of our English Cromwell, of Milton, of John Bunyan. These were men possessed of all the qualities that give nobility and grandeur to human nature—men whose life was as upright as their intellects were 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 our 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." (Calvinism, pp. 13–14.)

"For hard times hard men are needed, and intellects which can pierce to the roots where truth and lies part company." (Calvinism, p. 48.)

"The Calvinists have been called intolerant" . . . "But there is no reason to suppose that Calvinists at the beginning would have thought of meddling with the Church, if they had themselves been let alone." (Calvinism, p. 49.)

"They had many faults; let him that is without sin cast a stone at them. They 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 convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people's hearts." (Calvinism, p. 50)

TAINE, the French author of English Literature: "We considered these Puritans as gloomy madmen, shallow brains and full of scruples. Let us quit our French and modern ideas and enter into their souls: we shall find there something else than hypochondria, viz., a grand sentiment —am I a just man? And if God, who is perfect justice, were to judge me at this moment, what sentence would He pass upon me? Such is the original idea of the Puritans, and through them came the Revolution into England." . .

"We laugh at a revolution about surplices and chasubles; there was a sentiment of the divine underneath these disputes about vestments." . . . "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; . . . they founded Scotland; they founded the United States; at this day they are, by their descendants, founding Australia, and colonizing the world." (Bk. V., pp. 671–2.)

If any people on earth show the moulding power of Calvinism in their religious and national character, it is the SCOTCH.

Hear then what our *reluctant* witness *Froude* has to say of them in his lecture upon "The Influence of the Reformation on the Scottish Character": "Good reason has Scotland to be proud of Knox. He only, in this wild crisis, saved the Kirk, which he had founded, and saved with it Scottish and English freedom." (P. 143). "In Scotland, the Commons, as an organized body, were simply created by religion. Before the Reformation they had no political existence, and therefore it has been that the print of their origin has gone so deeply into their social constitution. On them, and them only, the burden of the work of the Reformation was eventually thrown." (P. 135.)

"The question now is, what has the Kirk so established done for Scotland? Has it justified its own existence? Briefly, we might say, it has continued its first function as the guardian of Scottish freedom." (P. 147.)

"For more than half the seventeenth century, the battle had to be fought out in Scotland, which in reality was the battle between liberty and despotism; and where, except in the intense, burning conviction that they were maintaining God's cause against the devil, could the poor Scotch people have found the strength for the unequal struggle which was forced upon them? Toleration is a good thing in its place; but you can not tolerate what will not tolerate you, and is trying to cut your throat." (P. 148.) . . . "There have rarely been seen in this world a set of people who have thought more about right and wrong, and the judgment about them of the upper powers." (P. 149.) . . . "Among other qualities, the Scots have been distinguished for humor, which half loves what it laughs at." . . .

"I should rather say that the Scots had been an unusually happy people. Intelligent industry, the honest doing of daily work, with a sense that it must be done well under penalties; the necessaries of life moderately provided for; and a sensible content with the situation of life . . . this through the week, and at the end of it the 'Cottar's Saturday Night'—the home family, gathered reverently and peacefully together and irradiated with a sacred presence. Happiness! such happiness as we human creatures are likely to know upon this world will be found there, if anywhere." (P. 150.)

THE UNITED STATES.

Now leaping from the Old World to the New, let us inquire what influence our Westminster Standards have exerted upon our institutions.

My theme proper does not take me back of the time of the Assembly's dissolution, 1648. I must however remind you that the *Mayflower* brought over the Pilgrims to Massachusetts in 1620, who fled from the English monarchy and hierarchy, to seek for freedom of conscience; that somewhat later the *Eagle Wing* brought persons from the north of Ireland with like purpose; and that, in the first half of the eighteenth century, thousands who suffered persecution in England, Scotland, Ireland, and France, sought asylum in the New World. These people settled in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas. From the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, the drifting of events made *Virginia* the great battle-ground between freedom and persecution. This colony had been settled and fostered by the patronage of the English Crown. Her early governors were thoroughly subservient to the Crown, and the Church of England was the only church in that early period, and claimed protection under the laws of the mother country. Strict laws of uniformity of worship were enacted by the first Colonial Assembly in 1642, twenty years before the Act of Uniformity under James II. in England. These laws were re-enacted in 1662–3, and were enforced with all possible vigor until 1699, ten years after the Act of Toleration was enacted in England under William and Mary. In 1699 an *obscure* provision for tolerating dissenters was made in Virginia; but *the clergy* of the English Church in the Colony continued a long time to give

all possible annoyance to dissenters, and to prevent the settlement and work of any dissenting ministers.

In 1682 or '83 Rev. Francis Makemie, a native of Ireland, and a minister ordained by the Irish Presbytery of Lagan, came as a Presbyterian missionary to this country. He settled upon the eastern shore of Maryland, one of the most tolerant of the colonies at that time. There he founded the churches of Snow Hill and Rehoboth, and a little later laid the foundations of the Presbyterian churches in Accomac and upon the Elizabeth River. His work, assisted by some others who followed him, resulted in a little over twenty years in the formation of the Philadelphia Presbytery, 1705. So soon as the tolerant provision above mentioned was passed by the Colonial Assembly, Makemie applied for and received *civil* license to preach the Gospel. Yet he was frequently molested in the prosecution of his ministerial work in Virginia, and in New York was arrested, tried, taunted, before Gov. Cornbury of that colony for simply preaching the Gospel. He was the first minister under the Westminster Standards known to have settled in Virginia or in the United States; and his certificate of licensure is the first one upon record in Virginia issued to any dissenter.

The story of his life in the colonies is one full of pathos. It is a story of conflicts, persecutions, unflinching devotion, and splendid fortitude in advocacy of the Westminster Standards and of liberty. He did not live to see his contention crowned with full success. Moses was not permitted to enter Canaan. But he was permitted to approach it, and, looking across the narrow Jordan, to see the green fields of the promised land. Makemie was permitted to approach the consummation of his brave contention; and, looking through the vista of about one century, to see the noonday of freedom rise upon this fair land.

During the first quarter of the eighteenth century, many Calvinistic immigrants settled in Pennsylvania and in the Valley of Virginia, and about the same time a stream of Huguenots was pouring into the Carolinas, and some into Virginia. Under acts of toleration in England and the colonies these dissenters grew notwithstanding unceasing opposition and annoyance by English Churchmen.

The Synod of Philadelphia, largely the trophy of Makemie's battles, was organized. By this time Presbyterians were settling the upper Valley, then "the back parts" of

Virginia, and constituting a strong line of defence against the Indians. Gov. Gooch was then governor of the colony of Virginia, a far more liberal churchman than his predecessors or the clergy of his church, and a wise ruler who valued and fostered the Presbyterians in "the back parts" as a defence of the colony against Indians.

In 1738 the Synod of Philadelphia, having received application for a minister from John Caldwell and others of "the back parts" of Virginia, deemed it necessary to obtain the favor of Gov. Gooch towards these people. "We thought it our duty to ask your favor in allowing them the liberty of their consciences, and of worshiping God in a way agreeable to their education."

In reply they are assured by the Governor, that "no interruption shall be given to any minister of your profession, who shall come among them, so as they conform themselves to the rules prescribed by the Act of Toleration in England." (Foote's Sketches, p. 104.)

About this period, also, Jonathan Edwards was thundering the doctrines of our Confession into the awakened hearts of New Englanders; and George Whitfield was shaking up dry bones from Georgia to New England, and reproaching Wesley for embracing Arminianism. It was a period of great religious awakening. The instruments largely used for this work were Edwards, the Tennants, Rowland, Dickinson, Frelinghuysen, Samuel Blair, William Robinson, John Blair, Roan, and Samuel Davies.

Samuel Davies, nomen clarum et venerabile! Ordained by Newcastle Presbytery, 1747, he soon settled in Hanover county, Virginia. He found a number of dissenters under indictments for worshiping God under "their own vine and fig tree." Davies obtained his civil license, and endeavored to obtain one for his friend and co-laborer Rodgers. The Council, however, denied a license to Rodgers, and therefore he was obliged to leave the colony, and leave Davies alone to fight the battles of Presbyterianism and of liberty. As an exhibit of the spirit of the clergy of the English church of that day, I will relate an incident. When the Council refused license to Rodgers, they were opposed by the Governor, who seeing present the clergyman who had instigated the Council, turned upon him: "I am surprised at you! You profess to be a minister of Jesus Christ, and you come and complain of a man, and wish me to punish

him for preaching the Gospel! For shame, sir! Go home. . . . For such a piece of conduct you deserve to have your gown stripped over your shoulders." (Foote's Sketches, p. 166.)

Samuel Davies' name is familiar to all who know the history of Presbyterianism and of liberty in the United States. He is known for his extensive and fruitful evangelistic labors; he is known for the unction, power, and eloquence of his unequaled volume of sermons; he is known for his agency in endeavoring to endow Princeton College; but his fame rests chiefly upon his resolute and powerful advocacy of religious freedom in Virginia, which gave impulse to the thought of leading men that resulted in the patriotic demand for independence from England and separation of church and state.

Three young lawyers of New York city, all Presbyterians, held frequent meetings to discuss the question of separation from England. These conferences resulted in 1752 in forming the "Whig Club." This club styled itself the "Sons of Liberty," but it was derisively styled "The Presbyterian Junta." It issued two newspapers to propagate sentiments of independence and liberty. It sent forth a call to Boston, to Philadelphia, and to the South for a Congress of all the Colonies; and *Bancroft* says, "This was the inception of the Continental Congress." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 83–84.)

May 20, 1775, a convention was held at Charlotte, North Carolina, which embraced twenty-seven staunch Calvinists, one-third of whom were Presbyterian ruling elders, and one a clergyman. This convention adopted what is known as "the Mecklenburg Declaration." It was written by Ephraim Brevard, a Presbyterian elder. This "Declaration" resolved the members into "a free and independent people," and pledged "to each other our mutual co-operation and our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honor."

In this eager period came to the front the fathers of the Revolutionary War, from New England to Georgia, many of whom were Calvinists. It is highly probable that Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson imbibed both light and heat from sparks which had flown from the anvil which Davies had beaten in their regions.

The Synod of Philadelphia in 1775 formally and openly declared for separation from England, and enjoined her people to aid the cause of independence and liberty by their

efforts and their prayers. The Adamses of Massachusetts were pronounced Calvinists. Rev. Dr. John Witherspoon was a Presbyterian minister, and President of Princeton College, a Presbyterian institution. He was a member of the Continental Congress. It is said that when some members of Congress hesitated to sign the Declaration of Independence, Dr. Witherspoon arose and said, "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 freeman. . . . 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." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 89-90.)

"When the constitution of New Jersey was adopted by a convention composed chiefly of Presbyterians, they established perfect liberty of conscience, without the blemish of a test." (Calvm. in Hist., p. 89.)

James Madison contributed largely to the ideas of religious freedom and separation of church and state. He studied at Princeton under Dr. Witherspoon, and *Bancroft* declares, "It was from Witherspoon of New Jersey that Madison imbibed the lesson of perfect freedom in matters of conscience."

Presbyterians were conspicuous in support of the Revolutionary War.

Rev. Charles Inglis, the rector of Trinity Church, N. Y., in a report to the Episcopal Church Missionary Society of London, under date October 31, 1776, states that all *their* (i. e., Episcopal) missionaries and other clergy were loyal to the Crown, and then says, "I do not know one of them (the Presbyterian ministers), nor have I been able, after strict inquiry, to hear of any who did not, by preaching and every effort in their power, promote all the measures of Congress, however extravagant." (Calvm. in Hist., pp. 66, 7, 9.)

When in 1775 Washington and Lee, both of whom were members of the Established Church, on their way to Boston to take their commands in our army, reached New York city, they were met by the body of the dissenting ministers of the city, but "there was not a clergyman of their own church to welcome them." (Calvm. in Hist., p. 93.)

An implicit compliment was paid to the toughness and hardihood of men who fed upon the strong meat of the Westminster Standards when Washington declared that if beaten in the east he would fall back upon the strongholds of Augusta. For the strength of Augusta lay in the sturdy arms and fearless hearts of the Scotch Irish Presbyterians that dwelt there. And the Father of his country recognized their worth, and sought in some measure to discharge his debt of gratitude to a brave people, when he so liberally endowed Liberty Hall Academy a Presbyterian school, and raised it to the honorable grade of Washington College.

RUFUS CHOATE, referring to the system of Geneva taught by Calvin says, "I seem to trace to it the great civil war of England, the republican constitution framed in the cabin of the Mayflower, the divinity of Jonathan Edwards, the battle of Bunker Hill, *the independence of America.*" (Calvm. in Hist., p. 98.)

And BANCROFT declares, "*He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin, knows but little of the origin of American Independence.*" (Calvm. in Hist., p. 99.)

And why should not these Westminster Standards make free men and heroes?

Their system of government exemplifies the wisest and most scriptural balance between the despotism of hierarchy and the passion of pure democracy. It is the democratic-representative-republicanism. Conspicuously upon this model the forefathers of this country shaped and adjusted our civil governments and our free institutions, before the venal ambition of plutocracy or the discordant greed of office, or the degrading fealty to party brought Pandora's box of ills and emptied it on the body politic.

Taught by the Word of God, and stimulated by the historic abuse of priestcraft, the Westminster fathers reduced the governmental power of the minister to a minimum and hedged his way closely by constitutional restrictions. Presbyterian ministers have no *individual* powers but to preach the Word of God and administer the sacraments.

This system throws around the humblest member of the church the arms of a loving mother for his protection. No man may be visited with any censure except by trial in which he is confronted with his accusers—and this not before the minister alone, but before *a court* embracing his representative ruling elders. He is constitutionally provid-

ed with every defence known to the freest civil code. And then, if aggrieved, he may carry his cause by appeal or complaint from session to Presbytery; and from Presbytery to Synod; and from Synod to General Assembly, till he obtains decision by a tribunal furthest removed from passion and interest. Personal freedom and personal responsibility are cardinal principles of Presbyterian government.

And what shall I say of our doctrinal theology?

It is wrought into a system which embraces all the great facts of revelation in respect of God and man, and the reciprocal relations between the two. The boldness with which these facts are recognized excites our admiration; the closeness and tenacity of their adjustment command our credit. This system lifts up for our adoration the God of grace who predestines, calls, justifies, and glorifies his elect. True it assigns man the sinner to a very humble place; but it represents the condescending and all sufficient grace of God as laying fast hold upon him, and bearing him through all conflicts "conqueror and more than conqueror" through Him that loved him and gave himself for him. The believer whose heart is saturated with these truths is and must be strong for adversity and heroic in trials.

Stonewall Jackson was a living impersonation of these doctrines, and no soldier of his rank was more dreaded by his enemies. When history would represent the energy, the wisdom, and the completeness of preparation for the struggle, the carnage, the victory of tomorrow's battle, it pictures this great honest Calvinist kneeling at midnight in the solitude of his tent. (See "Story of the Confederate States," by I. T. Derry, p. 152.)