

ferences are the least, mutual mistrust is the deepest, and some utterances which have appeared in the press recently would seem to indicate this tendency as in some quarters prevailing now, e. g., A converted membership has been claimed as a distinguishing mark. Entanglements with the state have drawn national churches into strange inconsistencies, which have left their marks even after the entanglements have disappeared. No denomination can justly claim through all its history an unblemished record. The tendency under state supervision is to slacken discipline; this is true whether Presbyterian Scotland or Puritan Massachusetts be taken for examples, but equally strong and pernicious is the opposite tendency by which a church of self-elected saints degenerates to be a court of Pharisees. Presbyterianism in Geneva and Congregationalism in the New England States both started with the grand conception of a Christian commonwealth, moulded after the spirit of the Hebrew theocracy. Christ was visibly to be viewed as King of nations, as confessedly he is King of Saints. Circumstances in some respects were more favorable for the experiment on American free soil, yet we will hardly say that it was successful as a state institution any more than the Genevian trial, only let it be remembered that the great principle in the upholding of which Calvin and Farel stood

shoulder to shoulder, and for maintaining which Calvin was driven into exile, was "purity of communion," or in other words, that the church was held together and defined by a bound over which the state had no authority. Presbyterian Calvin and Independent Brown here were on common ground.

It is manifestly beyond the limits of a symposium article to trace the diverse workings of identical principles under different conditions, and the growth of even divergent manifestations in their separation, but along such lines of approach mutual misunderstandings would vanish, and a substantial unity be found; and ere concluding this, our humble contribution and practical application, we may add that the two bodies just named have more than traditional aptness for *mutual* approach, (we emphasize that word "mutual,") they both are far removed from sacerdotal pretension, both acknowledge the scriptures as the one supreme symbol of faith and guide of manners. Each seeks to cultivate an intelligent faith rather than the more emotional, each sets a high value on ministerial attainment, and both have ever recognized, what other bodies are slowly acknowledging, the lay element as a necessary factor in true church government. Nor do they doctrinally stand apart if open expression were given to things as they practically are. The old controversies which focussed at