

till the Commonwealth came. Then came the Westminster Assembly, and with it the question of Erastianism or independence of the State for the Church. We are not astonished to find Selden and others of his party standing out strongly for the natural accompaniment of prelacy without a pope, but we should have expected something totally different from the Independents who stood forth as the champions of liberty. Strange to say, the five dissenting brethren of the Westminster Assembly, all Independents, asserted that they were willing to give more power to the civil magistrate in matters of religion than the principles of the Presbyterians would permit them to give. The English Parliament, which was largely composed of Congregationalists, insisted on having the supreme control in ecclesiastical matters, and refused to allow the Church power to keep back scandalous and unworthy persons from the communion, passing a law to the effect that if any person was refused admission to sealing ordinances by the Church Courts he could apply to Parliament, which might, by virtue of its authority, compel the Church to receive him, whatever his character might be. Erastianism is not necessarily bound up with royalty. It may flourish in a republic, as was seen even in 1614, four years before the Synod of Dort, in Holland, when the Arminians, that had recently come into existence as a distinct body under Arminius, who died in 1609, compelled the States-General to exercise its authority over the Church for prohibiting the discussion of the controverted five points. One need only read the early history of the Puritan settlements in New England to find another case in which the representatives of the sovereign people often went beyond crowned monarchs in the exercise of authority over and in the Church for the Church's good.

Scotland, holding the mean between the two extremes of absolute monarchy and democratic institutions, avoided the rock of Erastianism that cropped out on either side. The Covenanters waged bitter warfare against this enemy, which they ever regarded as the twin brother of prelacy, and which appears in company with the latter in all documents setting forth things that are to be renounced. The Confession of Faith is most explicit in regard to the sole headship of Christ over His own Church; and the principle was held with more or less tenacity until the time of the Disruption in 1843, when, rather than submit to what they deemed an infraction of it, those members of the Church of Scotland, who afterwards formed the Free Church, seceded. Since that time the Established Church of Scotland has made many efforts to cast off the yoke laid upon her, and reassert a principle of which she declares, on her part, that she has never lost sight. While the statement in the Confession of Faith with regard to the headship of Christ is accepted by all members of the Presbyterian Church, there are certain differences in the formula for the ordination of ministers of the Free and Established Churches that have arisen out of the Disruption. One of these is the addition of a question embodying the first section of the thirtieth chapter of the Confession of Faith, which states that *Christ as King and Head of the Church has therein appointed a government in the hands of Church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate*, and adding, along with an approval of the claim, protest, &c., of the Disruption Assembly, the words which, with the words of the Confession, make up the third question of our own formula, *that the civil magistrate does not possess jurisdiction, or authoritative control, over the regulation of the affairs of Christ's Church*. Another part of the formula in which differences are found, and which we have not adopted, contenting ourselves