

VERDICT

Essay 13

1984

Continental Patterns and the Reformation in England and Scotland

Robert D. Brinsmead

Editorial Note: This outstanding essay by George Yule serves as a valuable prelude to what we plan to publish on Biblicism. Traditional Christianity has often been guilty of using the Bible as a kind of Christian Torah— that is to say, in much the same way as the Pharisees used the law. Professor Yule forces upon us the disturbing question: Is our Biblicism really only a modern form of Christian Pharisaism?

The Reformed churches have frequently regarded the Reformation in ways that are contradictory but without seeing the contradictions. On the one hand the Reformation is assumed to be the common and binding heritage of Fundamentalists, the various Presbyterian churches throughout the world, the Southern Baptists, the Taizé Community, even the *avant garde* of the Second Vatican Council and Bonhoeffer's 'Protestants without a Reformation'. 'Justification by faith', 'the priesthood of all believers', 'the Bible alone' and often 'no Bishops' are catchwords, said to be common to all, and somehow entailing each other.

And at the same time when one regards this vast variety of Protestantism, one is blandly assured that in the interests of truth they are divided. And then if one points to the real catchwords of the Reformation, namely *sola gratia* and *solus Christus* one must assume that these are not as basic as those matters which divide— which is an impossible position to maintain, for *sola gratia* and *solus Christus* stand behind all else.

In this paper I wish to argue that it is much better to talk about 'patterns of reformation' than 'the Reformation' 1 and that these catchwords of the Reformation do

not entail each other in the way that is commonly assumed; that there was, and continues to be, an unconscious departure from the basis of the Reformation, *sola gratia*, and that other concerns were given a central position which automatically displaced this. In England and in Scotland, initially, the Reformed churches were much closer together in the period when *sola gratia* was given its central place. When the emphasis shifted to reformation, by biblical precedent, the serious splits that have continued to the present began.

Our increasing knowledge of the history of the Church in the fifteenth century has made it clear that many ideas that formerly were regarded as peculiar to the Reformation had a much older pedigree, and carried over with them presuppositions of medieval theology. From Wiclif on, there was a constant demand to reform the Church by way of biblical precedent. This strand, changed in some respects, was taken up by the Reformation, which built upon a whole century of biblical study....

There was a whole pattern of reformation often unrelated to *sola gratia* that was already active in the Church before Luther. Its greatest exponent was Erasmus, who meditated constantly on Holy Scripture.... In the New Testament one had the example of Christ presented in compelling simplicity and clarity. The deeds of Christ were examples of true piety. The demands of Christ on the Christian conscience are not demands of knowledge but of morals.' 2 The basic idea is reformation by precedent.

He talked of justification by faith...; but this is not his central preoccupation, nor is it *sola gratia*. Human striving is an essential supplement to the grace of God. Indeed this same attitude is present in his stress on Christ as the example....

For Erasmus, then, the New Testament was the best book of precedents for following the example of Christ in humility and love. In this he had a powerful influence on Zwingli, who was regarded at first as an Erasmian.... But soon Zwingli went further. 'At last I came to the conclusion that you must leave all the rest and learn God's meaning out of God's simple word. Then I asked God for light and it came.' 3 Nevertheless many of the Erasmian presuppositions remained with him. What in fact he did was to replace the philosophy of Christ with the law of Christ, and, like Erasmus, he interpreted the Gospel very much through Platonic eyes so that Christianity becomes 'spiritualized'. In the margin of Erasmus' *Lucubrations* where he had asked: 'But is not Christianity the spiritual life?', Zwingli underscored the question in the text and wrote in the margin: 'Christianity is the spiritual life.' 4 ...

This spiritualizing Erasmian tendency in Zwingli reinforced his tension between the law of Christ in the Bible which was utterly binding, and the 'ceremonial law of the Church most of which he claimed was not demanded by Christ. Like Karlstadt he appeared to be moving towards a service of entirely silent prayer— 'Moses calls

earnestly upon God within his heart and does not move his lips. So also Hannah did not cry aloud.' 5 This led to his rejection of all choral singing.... As God has not explicitly commanded music in worship it has to be omitted. Here Zwingli's spiritualizing tendency interpreted his Biblicism and the clear instances of singing in the Old Testament are explained by saying God did not command them on one hand, and, on the other, under the new Covenant the whole of Christian worship is spiritualized.

As a result of this thinking Zwingli completely revised the structure of the Mass. All elements not substantiated by scriptural precedent were to be abolished, though 'with such discretion that insurrections do not ensue', for 'everything that is added to the true institutions of Christ is an abuse... The people must be educated in the Word of God so that neither vestments nor songs have a place in the Mass. 6

The difference between Zwingli and Luther here has often been noted, but the base of this difference is a hermeneutical principle. The Zwinglian Reformation is based on using the Bible as a book of precedents, interpreted in a spiritualizing way...

But it must be immediately added that because of his deep appreciation of the Bible many of Zwingli's doctrines are christocentric. ...

Yet despite this, and despite the fact that Zwingli probably discovered the doctrine of justification by faith independently of Luther, the difference between the two conceptions of Reformation is very great. It is partly that Zwingli approaches the question of the Reformation as reforming abuses, and so his reading of the Bible always tended to have that orientation.

How different with Luther! Here *sola gratia* dominates everything. He saw, in a way that nobody else saw, the dangers of a new legalism. Justification by grace was not just one of a number of doctrines. It was the whole crux of the Gospel from which all else flowed. They therefore that interpret the Gospel as something else than good news do not understand the Gospel.' 7 What made the Bible the Bible was that it contained the Gospel. For Luther, Zwingli's approach to Scripture tended to make it a book of archaeology instead of good news. For the great danger of reformation by biblical precedent was that it became a new legalism and so obscured the Gospel. Luther saw this with great clarity. For example after setting out his proposed changes for the Mass he wrote that 'we take care in all such matters lest we make binding things which are free... it is not right that one should either require or establish some indispensable form as law in this matter . . . ' . 8...

Calvin, in a way that Zwingli never did, saw the radical implication of *sola gratia*. 'Like some great presiding chairman,' to use Professor Rupp's phrase, Calvin 'sums up the thirty years of Protestant discussion of salvation bringing together doctrines like

those of Word and Spirit which Protestant controversy and tensions had pushed asunder.’ 9 He achieved this remarkably rounded conspectus of the Christian faith not, as it were, by merely adding together the various insights of previous reformers but by re-interpreting their several contributions under the over-riding insight of *solus Christus*....

The tragedy of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the history of the Church is that this foundation of *solus Christus* and *sola gratia* ceased to be the controlling centre of the Church’s life. Instead of working out the liberating and reconciling meaning of *sola gratia*, the Reformed Churches barricaded themselves behind the divisive walls of a new scholastic legalism based largely on the use of the Bible as precedent.

The effects of this change are nowhere seen more clearly than in the Church in Britain. Despite popular prejudice Anglicans and Presbyterians...were alike in essentials. What held them together was that Cranmer in England and the authors of the first *Scots Confession* placed in the forefront of their theology *sola gratia* and *solus Christus*. There are few clearer expositors of Luther’s understanding of *sola gratia* than Cranmer. . . . ‘When St. Paul said, “We be justified freely by faith without works”, he meant of all manner or works of the law, as well of the Ten Commandments as of ceremonials and judicials.’ 10 ‘Faith,’ he wrote, ‘is no more to be regarded as a work or virtue than hope, charity, repentance, dread and the fear of God within us. It has to be renounced as a work in exactly the same way as any other work. When we trust in Christ we do not trust in ourselves. Faith says as it were: “it is not I that take away your sins but Christ only!”’ 11 In this superb statement Cranmer shows that *sola gratia*, *sola fide* and *solus Christus* are one. Justification by faith is not a principle, as it tended to become in later Protestant Scholasticism. It directs us away from itself to Jesus Christ. This was the identical position of Knox, who insisted that the controversy with the Church of Rome was primarily over this question of justification. 12 Just as he preferred to use the phrase ‘justification through the blood of Christ’ rather than justification by faith so too does Cranmer more commonly use such phrases. Indeed there are many similarities of theological stance between the *Thirty-nine Articles* of the Church of England and the *Scots Confession* despite the distinctive approach of the latter. Unlike the Westminster Confession, both start with faith in the Holy Trinity, both are far more christologically orientated, both see election positively in christological terms and above all both stress the importance of the risen humanity of Christ. 13

Theologically the Scots and English reformers of this period were far closer to each other than either were to the Westminster divines and their successors on the one hand, or to the moralistic Caroline divines on the other. 14...

As I said, Calvin combined something of the ‘biblical precedent’ approach of Zurich

with the *'sola gratia'* approach of Luther, though he always kept the former subservient to the latter. Knox, as his attitude at Frankfurt showed, was shifting the balance but in the last analysis he too did not allow precedent to control the Gospel. . . . Knox wrote: 'God forbid that we should damn all as false prophets and heretics that agree not with us in apparel and other opinions and yet who preach the substance of doctrine and salvation in Christ Jesus.' He 'could not allow or approve of those that obstinately do refuse to hear the message of salvation at such men's mouths as please not us in all things'. 15 This was Calvin's position. He undoubtedly tried to construct the worshipping life of the Church on biblical lines, but the Bible for him was primarily Gospel and not precedent and this fact controlled the pattern. . . . In the *Institutes* he defines the essential articles of the faith, 'God is one; Christ is God and the Son of God; our salvation rests in God's mercy; and the like. Among the churches there are other articles of doctrine disputed which still do not break the unity of faith.' 16 These statements show the delicate balance in Calvin's theological thinking. He took the Gospel with radical seriousness and consequently did not regard the Bible *primarily* as a book of precedents, not even in worship or doctrine, matters about which he was deeply concerned.

In the area of church government where it is popularly thought that differences were greatest, the outlook between the framers of the *First Book of Discipline* on the one hand and the Edwardian and early Elizabethan divines show marked similarities.

In England the Episcopal order continued with no word of condemnation from Calvin and certainly with Bucer's blessing. 17 As in Scotland, the aim was to reform the office of prelatial abuse. True bishops were to be pastors whose chief office 'is the preaching of the divine word'. In matters of discipline they are to act 'like a father with all affection of charity'. They should live without ostentation or ease. They should rule with the consent of their clergy. 18 . . . That the episcopate of the Church of England was not reformed in the way it was in the Church of Scotland was due largely to the Erastian outlook of Queen Elizabeth. She needed loyal officers of state to help to maintain what appeared to be a precarious political position, and in that hierarchical age she insisted that her bishops act as lords in secular matters and toe her line in religious. Her attitude created real heartburning among most of the bishops, but they realized that if they resigned, their places would have been filled by clergy hostile, or at best lukewarm, to the Reformation. 'Though the other habits were taken away,' wrote Bishop Horn to Gaultier, 'the wearing of square caps and surplices was yet continued to the clergy, though without any superstitious conceit, which was expressly guarded against by the terms of the act.... It was enjoined us (who had not then any authority either to make laws or repeal them) either to wear the caps and surplices or to give place to others. We complied with this injunction lest our enemies should take possession of the places deserted by ourselves.' 19 The unity of the Church must not be broken over such matters, despite the fact that they did not want them.

There was similar concern for regular biblical study in this early period. In Zurich, in answer to the need to train ministers, there had arisen frequent meetings in the Great Minster, set up by Zwingli in 1525. Here all the ministers of the town and all theological students met under the leadership of Zwingli, Bullinger, Conrad Pellican, Theodore Bibliander and Conrad Gresner for biblical exposition and discussion. This was followed by a public sermon to the whole congregation. 20 This idea was copied by Calvin in Geneva, á Lasco in London, and by Knox, first at Geneva, and later in the 'Exercises' of the *First Book of Discipline*. 21 In England the same order, under the name of 'Propheesyings' was practiced in most dioceses....

Elizabeth believed that these prophesyings were Puritan centers for disseminating anti-vestarian sentiments and she ordered Archbishop Grindal to see that this ceased. He refused to be a party to such a damaging attack on the life of the Church and he was dismissed. This rebuttal of the reforming bishops by Elizabeth was.., the reason for the successful rise of the Presbyterian wing of the Puritan movement. 22

It is quite clear, then, that the Scots Reformers of this early period and the Edwardian and early Elizabethan bishops were in basic agreement. It is not surprising therefore to find the Scots General Assembly addressing a letter to the English Bishops as our Brethren, signed by loving brethren and fellow preachers in Christ. 23 But in 1600 the General Assembly described the Anglican episcopate as 'anti-Christian' and 'repugnant to the word of God'. 24 Whereas Calvin addressed Cranmer as 'most distinguished and esteemed Primate.... May the Lord bless your labours', 25 in the next generation the Presbyterian, John Row, described the relatively harmless Archbishop Glastenes as 'a vile filthy bellied god-beast. Let that filthy apostate's perjured memory stink, rot and perish.' 26 With the change to these charitable judgments we have clearly entered a new age. What caused the change? The usual answer is that whereas the Scots and Puritans were loyal to the Reformation, the Anglicans riddled with Erastianism and Arminianism betrayed the Reformed faith. This answer is clearly wrong. . . . This change is due to a hermeneutical change to a far greater degree than is normally recognized. The Bible as precedent displaced the *sola gratia* as the centre of theological attention.

In Zurich the way of using the Bible as a book of precedents was confined largely to matters of worship, particularly over the use of images. 27 This was the case also at first in England, where controversy centered mainly on the question of vestments, though among the English refugees at Frankfurt the issue of responses and other so called non-biblical matters in the *Second Prayer Book* arose. 28

The question of vestments dominated the early years of Elizabeth's reign. It was partly a psychological question in that the reformers did not want to resemble even in

appearance the Church of Rome. But the question of biblical precedent was always present— ‘we are to seek our patterns not out of the cisterns and puddles of our enemies but from the fountain of scripture’. 29 ... Later Puritans made this-the only-test and their attack on the *Book of Common-Prayer* was often extremely legalistic. They failed completely to appreciate its great evangelical emphasis. Those who destroy not utterly ‘all idolatrous stuffe do God’s work negligently and therefore are accursed and as Achan’. 30 This became the logic of separation. ‘For we are commanded,’ wrote John Nash from prison in 1580, ‘to come out from among you that we touch none of your unclean things neither with our eye, heart, mind nor hand *and in so doing*, and in separating ourselves from you and your dissimulations, *God hath promised to be our Father* and we shall be his sons and daughters.’ 31

This hermeneutical principle was applied after about 1565 to wider areas of the life of the Church. In response to those who wanted further reforms, Beza sent a letter to Grindal which widened the scope of the controversy bringing to the forefront the question of Church-State relationships and Church government....

For the next twenty-five years the question of Church government dominated the Puritan controversy in England.... For Wilcox and Field, the Church, in order to allow Christ to be King, had to construct the government entirely along the lines of biblical precedent.

Hooker, on the other hand, maintained ‘that matters of faith and in general matters necessary unto Salvation are of a different nature from ceremonies, order and the kind of Church government: and that the one is necessary to be expressly contained in the Word of God or else manifestly collected out of the same, and the other not so’. 32

Calvin’s position was different again. His approach centered in the Gospel. What functions are necessary in the life of the Church that the Gospel can be heard? 33 Like Hooker he declined to make discipline one of the explicit marks of the Church, but like Field and Wilcox he saw that the question is related to the Gospel, though not by way of precedent as they urged....

The new Puritan leaders, Cartwright, Field, Travers and Wilcox 34 prescribed a ‘Presbyterian’ order of Church government which they urged was enjoined from the biblical pattern. By ‘Presbyterian’ these early writers meant that in the local parish there would be a pastor, doctor, elders and deacons. How this was related to the Presbytery or classic is obscure....

Other parts that were clear came out in a very wooden way as one would expect from this type of approach. In the discussions of the diaconate for example, the impression is given that deacons are necessary in the Church not because people are

in need but because the word 'deacon', and therefore the pattern, is prescribed in the Bible. Instead of taking over the local parish officers in England, as Calvin did in Geneva, and making them more effective, the office was conceived in abstraction from the real needs of the situation. 35 In Scotland under Melville the Assembly gave its approval to the scheme laid out in the *Second Book of Discipline*. Whereas Calvin had started from the functions that are necessary for the wellbeing of the Church, it would appear that Melville started from the names found in Holy Scripture and then spelt out their functions. Although proof texts are not given, the tone of the *Second Book of Discipline* is very different from that of the *First*, giving the impression of deduction from precedent and it is instructive to see that the earlier reformers who were still alive viewed the changes with little enthusiasm. It was, as in England, the work of new men. 36

These new English and Scottish approaches came together at the Westminster Assembly, and here the way of proceeding by proof text was deliberately embarked upon. 37 The arguments of the previous seventy years had revealed that as a matter of fact there was no absolutely certain biblical type of Presbyterianism. . . . Despite this, the *Form of Presbyterial Church Government* was produced with innumerable proof texts, many of which in crucial points failed to satisfy the doubters, and led to scandalous division in the Church.

Finally in matters of doctrine, there was a departure from *sola gratia* and the centrality of Christology, and this too was connected with the biblical precedent type of thinking. To safeguard itself against the Roman counter-reformation and the impressive theological barricades of the Council of Trent, the Bible was transformed from the witness to the Incarnation into a book of infallible lore: the Westminster Divines made a list of the Books of the Bible their starting-point instead of the Holy Trinity. Consequently the document tends to be an exposition of faith rather than a confession of faith. More subtly *sola gratia* is unconsciously undermined by the way they conceived 'the covenant'. First they divided the covenant up into two parts— the covenant of grace and the covenant of works. The latter carried with it a doctrine of 'a religion' and 'conscience' and the 'light of nature', all independent of the incarnation, and were used in addition to the covenant of grace to bolster up the moral law. This comes out nowhere more clearly than in the discussion on the Sabbath where the idea of 'a perpetual moral law binding on all men' is supported by the most strained exegesis. The doctrine of creation is divorced from redemption. But for Calvin there is one covenant, and that of grace, for redemption is no mere after-thought on the part of God. Again for the Reformers, with their insistence on the centrality of *sola gratia*, union with Christ is the heart of the Gospel, but the Westminster theology insists first on a judicial justification and justifying faith before we can enter into union with Christ. This makes the forensic and believing elements more important than grace. 38 With their different hermeneutical approach it was extremely difficult not to let judicial,

moralistic and often Aristotelian presuppositions displace the evangelical centre of the Gospel...

It would not be formally difficult to show many exceptions to what has been written above—the sections on justification in the Westminster documents, the stress on faith in Zwingli and so on. Yet once *sola gratia* is displaced from the centre of our life in Christ, a radical departure from the life of faith is made. Not one of the Reformed and Lutheran churches would formally deny *sola gratia*. Yet frequently it has been displaced from the centre in much of the life of the Church. In the moralizing ethical pronouncements, in the attitude to Church law, and above all in the relationships with other churches, biblical precedent (or nowadays more frequently church precedent) displaces justification by grace alone. We are told matters of truth must not be compromised. True, human sin and ignorance are matters to be reckoned with. But, as Barth says, “What is even truer more important and to be taken more seriously is the other fact that God in Jesus Christ is for man.” ³⁹ That is, *the truth* of the matter is that we are accepted despite our mixed-up doctrines, legalistic practices and so on. Consequently we have to accept each other not because we agree but because we have been accepted. Then together in the Body of Christ we may begin to get the truth of these other matters as together we seek the fullness of the faith. Luther stated this truth in a letter he wrote to the ministers of Nuremberg who were engaged in dissension. Suppose you saw Jesus Christ standing bodily in the midst of you and by His very eyes speaking thus unto your hearts: What do you, O my dear children, whom I have redeemed by My blood, renewed by My Word that you might mutually love one another?... There is no danger in your difference but there is much in your dissension. Do not thus sadden My spirit. Do not thus spoil the Holy Angels of their joy in heaven. Am I not more to you than all your matters of difference than all your affections, than all your offences? Can any unjust trouble pierce your heart so much as My wounds, as My blood, as I the whole Savior Jesus Christ?’ ⁴⁰

Notes and References

1. E. G. Rupp, ‘Patterns of Salvation in the first age of the Reformation’, in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 1966, pp. 52ff. I am much indebted to this essay.
2. Quoted J. W. Aldridge, *The Hermeneutic of Erasmus* (Richmond, Virginia, 1966), 41.
3. Quoted E. G. Rupp. ‘Luther and Zwingli’ in *Luther Today* (Luther College Press, Iowa, 1957), 153.
4. Quoted C. Garside, *Zwingli and the Arts* (Yale University Press, 1966), 36.
5. Zwingli, *Sixty-seven Articles of 1523*, article 44.
6. Quoted, Garside, *op. cit.*, 54.
7. Luther, *Commentary of Epistle to the Romans*, 7.6 (L.C.C. edition, p. 199).
8. Luther, ‘Formula of the Mass’, *Works* (Philadelphia edition), vi.92.

9. Rupp, 'Patterns of Salvation,' op. cit., 62.
10. Cranmer, *Works* (Parker Society), ii, 132.
11. *ibid.*
12. T. F. Torrance, 'Justification in Doctrine and Life', in *Theology in Reconstruction*, pp. 150ff.
13. See especially articles 1, 2 and 4 of the 'Thirty-nine Articles'.
14. For these generalisations see C. F. Allison, *The Rise of Moralism* (London, 1966), and B. Hall, 'Calvin Against the Calvinists', in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Grand Rapids, 1966). I am indebted to this essay.
15. Quoted J. Lorimer, *John Knox and The Church of England*, 234.
16. *Institutes*, IV.1.12.
17. In his letters to Cranmer and Edward VI, Calvin nowhere attacks the government of the Church of England as un-Christian. Bucer's writings on the subject would point to something like a bishop in Presbytery. See Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967), pp. 103, 159-60.
18. Patrick Collinson, 'Episcopacy and Reform in England in the Later Sixteenth Century', in *Studies in Church History*, vol. iii, ed. G. J. Cuming (1966), 100.
19. *Zurich Letters* (Parker Society), I.142.
20. W. M. S. West, 'John Hooper and the Origins of English Puritanism', in *The Baptist Quarterly*, XV.353-4.
21. Janet Macgregor, *The Scottish-Presbyterian Polity*, pp. 53-54. (The author's comments in this section should be modified in the light of Dr West's article.) Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 168ff.
22. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, Part Four. I am much indebted to this discussion.
23. Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, II.332ff.
24. *ibid.*, VI.3.
25. *Letters*, 11.330-3 (April 1552).
26. Row, *History of the Kirk of Scotland* (Wodrow Society, 1842), 303-4.
27. Garside, *Zwingli and the Arts*, 39ff, 141ff.
28. A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, pp. 289ff.
29. Coverdale, Humphrey and Sampson to Viret and Beza, *Zurich Letters* (Parker Society), ii.121.
30. *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, ed. A. Peel, i.148.
31. *ibid.* The italics mine. This line of thought went to extreme lengths in the Puritan Separatist congregation at Middleburg in the Netherlands, where Mrs. Francis Johnson was arraigned for her dress, 'First the wearing of a long busk after the fashion of the world contrary to Rom. 12.2, 1 Tim. 2.9 & 10. . . . Bodice tied to the petticoats with points as men do their doublets to their hose, contrary to 1 Thess. 5.22. Conferred with Deut. 22, 1 John 2.16.' C. Burrage, *Early English Dissenters*, 1.160.
32. Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, III.x.8.
33. See above, p. 313.

34. See the brilliant discussion of this changing Puritan emphasis in Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. He shows that the central stream in the Church of England was for moderate reform under a reformed pastoral episcopate, and that under Grindal this position had every hope of binding the Church together. But the Queen's dismissal of Grindal wrecked this hope. Whitgift embarked on a repressive and more Erastian policy with the result that the Presbyterian Puritans could now persuade the non-Presbyterian Puritans, who formed the big majority, that the only way to get reform was by means of a Presbyterian polity.

35. G. Yule, 'The Puritans', in *Service in Christ, Essays presented to Karl Barth on his 80th birthday*, ed. J. I. McCord and T. H. L. Parker, pp. 25-26.

36. G. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, p. 167.

37. When they came to discuss the Form of Church Government, we met in the Committee and the business we did was to collect all the texts where mention of any church officers is', Lightfoot, 'Journal of Proceedings of Assembly of Divines', *Works* (London, 1824), XIII, 21. In the Form of Church Government, note particularly the difficulty of getting proof texts for the setting up of Presbyteries, the casual attention given to Deacons', and the way the proof text to see that ministers are moderators of Church sessions is bolstered up by an appeal to expediency.

38. T. F. Torrance, *The School of Faith*, p. cxl.

39. *The Knowledge of God & The Service of God*, 46.

40. Quoted by Samuel Bolton, *The Arraignment of Error* (Thomson Tracts, British Museum, Jan. 1645 E 318), p. 351.

Each page in this document contains a true word for word unexpurgated transmission of the original essay: "*Continental Patterns and the Reformation in England and Scotland- R.D.B.*", *Essay 13, 1984*. Permission to photocopy, fax or otherwise electronically transmit in unexpurgated form has been granted. Passages may be quoted within the limits of "fair use." Greatest1command.com