

were formulated, one hundred years before, by the Calvinists in France.

In spite, however, of these clearly-outlined traits of resemblance, in their plan of colonization, in the homage they paid to the liberty of conscience, in their morals and in their fundamentals in politics, the Independents and the Huguenots do not occupy the same standpoint. Both are representatives of Calvinism, but each in a different phase of its development. With Robinson, Calvinism is more broadly developed than with de Coligni or La Noue. This has already been shown by the violence and bitterness of the troubles between the Independents and the Presbyterians. For the Presbyterians in England demanded the very thing which the Huguenots proposed in France, both for church and state.

In the church they did not want, what the Independents asked for: a circle of free, autonomic congregations. They demanded a thoroughly-organized ecclesiasticism, in which authority was vested with the synod, and from which the influence and voice of the laity were carefully excluded. In 1559 this fusion of the free congregations into one church union was effected, and only in our century has the appointing power of the boards been abolished. Was this a necessary consequence of the Calvinistic principle? By no means. In Switzerland there was no mention at this time of a synodic bond. During Calvin's lifetime there never was anything more than a consistory in Geneva. Calvin's church was absolutely autonomic. No: the motive for this close organization had another origin; its cause was not ecclesiastical, but political, and was not born of spiritual, but military interests. Consider the times. In 1559, shortly before the conspiracy of Amboise, it was felt that passive endurance had reached its limit, and that the issue was not to be decided but by the sword. The prelude of civil war had begun, and it was well known, that for such a war organization, unity of action and leadership were indispensable, but the idea was not yet born