

THE

# SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. X.]

APRIL, MDCCCLVII.

[NO. I.

---

---

ART. I.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE Protestant reformation proceeded from the practical development of two propositions, the one of which embodied its formal, the other its material principle. The first is, that the Scriptures are the only rule of Christian faith and practice; and the second, that justification before God is solely through the righteousness of Christ, imputed to the believer, without the works of the law. The former of these principles inaugurates the right of private judgment, and rescues the liberties of the church and people of God from the bondage of a usurping priesthood. The latter enunciates a theology, which, whether designated, from its unanimous reception by the divines of the reformation, by the name of "Reformed;" or from its great expounders called Calvinistic, Augustinian, or Pauline, has always proved itself the alone sure basis of a stable faith; and the only reliable fountain of a pure morality.

Viewed in its practical bearings the reformation was characterized by their cardinal features, springing from these principles. These were, the preaching of a Pauline theology, instead of the Pelagianism of the papacy; the vindication of the morality of the divine law, in contrast with the licentiousness of Rome; and the establishment of a scriptural polity and order in the church, in opposition to the hierarchy of a domineering priesthood. The three elements thus indicated, that is, doctrines, morals, and polity, sustain to each other relations exceedingly intimate and almost inseparable. A pure morality has never long survived that

VOL. X.—NO. 1.

1

the House of Representatives, that agreed to urge for them that gigantic measure. Legislative benevolence is always the most fumbling and bungling benevolence in the world. The greatest enemies of the Society and its colonies, need not have desired them any greater misfortune, than the adoption of that mad report would have been. The Society have put their hand to a work whose very magnitude and difficulties should make them sober. Let them beware of rash councils, and hasty plans. Let them eschew the great swelling words to which the writers of their reports, and the orators of their annual meetings have been so much addicted. We know not, nor do they, whether the Providence that brought the negroes here, intends to take them, even those now free, back to Africa or not. If He designs it to be done, His hand will do it, for no mortal's can. If He designs to bless the African race with Christianity, He will do that also, for it is beyond the power of man. And of one thing we may be sure, that the methods by which He will accomplish this latter object, never will be found to be the employment of darkness to enlighten darkness, or corruption to purify corruption. And though He may make use of some of Africa's own children, to raise their mother up from degradation, they will, doubtless, be men who have personally experienced another transformation, than any which a mere removal from America to Africa can work in the Colonists of Liberia.

---

ART. III.—THE MARTYRS OF SCOTLAND AND SIR WALTER SCOTT.

THE martyr age of Scotland begins with the restoration of Charles II. to the thrones of England and of Scotland, in the year 1660. This king was a free-thinker in regard to the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, a Sadducee in regard to a hereafter, and a mixture of the epicurean and the satyr, in relation to the moralities of the present life. He became reconciled to the church of Rome before his death. He was never its very bitter enemy in his life. The epigrammatic point of his reason for the faith that was in him, as to his choice among Protestant churches, has made the saying famous. He was an Episcopalian, he said, because that was "the more gentleman-like persuasion" of them. Men since have smiled, and thought that *gentility* must, indeed, have been prominent, and morality far in the rear, to suit Charles II!!

The atheist Hume gives a pleasing *resumé* of the character of Charles II., part absolutely laudatory, part apologetic, and all

thoroughly fallacious, as might be expected. And he actually snorts with contempt at the pious character of such men as Guthrie, Argyle, Warriston, and Carstairs. The great wonder is, that all men have not seen that Hume speaks of Charles just as a man standing where Hume stood, might be expected to speak of a man standing where Charles II. stood. That must, indeed, be a dull eye and a blunt sense which does not see the ever visible leanings to despotism and to infidelity in Hume's History. *His* praise of Charles, therefore, throws almost as clear a light on what that king really was, as do the filthy records of PEPYS' DAIRY itself.

It was in the reign of this king that two thousand illustrious and holy men—the old non-conformists—were put out of the pulpits in England, on the sad Bartholomew's day, for disagreeing with the king on the point of church government. It was in the reign of this king that Vane, and Russell, and Sydney were judicially murdered, for being the friends of constitutional liberty in Church and State. It was in the reign of this king that the mountains, and the mosses, and the moors of Scotland were made red with the blood of eighteen thousand of her holiest men; and those same mountains, and mosses, and moors, made sacred forever by the glory of those martyrs, because they would not take this king to be the Head of their church, the lord of their conscience, their earthly Pope and spiritual father.

That we may have a better view of the times, we must have patience, therefore, to call up the various witnesses to the character of this king that we may clearly see what right he has to expect his people to bend their religion and their consciences to his command. Who, and what was this Head of the Church of England?

*First Witness, David Hume:* "If we survey the character of Charles II., in the different lights which it will admit of, it will appear various, and give rise to different and even opposite sentiments. When considered as a companion, he appears the most amiable and engaging of men; and, indeed, in this view, his deportment must be allowed altogether unexceptionable. His love of raillery was so tempered with good breeding that it was never offensive: His propensity to satire was so checked with discretion that his friends never dreaded their becoming the object of it: His wit, to use the expression of one who knew him well, and who was himself a good judge, (the Marquis of Halifax,) could not be said so much to be very refined or elevated,—qualities apt to beget jealousy and apprehension in company,—as to be a plain, well-bred, recommending kind of wit. And although he talked, perhaps, more than strict rules of behaviour might permit, men were so pleased with the affable communicative deportment of the monarch that they always went away contented both with him and with themselves.

"This is, indeed, the most shining part of the king's character—and he seems to have been sensible of it—for he was fond of dropping the formality of State, and of relapsing every moment into the companion.

“In the duties of private life, his conduct, though not free from exception, was in the main, laudable. He was an easy generous lover (!!!) a civil and obliging husband, a friendly brother, an indulgent father, and a good natured master. The voluntary friendships, however, which this prince contracted, nay, even his sense of gratitude, were feeble; and he never attached himself to any of his ministers or courtiers with a sincere affection. He believed them to have no motive in serving him but self-interest; and he was still ready, in his turn, to sacrifice them to present ease or convenience.

“With a detail of his private character we must set bounds to our panegyric on Charles. The other parts of his conduct may admit of some apology, but can deserve small applause. He was, indeed, so much fitted for private life, preferably to public, that he even possessed order, frugality, and economy in the former—was profuse, thoughtless, and negligent in the latter. When we consider him as a sovereign, his character, though not altogether destitute of virtue, was in the main dangerous to his people, and dishonourable to himself. Negligent of the interests of the nation, careless of its glory, averse to its religion, jealous of its liberty, lavish of its treasure, sparing only of its blood, he exposed it, by his measures, though he ever appeared but in sport, to the danger of a furious civil war, and even to the ruin and ignominy of a foreign conquest. Yet may all these enormities, if fairly and candidly examined, be imputed, in a great measure, to the indolence of his temper—a fault which, however unfortunate in a monarch, it is impossible for us to regard with great severity.”

This is, indeed, an important witness—a significant testimony. The private life of Charles II. is then the exemplification of what Hume thought “in the main laudable,” and deserving of “panegyric!” We are also compelled to accept this chaste, virtuous, and high-principled king as a specimen, at least for his own times, of those who choose a religion on the *gentility* principle. This man was the Head of the “gentility” church of his day!

WE CALL A *Second Witness*—*T. B. Macaulay*: “On the ignoble nature of the restored exile, adversity had exhausted all her discipline in vain. He had one immense advantage over most other princes. Though born in the purple, he was far better acquainted with the vicissitudes of life and the diversities of character than most of his subjects. He had known restraint, danger, penury, and dependence. He had often suffered from ingratitude, insolence, and treachery. He had received many signal proofs of faithful and heroic attachment. He had seen, if ever man saw, both sides of human nature. But only one side remained in his memory. He had learned only to distrust and despise his species—to consider integrity in man and modesty in woman as mere acting. Nor did he think it worth while to keep his opinion to himself. He was incapable of friendship; yet he was perpetually led by favourites without being in the smallest degree duped by them. He knew that their regard to his interests was all simulated; but from a certain easiness, which had no connection with humanity, he submitted, half-laughing at himself, to be made the tool of any woman whose person attracted him, or of any man whose tattler diverted him. He

thought little, and cared less about religion. He seems to have passed his life in dawdling suspense between Hobbism and Popery. He was crowned in his youth with the covenant in his hand; he died at last with the Host sticking in his throat; and during most of the intermediate years, was occupied in persecuting both Covenanters and Catholics. He was not a tyrant from the ordinary motives. He valued power for its own sake little, and fame still less. He does not appear to have been vindictive, or to have found any pleasing excitement in cruelty. What he wanted was to be amused—to get through the twenty-four hours pleasantly without sitting down to dry business. Sauntering was, as Sheffield expresses it, the Sultana Queen of his Majesty's affections. A sitting in council would have been insupportable to him, if the Duke of Buckingham had not been there to make mouths at the Chancellor. It has been said, and is highly probable, that in his exile, he was quite disposed to sell his rights to Cromwell for a good round sum. To the last his only quarrel with the Parliament was, they often gave him trouble and would not always give him money. If there was a person for whom he felt a real regard that person was his brother. If there was a point about which he really entertained a scruple of conscience or of honour, it was the descent of the crown. Yet he was willing to consent to the Exclusion Bill for 600,000 pounds; and the negotiation was broken off only because he insisted on being paid beforehand. To do him justice, his temper was good; his manners agreeable; his natural talents above mediocrity. But he was sensual, frivolous, false, and cold-hearted, beyond almost any prince of whom history makes mention."

Such is the picture of Charles II. drawn by the pen of the prince of modern historians, in an article in the *Edinburg Review* for 1835, upon MacIntosh. This, too, is just such as might have been expected from a witness intending to be fair, but occupying Macaulay's stand point. It is a first principle of the Christian religion, very often strangely overlooked in hearing the testimony of historians, that he that is not heartily under its spiritual influence does not comprehend the nature of its power, but is actually averse to its spirit. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." This is as true of historians as of other men. Mr. Macaulay never has professed, but often laughed at, evangelicism. He understands almost as little, and seems not to care much more than did Charles II. himself, about the tremendous inward and outward workings of the spiritual powers, and that grand era of conflict between Jesus Christ, as rightful head of the Church, and the World's Prince who claimed to be head of the Church. Some say, Macaulay is not to be trusted at all; because he is superficial, flippant, and obstinate. We think this judgment too severe. He appears to us to be unreliable only when the very actings of the religious principle, in its deep, grave, unearthly moods, is the matter in hand. Of religious loyalty, faith, and conscience; the deep struggles of renewed souls for immortal principles; and of the peculiar conflicts and trials, and gifts from the throne of the Divine grace, to religious souls to die martyrs for

inspired truths, he comprehends little more than David Hume himself. Of course he failed to see the true nature of the conflict between the English dragoons, to execute the decrees of Charles II. as Head of the Church, and the Scottish Covenanters maintaining that the Lord Jesus was Head of the Church. This he failed to see; and no man can be much surprised at it, but one who thinks that historians are not fallen men; or one who thinks that the veils on men's minds, which are woven out of their own spiritual condition, do not apply to writers of history.

*The Third Witness*—the *Pictorial History of England*. By CRAIK and MACFARLANE :

“When the crawling and foot-licking age of loyalty succeeded with the Restoration, there was exhibited by right reverend and most learned prelates, a fanaticism less fervid, indeed, but far more profane and mischievous than that of the Commonwealth—and God, the Church, and the king, became their Trinity, while it was hard to tell which person of the three was the most devoutly worshipped. Then, too, the duties of non-resistance and passive obedience were inculcated as the golden rule of Christian practice, while opposition to monarchy was represented as a crime in which if the sinner died, his salvation was hopeless. In the same way, Charles and his brother were fanatics, who vibrated to the very last between their confessors and their ministers; and those gay and guilty courtiers were fanatics, who even amid their excesses, would sometimes fast and pray and be visited by superstitious impulses more ridiculous than the worst that have been fabled of Cromwell himself.”

And again :

“In this temper of the public mind, the restoration brought with it a tide, not only of levity, but of licentiousness—an inundation of all the debauchery of the French court, in which Charles and his followers had chiefly spent their exile. The strangest scenes were exhibited in the Duchess of Portsmouth's dressing-room, where Evelyn saw this worthless Cleopatra in her loose morning garment, as she had newly got out of bed, while his Majesty and the court gallants were standing about her. In some other points Charles' domestic habits were also very singular. His especial favourites were little spaniels, of a breed that still retains his name—to these he was so much attached that he not only suffered them to follow him everywhere, but even to litter and nurse their brood in his bed-chamber; on account of which the room, and, indeed, the whole Court was filthy and offensive. Court language was in no better taste. Charles, in quarrelling with Lady Castlemaine, called her a *jade*, and she, in return, called him a *fool*; and the first English phrase which the queen learned, and which she applied to her husband was, “you lie.” The levity of the court is strikingly exemplified in the anecdote told by PEPYS, that on the evening of that day of national disgrace, when the Dutch had blocked up the mouth of the Thames and burned the English shipping, Charles was supping with

Lady Castlemaine, at the Duchess of Portsmouth's, where the company diverted themselves with hunting a moth."

This witness speaks from the stand-point of that liberal feeling in Great Britain, in modern times, which gathered chiefly under the lead of the conductors of the *Edinburg Review*—Sydney Smith, Brougham, Jeffrey, and MacIntosh—to put down religious persecution. The work seems in the main, impartial. But failing to distinguish between the persecuting spirit, the lamentable error of almost all Christendom in the seventeenth century, as it is the fault of all other religions, and even of mankind at large, before the benign principle became known that man is not lord of the conscience—these writers seem impartial only in the hatred of all spiritual religion. It appears entirely fair, therefore, to give full credit to this witness, in reference to all matters not connected with the personal experience of spiritual religion.

*Fourth Witness*—WILBERFORCE, *Lord Bishop of Oxford*; taken from his Introduction to *Evelyn's Life of Mrs. Godolphin*. Published in 1847. See *London Quarterly Review*, for September, 1847.

"In the reign of Charles II., that revulsion of feeling which affects nations just as it does individuals, had plunged into dissipation all ranks, on their escape from the narrow austerities and gloomy sourness of Puritanism. The court, as was natural, shared to the full in these new excesses of an unrestrained indulgence—while many other influences led to its wider corruption. The foreign habits contracted in their banishment, by the returning courtiers, were ill-suited to the natural gravity of English manners, and introduced at once a wide-spread licentiousness. The personal character, moreover, of the king helped on the general corruption. Gay, popular, and witty, with a temper nothing could cross, and an affability nothing could repress, he was thoroughly sensual, selfish, and depraved;—vice in him was made so attractive by the wit and gaiety with which it was tricked out, that its utmost grossness seemed, for the time, rather to win than repulse beholders. Around the king clustered a band of congenial spirits, a galaxy of corruption, who spread the pollution on every side. The names of Buckingham and Rochester, of Etheridge, Lyttleton, and Sedley, still maintain a bad preëminence in the annals of English vice. As far as the common eye could reach, there was little to resist the evil."

The wild young Phæton, of the classic fable, could as easily have driven the horses of the chariot of the sun,—Pan and his satyrs could as easily have drawn up a system of orthodox, living, evangelical divinity,—as this king and this court could play the part of Head of such a deep, grave, and vitally religious Church as that of Scotland. The witness is unexceptionable, too, on the points on which we have heard him. He is of that church of which monarchs and ministers of State are still controlling potentates.

*Fifth Witness*—PEPYS' DAIRY ITSELF, as we find the cream of it in the *Edinburg Review*, for November, 1825. This man Pepys can hardly be said to have a stand-point at all. He is a mere flunkey,—a mere moth, buzzing with extatic delight around the lamp of royalty, though that lamp be fed with the very essence of sensual degradation. He says :

“In the privy garden I saw the finest smocks and linen petticoats of my Lady Castlemaine's, laced with rich lace at the bottom, that ever I saw ; and did me good to look at them. Sarah told me how the king dined at Lady Castlemaine's, and supped every day and night last week ; and that the night the bonfires were made, for joy of the queen's arrival, the king was *there* ; that there was no fire at her door, though at all the rest of the doors almost in the street ; which was much observed ; and that the king and she did send for a pair of scales and weighed one another ; and she, being with child, was said to be the heaviest.

“Mr. Pickering tells me the story is very true of a child being dropped at the ball at court ; and that the king had it in his closet a week after, and did dissect it ; and making great sport of it, and said that, in his opinion, it must have been a month and three hours old ; and that whatever others think, he hath the greatest loss, (it being a boy, as he says :) that he hath lost a subject by the business. He told me, also, how loose the court is. Nobody looking after business, but every man his lust and gain ; and how the king is now become besotted upon Mrs. Stewart ; that he gets into corners, and will be with her half an hour together, kissing her, to the observation of all the world ; and she now stays by herself and expects it, as my Lady Castlemaine did use to do ; to whom the king, he says, is still kind.”

Truly the gay cavalier king is, we would think, rather too richly, strongly gay, even for the furious anti-puritanism of Sir Walter Scott. One would hope he was rather too gay to be head even of the church which contended so valiantly for the Book of Sports ; much more, to be head of the Church of Scotland. But let us hear the witness :

“Pierce, do tell me, among other news, the late frolic and debauchery of Sir Charles Sedley and Buckhurst running up and down all the night, almost naked, through the streets ; and at last fighting, and being beat by the watch, and clapped up all night ; and how the king takes their parts ; and my Lord Chief Justice KEELING (the same miscreant who imprisoned the auther of *Pilgrim's Progress* for preaching) hath laid the constable by the heels to answer it next sessions ; which is a horrid shame. Also, how the king and these gentlemen did make the fiddler of Thetford, this last progress, to sing them all the obscene songs they could think of. That the king was drunk at Saxam, with Sedley, Buckhurst, &c., the night that my Lord Arlington came thither, and would not give him audience, or *could not* : which is true ; for it was the night that I was there and saw the king go up to his chamber, and was told that the king had been drinking. He tells me that the king and Lady Castlemaine are quite broken off, and she is



gone away, and is with child, and swears the king shall own it; and she will have it christened in the chapel at White Hall so, and owned for the king's, as other kings have done; or she will bring it into White Hall gallery, and dash the brains of it out before the king's face! He tells me that the king and court were never in the world so bad as they are now, for gaming, swearing, women, and drinking, and the most abominable vices that ever were in the world; so that all must come to nought."

What a luscious and generous escape from Puritanism this was! But he proceeds:

"They came to Sir G. Carteret's house, at Cranbourne, and there were entertained and all made drunk; and being all drunk, Armerer did come to the king, and swore to him by God. 'Sir,' says he, 'you are not so kind to the Duke of York, of late, as you used to be.' 'Not I?' says the king. 'Why so?' 'Why,' says he, 'if you are, let us drink his health.' 'Why let us!' says the king. Then he fell on his knees and drank it; and having done, the king began to drink it. 'Nay, sir,' says Armerer, 'by God you must do it on your knees.' So he did, and then all the company—and having done it, all fell a crying for joy, being all maudlin and kissing one another! the king the Duke of York, and the Duke of York the king! and in such a maudlin pickle as never people were; and so passed the day."

We now wish to recall one of the witnesses for a moment—Mr. MACAULAY—and hear a few sentences from his article on the *Comic Dramatists of the Restoration*. Published in the *Edinburg Review*, for 1841. He says:

"We can at present hardly call to mind a single English play, written before the civil war, in which the character of a seducer of married women is represented in a favorable light. We remember many plays in which such persons are baffled, exposed, covered with derision, and insulted by triumphant husbands. Such is the fate of Falstaff, with all his wit and knowledge of the world.

"On the contrary, during the forty years which followed the Restoration, the whole body of the dramatists invariably represent adultery—we do not say as a peccadillo—we do not say as an error which the violence of passion may excuse—but as the calling of a fine *gentleman*—as a grace without which his character would be imperfect. It is assential to his breeding and his place in society that he should make love to the wives of his neighbors, as that he should know French, or that he should have a sword at his side. In all this there is no passion, and scarcely any thing that can be called preference. The hero intrigues just as he wears a wig; because if he did not, he would be a queer fellow, a city prig, perhaps a puritan. All the agreeable qualities are always given to the gallant. All the contempt and aversion are the portion of the unfortunate husband."

To be of the "gentleman-like persuasion" in such times, we submit, is rather an equivocal compliment.

Keeping our attention still fixed on the great quarrel in Scot-

land, which we are endeavoring to approach understandingly, one more witness must be introduced. His testimony relates more specially to the subject-matter of the quarrel, that is—the determination of king Charles II. to compel the Scottish people to become Episcopalians.

When Sir Walter Scott was called to account for his singular misconceptions of Scottish Church History, in a series of articles, by McCRIE, in the *Christian Instructor*, he defended himself, by reviews of some of his own works, published in the *Quarterly Review*, in London. In those defences, he quoted *Kirkton's Church History* as his authority. We will, therefore, take Sir Walter's witness in relation to the ecclesiastical character of Charles II.

*Sixth Witness—Kirkton*: “The king, (Charles II.,) even as his father, was resolute for bishops, notwithstanding his oath to the contrary; he knew well bishops would never be reprovers of the court, and the first article of their catechism was non-resistance. They were men of that discretion as to dissemble great men's faults, and not so severe as the Presbyterians. They were the best tools for tyranny in the world; for do a king what he would, their daily instruction was kings could do no wrong, and that none might put forth a hand against the Lord's anointed and be innocent. The king knew also he could be sure of their vote in Parliament, desire what he would; and that they would plant a set of ministers which might instill principles of loyalty into the people, till they turned them first slaves, then beggars. They were all for the king's absolute power, and most of them for the universal propriety, and to make the people believe the king was lord of all their goods without consent of Parliament; and for these reasons—and such as these—they were so much the darlings of our kings, that king James was wont to say ‘no bishop, no king.’ So bishops the king would have at any rate.

“Meanwhile the king's character stood so high in the opinion and idolatrous affections of the miserable people of Scotland (they were far away and knew him not) that a man might more safely have blasphemed Jesus Christ than derogate in the least from the glory of his perfections. People would never believe he was to introduce bishops till they were settled in their seats; and there was a certain man had his tongue bored for saying the Duke of York was a papist, which the priests at London would not believe upon his coronation day; and that day he first went to mass, fourteen of them choosed for their text, Psalm cxviii: 22.—(‘The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner,’)—making him the corner-stone of the Protestant religion.

“As for Charles, many times did the ministers of Scotland, and even many godly men among them, give the Lord hearty thanks that we had a gracious Protestant king, though, within a few years, he published it to the world that he lived a secret papist all his life, and died a professed one with the hostie in his mouth.” *History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 132.

If the reader has in his mind a picture of the character of Charles II., then we are ready to proceed to the real thing before

us, that is—the forcible alteration of the Scottish Church government from Presbytery to Episcopacy, by the authority of the king's supremacy in Church as well as in State. Charles II. was the acknowledged Head of the Church of England. All her Protestant monarchs had been so acknowledged since Henry VIII. Why the Church of England never complained of her head, when he was such as this man, let those answer who have the means and inclination so to do. It seems to us to be a most biting reproach to the English bishops that they never once recalcitrated against Charles II. as the Head of the Church. How much lower *could* they have bowed to sin?

The Scottish Church refused to acknowledge the king as its head. They would obey him in civil matters—not in spiritual matters. They acknowledged him as Chief of the State, not as Head of the Church.

The famous act of supremacy did “assert, enact and declare that his Majesty hath supreme authority and supremacy over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical within his kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, the ordering and disposal of the external government and policy of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty and his successors, as an inherent right of the Crown.”

It would seem that nothing could be much clearer to a sober mind, in our day, than the principle that the civil government is supreme in civil matters, and that the Lord Jesus alone is supreme in matters of conscience in religious matters. *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.* This principle gives clear light against the corrupt *Seward* and *Sumner* doctrine of modern times; that the civil government *is not* supreme in civil affairs, on the one hand; and equally clear light against the corrupt Jacobite doctrine of the seventeenth century, that the civil government *is* supreme in religious matters. It is astonishing that, even under such kings as Henry VIII, Charles II., and George IV., the high-bred and learned English prelates should have continued, up to this day, to hold to this principle of the supremacy of the king in religious matters. But it is true that they do hold to it yet. This doctrine in England sprung from the peculiar nature of the reformation in that country. The reformation there, as is well known, sprung from the divorce of Henry VIII., and was conducted chiefly by Act of Parliament. It was, in a great measure, a political affair. It was a mere revolt from a chief-priest who dwelt upon the Tiber, and could have no lawful wife at all, to a chief-priest who dwelt upon the Thames, and would have what wives he chose—a revolt from a priest-pope to a king-pope—save, and except, indeed, what the word of God did among the people, which was often against the Acts of Parliament.

The story of the Scottish Church had been far different. The

Reformation in Scotland was in the main, a revival of religion, a work of the word of God, made powerful by the Spirit of God. It was such as the reformations on the continent were. It was such as the reformation at the day of Pentecost was. It was produced by spiritual, not carnal weapons. It was conducted by spiritual and religious men. The politicians were merely its protectors. They were not its fathers and its martyrs, as they were in England. The union of the crowns of England and Scotland, in the dynasty of the Stuart's, brought this principle of the supremacy of civil authorities in ecclesiastical matters, to trial in Scotland. The attempt of Charles II. to compel Scotland into Episcopacy put the matter to immediate issue.

In the month of August, 1661—the same year on which Sir Harry Vane was put to death for republicanism, and the Marquis of Argyle for Presbyterianism—the same year on which the body of Oliver Cromwell was dug up from the grave and publicly hung at Tyburn, by the chaste religious and patriotic court of Charles II.—in the month of August of that year, Charles II. sent a letter to the Scottish Council of State, in which, after reciting the inconvenience of the Presbyterian form of government, and asserting its inconsistency with monarchy, he says: "Wherefore, we declare our firm resolution to interpose our royal authority for restoring the Church of Scotland to its right government by bishops, as it was before the late troubles." The tory writers have pleaded to this, that it was a simple repeal of the recent laws which established the Presbyterian church, and a leaving of those old laws in force which established Episcopacy—only the king of England was the head of the bishops instead of the pope of Rome. The answer to this is, that there never were any Protestant bishops in Scotland before the late troubles, but nominal bishops, *tulchan* bishops, put there by ungodly patrons to draw the revenues of the old sees. Knox, Melville and Henderson are sufficient proof that the stroke of the word of God, on regenerate Christian conscience, always sent forth a Presbyterian sound in Scotland. And it is also alleged, in extenuation, that this violent change in the Scottish Church government was sanctioned by the Scottish Parliament. So it was, with the aid of a corrupt packing of the Parliament, and then not without threats and intimidation. All pretence of excuse for the Act on the ground of the consent of the governed is swept away completely, by the fact that the Church of Scotland herself bled and groaned forth her opposition for twenty years. She never did agree to it.

As to the attitude in which the royal satyr, who was kissing my Lady Castlemaine and Mrs. Stewart in corners, and carousing with Sedley and Buckhurst in drunken brawls, appears in this grave Scottish transaction, of course his attitude is sorry. Few readers, however, will fail to be surprised, on being reminded

how sorry is the attitude in which he appears. The Scottish people had felt a deep and tender loyalty to Charles II. long before his restoration in England, on account of his misfortunes, and because he was the heir of their *own* ancient line of kings. He had been proclaimed king of Scotland ten years before he was acknowledged king of England. Cromwell's crowning mercy of Dunbar had awakened him from that dream of hope. But not before he had published to the world his famous *Dumferline Declaration*, in August, 1650—which may be found at length in Wodrow. On that occasion he vowed that he was a conscientious Presbyterian, and after subscribing the covenants, or mutual bonds in which the Presbyterians of that day bound themselves to each other, he voluntarily added the following clause: "And his Majesty having, upon a full persuasion of the justice and equity of all the heads and articles thereof, now sworn and subscribed, the national covenant of the kingdom of Scotland, and the solemn league and covenant of the three kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, doth declare that he hath not sworn and subscribed those covenants, and entered into the oath of God with his people, upon any sinister intention of crooked design for attaining his own ends, but so far as human weakness will permit, in the truth and sincerity of his heart, and that he is firmly resolved, in the Lord's strength, to adhere thereto, and to prosecute to the utmost of his power all the ends thereof in his station and calling, really, constantly, and sincerely, all the days of his life."

The only apology he ever offered, as far as is known—for what appears about the basest instance of perjury in history—is found in the flippant jest already mentioned, about the "gentleman-like persuasion!"

Few of the Scottish noblemen had submitted to the government of Cromwell—or as submitting to the government of Cromwell was called—*taken the tender*. A faithful loyalty to their hereditary line of kings had prevented the Scottish noblemen from going over to Cromwell in any considerable numbers. It is hardly necessary to tell the intelligent reader, that the ingenious slander against them that they sold their king, Charles I., to the English Parliament, has been thoroughly exploded by the *dates*, which prove that the corruption imputed was impossible. One of the few Scottish noblemen who did take the tender, forsake the fortunes of the Stuart's, totally, and go thoroughly over to Cromwell, was James Graham, Marquis of Montrose, who afterwards betrayed the Covenanters in turn, went back to the king, and became such a pink of royalist chivalry as to become a prime favourite of the author of *Waverly*.

About as few of the Scottish clergy as of the Scottish nobles had taken the tender. Cromwell's Independents were regarded

by them as the ultra-puritans, which they have since shown themselves to be in New England. We are sorry they did not at once imbibe the spirit of religious liberty which breathed from the soul of that great-hearted Paladin of spiritual christendom. But he was too revolutionary, too levelling, too unconservative for the greater part of them. Among the few of the clergy who did take the tender, and join in the ultra-puritanism of Cromwell's army, was the Reverend JAMES SHARP. This brought him into personal intercourse with the Protector. On one occasion he and Cromwell had a long conversation. Grim old Great Heart had a far keener eye to look into the hearts of men, even while he was delivering himself of his winding and parenthetical sentences, than such a man as Sharp could stand. Cromwell never liked Sharp. He declared, after that conversation, that he believed Sharp to be an atheist at bottom.

When the agitations and negotiations were going on at London, after the abdication of Richard Cromwell, and during the hesitation of Monk and his army, as to what was to be done, Sharp was sent up thither, as the agent or ambassador of the Presbyterians, to see that they might obtain protection under the new government, whatever it might be. While Charles was at Breda, making abundance of those fair promises which were to be kept like the Dumferline Declaration, Sharp was sent over there to look after the interest of the Scottish Church. And after the bringing in of the king in 1660, Sharp was still the trusted agent of the Scottish Church near Charles II. When lovers break off, the letters which pass between them in their days of harmony, often tell awkward tales upon one party or the other. Sharp's letters to the Presbyterian ministers of Edinburg, while he was their accredited ambassador to Breda and to London, are preserved in the introduction to Wodrow's History. It is the most cleanly cut and deeply engraved monument, to his own infamy, that any man known to history has erected in writing. There will never be any need for the chisel of Old Mortality to touch that monument, while the English letters are legible, and human reason has her throne in society. As soon as it was certainly known that the king intended to break the covenant of his youth with the people of Scotland, undertake that singular job for such a man as he, the dragooning of those people from one religion to another, Sharp instantly became a convert to Episcopacy. With the very letters of credence and of confidence of the Presbyterians in his pocket, he at once received and accepted the Archbishoprick of St. Andrews, which constituted him at once the arch-enemy, and the arch-persecutor of those whose trusted agent and vowed friend and brother he was up to that time. His being in possession of the counsels, designs, and full confidence of the Presbyterians, enabled him to be, what he immediately became, the

most exquisitely cruel, and stinging, and unrelenting of their persecutors.

Among our American Jacobites, and sympathizers with the measures of Charles II., there is found a remarkable want of information concerning the plainest facts of the history of the period. Some think the Covenanters were merely rebels on a civil account, and that good king Charles, and dear bishop Sharp, had never done any harm to the horrid Covenanters! The writer has himself heard an Episcopal lady strive hard to make capital out of the Presbyterian persecution of Sharp!! She knew evidently not a word of his treachery—not a word of the private licentiousness of his character at St. Andrews—not a word of his bribe.

In this connection, it becomes a matter of a little curious interest to notice what account is given of the troubles in Scotland in the reign of Charles II., in the *Waverley Novels*, from which some of our Jacobites boast that they derive their whole stock of Scottish Church History. The principal historic sketch of those times which he gives, is introductory to *Old Mortality*, and commences with the second chapter of that romance. It begins thus:

“Under the reign of the last Stuarts, there was an anxious wish, on the part of the Government, to counteract, by every means in their power, the strict or puritanical spirit which had been the chief characteristic of the Republican Government, and to revive those feudal institutions which united the vassal to the leige-lord, and both to the crown.” And thus the sketch proceeds for a page or two, as every reader may see, by turning to that fascinating and ubiquitous romance. Now, although the scene of this romance is laid just after the assassination of Sharp, though Sharp is the martyr-lamb of the whole story, though Balfour of Burley is the big black fiend, the hero of pitch, of the book, yet no man could gather from any place of the whole work that is remembered or can be found, any thing of Sharp’s bright, sweet history in London, or any thing of the real nature of the troubles in Scotland, in the effort of the Government to force the consciences and change the religion of that people. Throughout those fascinating romances the Scottish troubles are represented as the restlessness of *civil* rebellion and turbulence, against a reasonable and paternal Government! And such many American Jacobites, who have not met with other and better information, seem really and honestly to believe them to have been!

But with what feelings could an American, thus apologizing for his countrymen as well as might be, read an article which appeared in *Blackwood’s Magazine*, for November, 1847, entitled *Magus Muir*—the place at which Sharp was assassinated, signed W. E. A., the initials of Professor Aytoun, the reputed editor of that magazine, in which, without mention of either Sharp’s public

or his private baseness, he is held up as a saint and a martyr. It seems to us to complete the list of that hagiology on which stand the names of Archbishop Laud and Charles I. Laud—Charles I.—and Sharp—it seems the very apotheosis of baseness. Pity for the interests of this martyr-roll, that Charles II. and Sir Charles Sedley had not been put to death somehow or other, instead of dying, as they did, in the private rottenness of their infamy. Their names would have greatly enriched the list of martyrs for anti-puritanism. And this gilding of corruption, and murder of historic truth, has been the great deed of modern genius! How precious a gift is genius! Yet how weak are they who are thus misled by its false and illusory glare! And how fearful are their responsibilities who, by its bright torch, undertake, Salmeon-like, to eclipse the radiance of the sun of truth!

Sharp was assassinated on Magus Moor, in 1679, by a company of men who were lying in wait for Carmichael, an infamous creature and tool of the Archbishop, whom they expected would pass that way. The act was a foul crime, and a piece of wretched and short-sighted policy; and was so regarded by the best and purest of the party—the Covenanters—to which these men claimed to be attached. Not that any man in his senses, and in possession of the commonest facts in the history and antecedents of the man, can for a moment doubt that Sharp deserved death, if man ever deserved it. He, the false and treacherous instrument of the death of thousands, whose blood was at that very time flowing all over the west of Scotland, under the broadswords and pistols of Claverhouse and the English dragoons, for the offences of a strict religion and a strict morality—he surely deserved death far more than they—unless, indeed, Jacobism and genius can avail to overturn Mount Sinai and eternal Law also, as well as to bribe and make drunk the muse of historic truth. But Archbishop Sharp did not die by the sentence of a legal tribunal, and after fair trial. Therein, really, lies the crime of his fall. But Archbishop *Laud* did die by the sentence of a legal tribunal and after fair trial, and they have made a martyr of him. Charles I. did die by the sentence of a legal tribunal and after a fair trial, and they have made a martyr of him!

But can any one conjecture what idea there probably is in the mind of that All-seeing God, who looks down from heaven with a recording eye upon the memory of his saints and the truth of their transmitted good names, concerning that history and that romance which make a martyr of such a man as Sharp, and forget or conceal the martyred blood, and the unspotted good names of the host of godly men then dying on mosses and moors, by the pistol of military execution—Guthrie, Argyle, Warriston, Cameron, and thousands of others, eighteen thousand saints in all, says the smallest estimate, dying for their religion—offered



life any day, any of them, if they would swear a profane oath, or blaspheme God, or deny the Lord Jesus Christ? It is an awful question, and to be fearfully answered on that strange and grand day, when the sins of acted history, and the sins of the records of history, come to be displayed to the light of truth, and to the consciences of an intelligent universe.

But we have slightly anticipated. The master-piece of the Government, for the ruin of the Covenanters, was that famous INDULGENCE, for their scruples about accepting which, the gay and gifted Sir Walter Scott holds them up to such virtuous and paternal reproach. Its alliance with the arbitrary government of Charles, the miserably shabby moral character of the bishops, (with the single exception of Archbishop Leighton,) and its dependence for propagation on the pistols of Claverhouse, and his dragoons—those Sharp's-rifle-evangelists of the seventeenth century—these things were stripping the Episcopal movement in Scotland of all the small amount of moral force which it may have had at first among the people. In addition to these considerations, the moral character of the persecuted stood out in very striking and very telling contrast to that of the persecutors. Some device must be fallen upon, to take off some of the colour of ungodly violence which the movement bore every where, or else the failure of that movement was evident and impending. The indulgence was such a device, to the credit of the invention of which, we believe, that Archbishop Sharp is confessedly entitled.

This was an ecclesiastical proclamation or edict of the king, openly avowing itself to depend for its authority upon the king's supremacy in matters of religion; and offering the privilege of a kind welcome back into the church to all such Presbyterian ministers as would acknowledge the principle of the royal supremacy. They were wretchedly impoverished. They were hunted by dragoons upon the moors and upon the hills. Why should a mere abstraction prevent them from returning to the church? The act would put bread into the mouths of their famishing wives and children. There is hardly another nation on the face of the earth, in which the device would not have been completely successful. There are numbers of men, every where, who make a boast of their practicability,—who laugh at abstraction, and call all principle, abstraction;—and who almost advertize themselves as for sale, in the market of short-sighted expediency. All such would have taken the indulgence with a rush. But the indulgence involved the very principle for which the Covenanters were contending, the only principle worth contending for in the whole business—the principle that Charles II. could not alter the Bible; and bind men's consciences with new obligations in religious matters. The indulgence granted subsistence and a place in the church, to such as would barely acknowledge the king's religious

supremacy, that is—such as would accept a benefice without acknowledging the bishops' authority. And none could accept it at its lowest terms, and return, in any way, and “keep kirk-sessions, presbyteries, and synods,” except, said the edict, “in our name and by our authority.” But high privileges were granted to such of the ejected ministers as would return and accept, not only the king's indulgence, but the bishops' collation, and so not only acknowledge the religious power of the king, but the ecclesiastical authority of the bishops also.

This was, indeed, a master-piece of the serpentine cunning which the writers of the period ascribe to Sharp. It was sure to divide the Presbyterians. Some in other countries might have been expected to accept it completely, and go wholly over to Episcopacy. But as good as none did this in Scotland. Some would acknowledge the king, but not the bishops. And some would take the plain, but fearfully-trying ground of downright truth and principle, and acknowledge neither. So there would be a variety of parties among them. Eighty clergymen were mentioned, by names, as indulged. They were to confine themselves to their own parishes—to celebrate the communion on the same day all over a diocese to prevent concert among them—and not to depart from their diocese without leave from the bishop.

Would that it could be written that not a man of them accepted it at all! And yet the reader of the *Tales of My Landlord*, will remember to what derision their *Macbriars*, and their *Muckleoraths*, and their *Pound Texts* are held up in that work of wonderful genius, because they would not all permit themselves to be lured into what all men now admit, was an insidious Episcopacy, involving the denial of every principle which they held peculiarly dear. It was with a pang of sadness, gradually changing itself into the most thorough contempt, that the writer first saw the fact, since perfectly obvious to him, that the author of *Old Mortality* takes it as his first principle that the Scottish and the English people *ought* to have accepted whatever changes in their religious faith and conscientious obligations king Charles chose to make; and that he actually deals blame and praise to the parties respectively, as they accept the king as lord of their conscience, or do not accept him. It will be a first principle of the most hideous bad odour in coming years. Let every man who perceives it, free his garments from it in good time.

But there is another feature about this indulgence, not to be forgotten in estimating the *animus* of those who granted it. The courtiers of Scotland, who were called lords of the clergy, actually became alarmed for fear too many of the Presbyterians would accept the indulgence, and that thus their bishops would not have vacant benefices enough to reward those who hungered for the spoils of the ejection! We do not know that this histori-

cal fact has been disputed, or is disputable. We use it on the authority of WODROW, and quote it in his words. Vol. 2., p. 131 :

“In this interval, the lords of the clergy, and some of their orthodox ministers, had a meeting to fall upon means to *hinder the indulgence*, which they apprehended would be ruining to their interests. No practical measures could be proposed to prevent it altogether, since the king had made known his pleasure ; but bishop Sharp, to comfort his brethren, promised to do his utmost to make it a bone of contention to the Presbyterians. Indeed, he wanted not abundance of serpentine subtilty ; and when his attempts to break it altogether failed, he set himself with all vigour to have it so clogged, from time to time, as to break ministers and people of the Presbyterian judgment among themselves.”

And yet Sharp is the virtuous and illustrious martyr of Old Mortality, and these men whom he set himself, with all vigor, to break up and divide among themselves, that his *brethren might get the spoils* of their Church, are perverse rebels, whom fanaticism would not permit to be quiet under the mildest and most virtuous of monarchs. We rather think it would take all the gentility of “the more gentleman-like persuasion,” and all the genius of the Waverly romances, to reconcile us to such martyrs as Sharp, and such men of honour as Sir Walter Scott. And, yet, we await with great cheerfulness, the coming, in the realms of history, of Talus, the iron man of truth, with his fearful flail “to beat down falsehood, and the truth unfold.”

The reader will find the Presbyterian church reviled for its *republican* tendencies during the whole time of the dynasty of the Stuarts in Great Britain.

When the Presbyterian and Episcopal divines met together for conference, at the Restoration, to see if there was a chance of accommodation or compromise, the Presbyterians objected to the government of the church by a single person. The Episcopalians replied that “they wondered they should except against the government by one single person, which, if applied to the civil magistrate, is a most dangerous insinuation.”\* It is well known that the attachment of king James I. and king Charles II. to Episcopacy, was on a political account, as it agreed with their ideas of monarchy, and that in the far-famed and classic phrase of the British Solomon, “presbytery agreed with monarchy as God with the devil.”† Hume, MacIntosh, Macaulay, Sir Walter Scott, and a vast multitude of authorities and quotations might be heaped up upon this point. They would be useless, because well known to any one acquainted at all with the tenor of British

\* Neal's Puritans, 2., 572.

† Pictorial History, Book 7., pp. 444, 446.

historians. We can hardly undertake those who know no history but the romances. The climate of their Bœotia is too thick for us at the present. The reader will find as neat a little specimen as he has often seen, of the art of carrying water on both shoulders, in the late Episcopal tract entitled, "Why I am a Churchman," wherein certain beautiful analogies are pointed out, between the constitution of the Episcopal Church and that of the American Republic!! We wondered as we read, whether the writer had forgotten the bold and eloquent champion of his cause in the reign of Charles II.—he that spoke of blind and glorious old Milton as "the Latin Secretary, the blind adder—and of Charles II. as "the *ne plus ultra* of all regal excellency"—Dr. ROBERT SOUTH—and his vehement assaults on the covenant as republican, in his anniversary sermon on the day of the death of Charles I., in the memorable year 1662;—and his splendid and triumphant declaration, in his fifth sermon, that "*the Church of England glories in nothing more than that she is the truest friend to kings and to kingly government of any other church in the world.*" It is a little awkward sometimes, to attempt to steer both sides of the same breakers; to ride both sides of the same tree; to be both hound and hare according to the fortune of the chase.

But the Presbyterians defended themselves from the charge of republicanism in the seventeenth century, in Scotland, and pointed to their deep and earnest loyalty towards their ancient line of kings. They did not confess the charge of republicanism under a monarchy; for that would be synonymous with rebellion. But they claimed then, and they claim now, they claimed in Scotland, and they claim in America, to be constitutionalists under all governments. The title of the famous book of old Samuel Rutherford—*Lex Rex*, which, by the way, it is said, has never been answered, and never can be fairly answered—that famous work which king Charles II. graced with the honour of being burnt by the hangman at the market-cross, the title of that noble book was, indeed, the motto of all their struggles for liberty. The condition of Britain at the present time demonstrates, with all honour to her noble races of men, that liberty may exist under a government of law, even though administered by a king. Indeed, it is hardly probable that the Covenanters of Scotland, or the parliamentarians of England, would have rebelled against the Stuarts on a merely civil account. But they could not make a Stuart the lawgiver of their consciences and their religion. And the mighty God who works his deep designs in wondrous ways, bound civil liberty close around religion, as the golden circle around the jewel, so that in securing the one, which he saw they never would quietly let go, they secured the other too. They could not permit a Stuart to be the ape of the Lord Jesus, as a

Romanist permits the pope to be, and lay the rude hands of carnal and sensual laws upon the mysteries of man's religious soul.

But, in truth, the course of events very soon refuted the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance which the bishops had so sedulously preached to the Scottish people during the Episcopal dragonade in that country. James II., unfortunately for their logic, was a Roman Catholic. Never were principles more thoroughly refuted by adverse necessity than theirs were by the regular legal succession to the throne. If the Scotch had no right to resist the compulsory Episcopacy of Charles II., then the English had no right to resist the compulsory Romanism of James II. If it was wrong to resist Charles in Scotland, it was wrong, by precise parity of reasoning, to dethrone James in England. The parallel is far worse than equal for the bishops. James' offence was a suspension of the laws enforcing Episcopacy. His sin against them was his ceasing to persecute in their behalf. He suspended the laws, by usurped power, so as to grant toleration to papists and covenanters. Then they deserted, dethroned, defeated, and drove him away. Charles' offence was a rigorous administration of executive decrees, establishing Episcopacy where the people did not desire it. He persecuted the Covenanters to drive them to a faith strange and hateful to them. They never preached passive obedience. They seldom practiced civil rebellion. They made a sort of *passive resistance*, if that is an allowable idea. The Cameronians, or *hill-people*, alone, disowned the civil authority of the king. But if it was right and proper to drive off the king of England for being a Roman Catholic, would it not have been precisely as right to drive off the king of Scotland for being an Episcopalian? Is there any imaginable difference, except that the bishops were on the winning side in one case and not in the other? All honour to the English people for that manly bravery with which they cast off the meshes of that slavish logic, when their religious rights were in danger. All those rights, save the right to persecute the Scotch, were worth preserving, even at the expense of the expulsion of a graceless bigot from the great Protestant throne. It is strange and sad that their zealot Tories, to this day, have not caught the noble and generous idea of giving equal honour to the Scottish people, for simply disobeying the sorrier of the two brothers, in his attempts to overthrow their faith. The act of the English church and people, in 1668, went much farther than a full sanction to the patient refusal to apostatise, of the Scottish church and people during the previous twenty-eight years. So certain are erroneous and one-sided principles, of a practical refutation, when men are required themselves to live by principles which they manufacture for others.

Here it may be observed how different were the circumstances under which the Presbyterian system was attempted to be set up in England, in the time of the commonwealth, from the circumstances under which the Episcopal system was attempted to be set up in Scotland in the reign of Charles II. The Presbyterian system proposed to the English was the Westminster Confession—a system formed by a body of *English* divines, convoked by *English* civil authorities. There were not a dozen Scots in that large assembly. The solemn league and covenant was a voluntary bond entered into by the English, Scottish, and Irish peoples, to adopt that system, as a more complete reformation of the church. The Scottish people swore to adopt it, and did adopt it. To this day, the fact stands out broadly in British church history, that the Scottish Confession of Faith is a book furnished them by an assembly of English divines. Truly, it is not easy to see how this solemn league and covenant was a persecutor of the English. If the English Episcopalians were persecuted, it was by English Presbyterians, not Scottish.

The Episcopal system attempted to be set up by military force in Scotland was foreign to the whole Scottish mind. It was the Romish system restored. It was reactionary. It was a lapse from reformation. It was never assented to at all by an ecclesiastical assembly in Scotland, but was professedly based on the claim of royal supremacy in religious matters, and was ratified only in a Scottish Parliament, composed of the profligate tools of a more profligate king.

The reason for which presbytery was attempted to be set up in England was that it was a more perfect reformation of the church than the old system; and, in the language of David Hume, that "that form of ecclesiastical government is more favourable to liberty than to royal power." The reason for which Episcopacy was attempted to be set up in Scotland, was that it was regarded as a form of ecclesiastical government more favorable to royal power, and especially to the peculiar ideas of royal power entertained by the house of Stuart. Both these propositions could be established by a very large number of authorities and references, which will occur without difficulty to the memory of the reader well informed in the history of the seventeenth century.

When Episcopal ministers were ejected from their parishes in England, in the times of the commonwealth, it was, as a general thing, for a dissolute moral character, for shameful incompetency to teach, or for a denial of fundamental doctrines. Old Fuller, the witty historian, almost as zealous a royalist as South himself, was admitted to a living by Cromwell's Court of Triers. The reader who has met with the morceau, will hardly have forgotten how the jolly old clerical wit, amused himself afterwards with the questions the Triers asked him on the subject of the new

birth. That subject he treats very much with the sharp and scorning wit with which Dickens treats it in the *Pickwick* papers. He evidently got through the Court of Triers by means of equivocations and double-entendres. Many an other as good an Episcopalian, and far better Christian than he, was admitted to the comprehensive church of the commonwealth. The court was not authorized to inquire into a man's views of church government. The conclusion is, therefore, irrefragable, that when Episcopalians were excluded it was not as Episcopalians, but as men of unsound tenets, incompetent qualifications, or scandalous lives. Surely, this was a very righteous sort of persecution with which old protector Great-Heart visited that dissolute body of men.

When Presbyterian ministers were ejected from their parishes in Scotland, in the times of Charles II., it was, as a general thing, for the unflinching strictness of their morality, and the deep conscientiousness of their piety. No contrast could be better established in point of fact than this. None could be more telling in its import. When one of the Covenanters was brought before a magistrate to be committed to prison, if he or she exhibited signs of piety by abstaining from the vices of the licentious speech of the age, the commitment was made out at once without waiting for forms of law. But if the accused threw out a profane oath, the court laughed, and at once discharged the prisoner, as not the game for which they were in search. In all their proceedings, in pursuance of the king's proclamation concerning church government, piety led to conviction, open vice led to acquittal. Those who were put into the English church in the place of the ejected, were men of great piety and learning: as the names of Owen, Baxter, Howe, Flavel, Bates, Alleine and a host of kindred spirits abundantly testify. Those who were put into the Scottish church, in the place of the ejected, were—with the single exception of Leighton, the good—men whose names have never been on the records of learning, piety, or talent; and have perished from the memory of none. The outcry which the tory writers make about the drumming of these worthless curates out of Scotland, at the coming in of William III., must be a desperate resort. They had no right to the stipend by any just law,—no personal merit,—no hold upon the affections of the people. Their blood was not spilled. They were simply laughed, drummed, or as it was called, *rabbled* away. Those who were ejected from the church of England, at the Restoration, were the best, purest, holiest, most-learned men of the land. The act of uniformity, and the five-mile act were intended to hunt them from the face of the earth.

It was a wide and unfortunate mistake of the civil government, during the times of the English commonwealth, that they undertook to produce sanctity of manners by legislation. They had taken the English idea of the oneness of Church and State,

and had puritanized it, and spiritualized it. Many more of them, besides the mad Fifth-Monarchy men, dreamed of the reign of king Jesus upon earth, and a code of laws drawn directly from the pure wells of Gospel truth; and of the administration of laws by the hands of the saints. Civil laws, however, can never safely or properly go farther than the promotion of public decency and social morality. Men can not be made either moral, or religious, or holy, by legislation of any kind. The error of the reign of the saints, was that they thought they could promote sanctity by law. This gave rise to the hypocrisy with which they have been charged. Unholy and profane men, who thought all holiness was but hypocrisy and pretence, as unholy and profane men often do think, and who, therefore, did not scruple to pretend it, when they did not possess it, seeing that sanctity of manners was the passport to civil emolument, crept in among the puritans, and brought reproach upon them. But it seems very clear and easy reasoning, that it was not the puritan himself who was justly entitled to bear this reproach of hypocrisy. The real puritan had no need to pretend to be a puritan. The real Christian has no need for the cloak of christianity. But it was the man of loose morals, and of low ideas of the sacredness of holy things, from the anti-puritan ranks, who practiced this hypocrisy; who alone had need of it; and whose civil promotion depended on it. Puritans may be fanatics. They sometimes have been. They often are in modern times. But it is an impossible thought that men were hypocrites who dared, and suffered, and were brave, and denied themselves, and raised the dignity of the State, and spread the reign of morals, thrift and industry around, as did Cromwell and his saints. If so, then hypocrisy made the deepest impression for good, which has ever been made by any one else's sincerity, on the destinies of England;—which is a contradiction.

But the wider and more unfortunate mistake of the civil government, in England and in Scotland, under Charles II. was, that it levelled all the artillery of the law *against* holiness, sanctity, conscience, religion, and against all strictness, and self-denial of morals and of manners. Self-denial was the emblem and the watchword of the commonwealth. Joyous license to do as one would, was the prevailing principle of the restoration. The one was the reign of the saints and prophets. The other was the reign of the fiends and satyrs. The one attempted, erroneously and extravagantly, to legislate holiness into men's hearts. The other attempted, blasphemously, to legislate holiness and conscientiousness out of the land. Oliver Cromwell dictating to the "Latin Secretary," the epistle which was a shield of defence around the Protestants of Savoy, is an emblematic scene of the commonwealth. Charles II. hunting a moth, and writing letters of urgency to Claverhouse and Dalziel to hunt and slay the Pro-



testants of Scotland, is a scene emblematic of the Restoration. Cromwell may have prayed too long; but was never drunk. Charles II. was drunk about as often, probably, and as long, as Cromwell prayed. And Charles never prayed at all that we know of.

The men who resisted presbytery in England were, as a general thing, the advocates of despotic government, the Buckingham, the Lauds, the Straffords, and the Mainwarings. They were remarkable for their lofty views of kingly authority, and their low ideas of virtue, conscience, duty, and right. They saw the restoration of their king and church in 1660. But along with them came the lowest condition of religion, of morals, and of national standing abroad, which the nation has ever known. They saved their cherished dynasty of the house of Stuart; and their favourite doctrine of the divine right of kings, and the sacred obligation of the subject to passive obedience and non-resistance. But they saved them both for only twenty-eight years. The revolution of 1688 came; and the dogma was scattered to the winds, refuted by the very conduct of its authors; and the dynasty was dethroned forever. They saved also an established Episcopal church; but they lost two thousand of its brightest jewels who would not conform to its "crawling and footlicking" spirit. And the toleration which came has turned into other channels than those of the establishment, a majority by estimate, of the numbers and piety of Protestantism in that land.

Those who resisted Episcopacy in Scotland were, as a general thing, advocates of law and legal liberty: Rutherford, Argyle, Guthrie, Baillie, Warriston, Brown, Cargill, Peden, Blackader, Renwick, and Carstairs; men against whose morals nothing could be alleged; men who plead their consciences, and whose self-denial proved them to be conscientious. They stood for religious liberty. Their loyalty was to the unseen and divine King to whom they had given themselves soul and spirit. They did save religious liberty, conquering by patient endurance. And they also saved civil liberty—Hume, himself, being witness, no friend, indeed, to them, to either of their liberties, or to their religion. They delivered Scotland from what they thought an impure Protestantism; and gave to it a naked, clear, spiritual system, deeply fixed in the convictions and affections of the people. To this day that grand little kingdom, though rife with dissent from established Presbyterianism, is still almost unanimously Presbyterian—all the dissenters claiming to stand in some respect or other, nearer to the pure and primitive model than the establishment.

Another fault from which the English commonwealth-men can be defended, but the Scottish Covenanters cannot, is intolerance. But there was no conception of the idea of toleration in those days any where except in the mind of Cromwell, of Milton, of

John Howe, and a few other such foremost men of all the world. The English Episcopalians regarded toleration as treason to the throne of the king and to the mitre of the bishop. The Scottish Presbyterians regarded it as treason to the Gospel of Christ, and to the souls of the people. The suppression of error by force was the principle of both parties in Scotland. The only advantage the Presbyterians have in the estimate is that they spilt little or none of the blood of others, and shed much of their own; while the Episcopalians spilt much of the blood of others and shed but very little of their own in the religious persecutions. The suppression of error by force—says the *Pictorial History*—"was still the popular and national feeling; for, after all, nothing is more incontestible than that all the severe laws which were passed against non-conformists, between the restoration and the revolution, were in accordance with the sentiments of the great majority of all classes of the English people."

At the very time when the English Parliament had become alarmed at the prospect of having a papist upon the throne; and were busily discussing and insisting upon the bill for the exclusion of the Duke of York from the right of succession, at that very time it was treason in Scotland to maintain the principle of the bill of exclusion. Penalties for opinion were run mad. No party is perfectly clear from the just reproach. The world had not yet been lifted high enough to see the light of religious liberty, and the wrong and inexpediency of laying edicts concerning spiritual truths upon the conscience of man by human authority.

We have a concluding word to say, in the way of protest, against the odium now attempted to be cast upon the Scottish and English puritanism of the seventeenth century, in consequence of the sorry and abortive fruits of puritanism in New England in the nineteenth century. It is like casting a reproach upon the Geneva of Calvin, which is taken from the modern Geneva of the Unitarians. It is reasoning from names, but not identities, or resemblances. Never were two things of the same name much less identical in spirit and intrinsic character than the English puritanism of the seventeenth century and the Yankee puritanism of the nineteenth. They seem alike only in the erroneous practice of inquisitorial and intolerant legislation concerning moral questions. Like all imitators, the modern spirit has copied the mere defects, but few or none of the greatneses of the ancient. Never was there a more deep, earnest, inward, mental, spiritual, and real civilization than that which sprung up with such mighty radiance in Great Britain, in the seventeenth century, under the influence of the old puritans. Seldom has there been seen among the nations, a more shallow, outward, physical, mechanical, and materialistic civilization, than that which has sprung up with such

mighty *bruit*, under the puritan influences in New England, in the nineteenth century. The one is all physical. It subjugates matter. It excels in the mechanic arts. It makes constant and important contributions to the material comforts of outward life. It glories in the wide diffusion and the shallow depth of education. It is envious of all but itself. It is devoted to pecuniary profit. It has learning enough to receive ideas—not logic enough to sift them, so as to discern between the superficial and the profound, the plausible and the true, the sham and the real.

The other was all spiritual. The moral, intellectual and spiritual grandeur which its writers spread over religious life, yet lies on it like golden sunshine, still uneclipsed by any brighter radiance. It had its trophies on battle-fields. It had its Marstons, and Nasebys, and Worcesters. But it had more trophies in the realms of genius and learning. It was full of great ideas and generous impulses. It gloried in all depths of learning, of thought, of piety; and strove to diffuse learning without rendering it shallow. It had no inordinate thirst for the *peculium*. Mammon was never its God.

It was its highest glory to be able to know truth from plausibilities; fleeting shams, and unveracities, and empty forms, from eternal realities. Never was the same name borne by two more intrinsically different things, than the English puritanism of the seventeenth and the New England puritanism of the nineteenth century.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT JEWS TO THE PLURALITY AND TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD.

ON this point we have already adduced a number of very strong passages from the most authoritative books of Jewish learning.\* We will, however, give an outline of the sources from which testimony may be drawn to prove that the ancient Jews did not believe in the present Jewish dogma of an absolute personal, metaphysical unity of God. These views are sustained by other learned men from an examination of the same writings. The ten Sephiroth† have been represented in three different forms, all of which may be seen in H. Moore's *Opera Philos.*, I., 423. The

---

\* See especially the Article on the Unity of God as an objection. *So. Pres. Rev.*, Vol. VIII., p. 305.

† *Kitso's Bib. Cyclop. Art. Kabbalah*, vol. 2., p. 190. English Edition.