

THE
TRI-CENTENARY,
OF THE
Scottish Reformation;
OR,
THREE CENTURIES
OF
CALVINISM AND PRESBYTERIANISM
IN SCOTLAND,

BY THE
REV. ALEXANDER McLEAN
OF EAST PUSLINCH.

GUELPH:
PRINTED AT THE "ADVERTISER" OFFICE,

.. 1861.

THE
TRI-CENTENARY,
OF THE
Scottish Reformation :
OR,
THREE CENTURIES
OF
Calvinism and Presbyterianism
IN SCOTLAND,
BY THE
REV. ALEXANDER MCLEAN-
OF EAST PUSLINCH.

GUELPH:
PRINTED AT THE "ADVERTISER" OFFICE,

THE
Tri-Centenary of the Scottish Reformation.

The Passover and feast of unleavened bread were instituted by Divine appointment, in commemoration of the wonderful deliverance of Israel from the oppression and thralldom of Egypt; and the Lord enjoined upon his ancient people the annual observance of them, as a perpetual ordinance throughout their generations. They were to cherish the memory of their deliverance, that future generations might know the mighty works of God, the great things he did for his people, and be stirred up to a grateful acknowledgment of his goodness. The time of their emancipation was to be unto them "The beginning of months," the period from which they were to count their year; "for in the month of Abib the Lord their God brought them forth out of Egypt." And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day, it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went forth from the land of Egypt. It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt; this is the night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel, in their generations. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever."—Exodus 12, 41, 42—14. "And it shall be, when thy Son asketh thee in time to come, saying—What is this? that thou shall say unto him. By strength of hand, the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage."—Exodus, 13, 14.

Moreover, the Lord, on various occasions, enjoined upon his ancient people the remembrance, and even the commemoration of other memorable events in their history; and often upbraided and punished them, because they so soon forgot his mighty deeds. Hence, we have every reason to believe that it is the duty of the people of God now, as well as then, to acknowledge and commemorate the wonderful goodness of God to their fathers in days gone by.

and particularly when they themselves reap the fruits of it. And, accordingly, we would humbly endeavor at this time to call attention to the great things God hath done for our fathers, and us in delivering them from the yoke of Antichrist. It becomes us particularly at such a season as this, to be duly impressed with a deep sense of the great things God hath done for us by the Reformation, and to be reminded of the great struggles and sufferings of our ancestors, who "resisted unto blood," for the crown of Christ, the purity of his church, and civil and religious liberty; and more particularly to be reminded of the solemn responsibility now devolving upon us, their descendants, to maintain the great principles and masculine theology of the Reformation, and hand them down to our children entire and unimpaired, as we received them. And we are to do this the more earnestly, both because those principles contain the truth of God, and also are the purchase and fruits of our ancestor's blood. Presbyterians will not deny, generally speaking, whatever country they belong to, that it was in Scotland, more than any other country, the battle for Presbyterianism was fought and won. It was in the year 1560, on the 17th August the Protestant religion was established in Scotland, when the Scottish Parliament ratified the first confession of faith, passed an act against idolatry, abolished the mass, and the jurisdiction of the Pope. And as we are already aware the tri-centenary of the Reformation was accordingly commemorated in Scotland in August last. This is truly a time "Much to be observed unto the Lord," and to be much remembered by the Church of God. It was on the 20th of December 1560, the same year, precisely three hundred years ago that the first meeting of the General Assembly was held at Edinburgh, a day "much to be observed for a memorial throughout their generations," by all Presbyterians. Piety and patriotism alike dictate gratitude for great favors and privileges, and a sacred remembrance of those men who, by their disinterested labors and toil, have under God, been instrumental in procuring them. It is the very height of ingratitude to be otherwise disposed toward them. Indeed, in proportion as men are actuated by enlightened piety, and genuine patriotism, they will always be found to cherish the memory of those glorious events, in their national and religious history, from which stupendous results have flown to them, and with which are identified their highest achievements, their most sacred rights, and their most precious and distinguishing liberties and privileges. It is no less

characteristic of nations, than individuals, to observe a grateful commemoration of great and beneficial deliverances, of those grand and interesting events, which form an epoch in their history, and which elevate them in the scale of existence, socially, morally and religiously. The Reformation has been a greater blessing, and its results have been more beneficial to Scotland, and to the world at large, than all the other events of modern history put together.

With gratitude to God we are desirous to commemorate, or at least call attention, to the Reformation from Popery, and the struggles of our fathers in its behalf. This season reminds us of all our privileges as Protestants and Presbyterians. 'And if our children should inquire of us, "What is this? What mean ye by this service?" our answer is, that our fathers were "bondsmen" within the dominions of Antichrist, and that it pleased God in his sovereign mercy "by strength of hand," to deliver them from the bondage and darkness of Popery, emancipate them from the yoke and thralldom of "The Man of Sin," and establish the blessed gospel of his dear Son among them, which blessing we, as well as they, have hitherto enjoyed. Let us then with hearts thankful to the Great Disposer of all events, "Walk about Zion, and go round about her, tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generation following. For this God is our God for ever and ever, he will be our guide, even unto death."

In the further prosecution of this subject, I would adopt the following order:—

1. The moral and religious state of Scotland before the Reformation.
 2. The rise, progress, and consummation of the Scottish Reformation.
 3. The subsequent history of the Reformation, and the present state of religion in Scotland.
 4. The theology and ecclesiastical polity of the Scottish Reformation.
 5. The duty devolving upon us to maintain the doctrines and principles of the Reformation, and transmit them to future generations.
1. The moral and religious state of Scotland before the Reformation.

The Church of God at the commencement of Christianity, was established "According to the pattern showed them on the Mount," by Apostles and Evangelists, in the midst of persecutions and sufferings unto death. The motto of the Church, *burning, but not consumed*, has been truly representative of her condition from the very first day she was seen "Coming up from the wilderness leaning upon her beloved," until now. "But as then he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now."—Gal. 4, 29. It was particularly so in the Apostolic age, being always amid the fire and smoke of persecution, and surrounded with the elements and instruments of death. But no sooner had the Apostles thus founded the Church; no sooner had the primitive Christians said:—"Here will I dwell for I have desired it"—"it is good for us to be here,"—then "a cloud overshadowed them" in the midst of their enjoyments. "Alas! how is the gold become dim? How is the most fine gold changed?" As the sons of God were met together, "Satan came also among them." Great and growing errors made their appearance in the Apostolic Church. Jewish notions about circumcision and the ceremonial law, justification by works, penance, abstinence, Platonic notions about the Deity, with many other fatal errors of Jewish superstition, and heathen idolatry, made great breaches upon it, whereby it was much disfigured. It is in this combination of Pagan idolatry and Jewish superstition, that we find the rise of Popery, and that we must account for its existence. This is the fountain from which such deadly waters have gushed, the nest from which so many serpents have proceeded, the spring from which so many poisonous streams have issued, and the pit from which such darkness, infection, and wickedness spread. The Apostle Paul discerned the first movements of "The Man of Sin," in the corruptions and errors, which appeared and partly prevailed in his own day. He perceived the latent germs of "the mystery of iniquity" in the elements then at work, which, although they were not as yet systematized and united, yet were not discordant; but were pregnant with a capacity of union, and only wanted time and experience to develope their adaptation to the formation of the gigantic system of Popery:—2 Thes. Ch. 2, 1 to 12. 1 Tim. Ch. 4, 1, 2, 3, &c.

"The Son of Perdition" was once a child—and "the mystery of iniquity" was not always a well organized system. "The man of sin" was not like Adam, a full grown man at his first appearance.

He, even now, in his old age, leaning himself on the staff of France, remembers his early days and juvenile associations. The elements of "the mystery of iniquity," as the Apostle tells us, were already at work in the Apostolic age in the dark and turbulent waters of wrangling controversies, and in "the oppositions of science falsely so called." Antichrist, however, was as yet without shape and form, but the spirit of darkness was brooding over the face of the church. Soon there was a shaking among "the scattered dry bones" of this mysterious phenomena, and a gathering together of the separate atoms and disconnected elements which formed and developed the gigantic system of Popery.

No sooner had the church acquired power, Paganism was overthrown and Rome became nominally christian, then the ambition, pomp, and corruption of the clergy passed all bounds. Rome being the capital of the world, its Bishop usurped authority over the whole church claiming to be both head of the church and vicar of Christ. In short, he assumed infallibility, arrogated to himself the power of life and death—of shutting and opening the Kingdom of heaven—of decreeing and changing laws—and of dethroning Emperors and Kings, and setting up others in their places at his pleasure. He not only claimed divine honors—"sitting in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God"—but persecuted unto death such as would not worship him. Indulgences were sold for every conceivable crime. Past sins were pardoned for money, and liberty (and indeed the right) to commit future depredations was also sold for money. The very houses of prostitution were licensed by the authority of the Pope for a division of the spoils to fill the coffers, and replenish the exhausted treasury of the vatican. No faith was kept with heretics; and it was a duty, and only doing God's service, to put all such to death. It was thus "The Man of Sin" came into existence, and grew to such a stature: and it was thus "The Mystery of Iniquity" was developed. The light of the gospel was now extinguished throughout the world, at least so far as Rome could accomplish it. Darkness covered the face of the earth, and thick darkness the people. Darkness that could be felt prevailed everywhere; and "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth," if we except the yet unslaughtered flock of Christ among the Waldenses, who were scattered on "the cold Alpine Mountains." There is indeed reason to believe that the light of the gospel has never been wholly extinguished since it was

first kindled by its Divine author, eighteen centuries ago; for it is a well-known historical fact, that an evangelical church existed among the Waldenses during the darkest ages of Popery.

THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY INTO GREAT BRITAIN.

The date of the first introduction of Christianity into Great Britain, is involved in great uncertainty. It is not unreasonable, however, to suppose that the violent persecutions raging everywhere within the dominions of Papal Rome during the first three christian centuries, would have driven many christians into the territories of unsubdued nations, and that the Gospel was thus introduced into the unconquered districts of Scotland and Ireland—of this, indeed there seems to be no doubt. The Gospel was preached in Ireland in the Fifth Century, in the days of St. Patrick, and very likely long before his day. In Scotland the Gospel was preached in the Sixth Century, (and no doubt sooner) through the instrumentality of Columba and his pious fellow-workers, the Culdees. But this light was soon extinguished in the British Isles by a blast of the corrupt breath of Antichrist. Pope Gregory the Great, sent the Italian Monk, Augustine, with forty assistant Missionaries to introduce the growing corruptions of Papal Rome into the British dominions—and the consequence was, that they soon impeded the progress of the Gospel, and subdued and silenced the Culdees. Great ignorance and awful wickedness prevailed everywhere. The Priesthood was the most ignorant and profane part of society. But it would encroach too much upon our space, interesting though it might be, to give anything like an idea of the fearful state of things in Church and State in Scotland, previous to the Reformation. I cannot, however, resist the temptation of giving an extract, bearing upon the point from the venerable Dr. McCrie's "Life of Knox." This profound Historian says:—

"The corruptions by which the Christian religion was universally disfigured before the Reformation had grown to a greater height in Scotland than in any other nation within the pale of the Western Church. Superstition and religious imposture in their grossest forms, gained an easy admission among a rude and ignorant people. The full half of the wealth of the nation belonged to the Clergy, and the greater part of this was in the hands of a few individuals who had the command of the whole body."

"Bishops and Abbots rivalled the first nobility in magnificence, and preceded them in honors. A vacant Bishopric called forth power-

ful competitors, who contended for it as for a principality or petty Kingdom. Inferior benefices were openly put to sale, or bestowed on the illiterate and unworthy minions of courtiers, dice-players, strolling bards, and the bastards of Bishops.

“The lives of the Clergy were become a scandal to religion and an outrage on decency. While they professed chastity, and prohibited under the severest penalties, any of the ecclesiastical order from contracting lawful wedlock, the Bishops set an example of the most shameless profligacy before the inferior clergy, avowedly kept their harlots, provided their natural sons with benefices, and gave their daughters in marriage to the sons of the nobility and principal gentry—many of whom were so mean as to contaminate the blood of their families by such base alliances for the sake of the rich dowries which they brought.

“The Kingdom swarmed with ignorant, idle, luxurious Monks, who, like locusts, devoured the fruits of the earth, and filled the air with pestilential infection; with Friars, white, black and grey, &c., Large sums of money were annually exported out of the Kingdom, in exchange for which were received leaden bulls, woollen palls, wooden images, old bones, and similar articles of precious consecrated mummerly. Instead of being directed to offer up their adorations to one God, the people were taught to divide them among an innumerable company of inferior divinities.

“Legendary tales concerning the founder of some religious order, his wonderful sanctity, the miracles which he performed, his combat with the Devil, his watchings, fastings, flagellations; the virtues of holy water, chrism, crossing and exorcism; the horrors of purgatory, and the numbers released from it by the intercession of some powerful Saint—these, with low jests, table-talk and fireside scandal, formed the favorite topics of the preachers.”

Such is the frightful picture given of the state of things in Scotland previous to the Reformation, by this searching and accurate Historian. And be it remembered, we have only extracted a sentence here and there from his very able summary of it. As to the multiplicity of monasteries and their lewdness and debauchery—and as to the avariciousness and rapacity of Priests, who besieged the beds of the dying, and disturbed their last moments to extort bequests to themselves or to the church; and who, moreover, car-

ried off their corpse-present, as soon as the cold hand of death had visited the family, we must pass by without further observation.

2. THE RISE, PROGRESS, AND CONSUMPTION OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

Notwithstanding the dark picture I have just presented of the prevailing state of things in Scotland before the Reformation, still it is generally supposed that the influence of the doctrines of the Culdees, was not entirely lost upon the Scottish people, even after they had been suppressed as a church. The last document signed by them as a public body, of which we have any account, comes down to the year 1297, from which it may be reasonably supposed that the influence of their doctrines was not, as yet, entirely extinct. The Lord, as in Israel of old, might have not a few among them, although secretly, who did not bend the knee to Rome, and who like Simeon, "were waiting for the consolation of Israel" and the Reformation of the church.

The light of the morning star of the Reformation, the famous John Wickliff, had also penetrated into Scotland. This Patriarch of the Reformation, was born in Yorkshire in 1324, advanced to be Master of Baliol College, Oxford, in 1361, and advanced to the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall in 1365, where he continued until expelled by the Pope in 1370 for his advocacy of reforming principles in the church. Wickliff has been compared to "The voice of one crying in the Wilderness"—a voice and nothing more—a mighty agency which is known only by its effects. This noble servant of Christ stood in the same relation to the Reformation as John the Baptist stood to our Saviour, and as David stood to the Temple of Jerusalem. He could truly say with David:—"Now, behold, in my trouble, I have prepared for the house of the Lord." The writings of Wickliff found their way to the continent of Europe, and particularly to Bohemia, where they fell into the hands of John Huss and others, whose eyes had been opened by them.

But to return to Scotland—John Resby, an Englishman, and a disciple of the celebrated Wickliff, found his way to Scotland, where he "strengthened the things that remained and were ready to die" by the preaching of the gospel. He revived the embers of the doctrines of the Culdees. But he was burned to death at Perth in the year 1407 along with others who were his followers. The next

victim of papal persecution was Paul Cawar, a Bohemian, and a follower of John Huss, who was apprehended at the instigation of Wardlaw, Bishop of St. Andrews, and committed to the flames for disseminating heresy in the year 1432. What his design was in coming to Scotland is not definitely ascertained, but it is not at all unlikely his sole object was to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the Scottish people. In the year 1494 we meet with another class of men, opprobriously termed the Lollards of Kyle; and from all the accounts of them that have come down to us, it is very plain that they did not relish the corruptions of the Romish Apostacy. They were summoned before the great Council this year, charged with heresy and opposition to the Popish religion. But fortunately for the Lollards, James the IV., himself, presided at this memorable trial; and he was so well pleased with the ability and spirit with which they defended themselves that he dismissed them, much to the chagrin of Archbishop Blackater and his Priests, with the admonition to content themselves with the faith of the Church, and beware of new doctrines. From this it would appear that the Lord had a remnant according to the election of Grace in the West of Scotland in the districts of Cunningham, Carrick, and Kyle, previous to the Reformation,

PRECURSORS OF THE REFORMATION.

But the precursor of the Reformation in Scotland was Patrick Hamilton, a youth of royal lineage, who was burned to death at St. Andrew's, on the last day of February, 1528, in the twenty-fourth year of his age. The previous year he returned from Wittenberg, where he embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, which he now preached to his countrymen, and for which he was put to death by

Dr. Wylie says:—"A Missionary from that Church (Waldenses) called Walter Lollard, visited our country in the Fourteenth Century, and became the founder of the sect of the Lollards. From the Lollards did Wickliff derive his knowledge of divine truth. The writings of Wickliff communicated that truth to John Huss. Huss transmitted it to Luther: and thus are we warranted in saying that the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century lighted its mighty torch at the candle of the Waldensian Church, and that a continuous line of witnesses handed down the Word of Life from the days of the Apostles to modern times."

James Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrew's. As he was led to the stake to be burnt, he divested himself of his outer garments, and presented them to his servant, who had attended him most affectionately for many years, accompanying the gift with these tender and pathetic words:—"This stuff will not help me in the fire, and will profit thee. After this you can receive from me no more good, but the example of my death, which, I pray thee keep in mind—for albeit, it be bitter to the flesh, and fearful in man's judgment, yet it is the entrance to eternal life, which none shall possess that denies Christ Jesus before this wicked generation." As the pile was kindled and the flames rose up around him, he uttered these words: "How long, Oh Lord, shall darkness cover this realm? How long wilt thou suffer this tyranny of man? Lord Jesus receive my spirit." It was his desire to build the Reformation temple in Scotland and "raise up the tabernacle of David that was fallen," and no doubt he contributed largely to the accomplishment of it, although he was martyred in the attempt. But his blood was the seed of the Church. Like Samson, he accomplished more by his death, and made a greater breach upon the kingdom of darkness by his blood, which cried to Heaven for vengeance against popery, than although he had lived to preach the gospel for many years. The tidings of the Martyrdom of this learned and godly young man like lightning spread throughout Scotland, and moved a spirit of inquiry among the people, which would not otherwise have been the case. In his death they saw the infernal cruelty and blood-thirstiness of Popery; and what treatment they might expect from its tender mercies—and were accordingly roused up against it and ripened for the Reformation. When the Archbishop was still threatening to subject others suspected of heresy to a similar treatment, his servant, John Lindsay, said to him:—"My Lord, if ye burn ony mair, except you follow my advice, ye will utterly destroy yourselves. If ye will burn them; let them be burned in some house cellars, for the reek of Mr. Patrick Hamilton has infected as many as it blew upon."

In the year 1542, James V. died at Falkland, when his ill-fated daughter, Queen Mary was only a few days old. He was in earlier life favorable to the Reformation. But the Queen, the intriguing Mary of Guise, soon gained him over to Popish cruelties. It is said that it was at his express command the celebrated George Bu-

Buchanan wrote his famous satire, the *Franciscan*, in which the poet says:—

“O Muse! explain how Priests’ deception spread,
How torpid souls are by delusion fed
With pious frauds, and wild inventions full,
Kingdoms entire a wretched people gull;
To gaping crowds their wonder strange reveal,
Beneath a veil their base chicane conceal,
Despotic creeds, a wild and wicked life,
Full of ambition, wrath, fraud, envy, strife—
Christ’s sheepfold plunder, at each ill contrive
Of sense and gold the christian flock deprive.

In 1542, the year in which the cruel Archbishop Beaton died, persecution was raging all over, so that many were consigned to the flames, and many more had to flee out of the country, among whom was George Buchanan, who was absent for nearly twenty years from his native country.

After the King’s death, Cardinal Beaton of infamous memory, the nephew of the late Archbishop, made a bold, but unsuccessful attempt to get the government of the country into his own hands. But the Earl of Arran was appointed Regent of the Kingdom. He was at first exceedingly favorable to the Reformation, prompted no doubt in his opposition to popery on account of the martyrdom of his relative Patrick Hamilton. He, however, although a plausible man, was weak and fickle, and proved too simple for the wily Cardinal, who soon succeeded in gaining him over to countenance and even encourage his own cruelties.

But the Reformation had made great progress during the short time that it was patronised by the Regent. Its progress, though silent, was steady. In spite of the opposition of Cardinal Beaton and his followers, the Parliament passed an act in 1542, declaring it lawful for the people to possess and read the Scriptures in their native language. The opening of the Bible to the people, truly forms an epoch in the early history of the Scottish Reformation. It was by the circulation of the word of God that the country was enlightened, and Popery was consumed. The moment it became the law of the land to read the Scriptures, the effect was sudden and wonderful; and the power of the Priesthood was daily becoming

weaker and weaker. Williams, Rough, Harlan, Willox, Methven, and Knox, and other preachers, were successfully disseminating the doctrines which were to overturn the established superstition; and the leading men of the country were listening to them with great earnestness. But as soon as the Regent began to waver in his attachment to the Reformation, his faithful chaplains, Williams and Rough, were dismissed from the court, and had to flee out of the country for their lives. Having got the Regent on their side, the Priesthood with Cardinal Beaton at their head, were determined to extinguish the light and stem the tide ere it reached its flood, and in their desperate effort to accomplish it they respected neither rank nor age nor sex. Suffice it to say, that the Cardinal recovered his lost ascendancy in the government of the kingdom, so far as to persuade the Parliament which met at Stirling in 1543, to revive the old laws against heresy and heretics. He, moreover, got himself appointed to carry those laws into effect. And for this purpose he resolved to travel through the kingdom, and set up petty inquisitions everywhere for the suppression of heresy and punishment of heretics. The result of all this was, that a great multitude of God's people were persecuted unto death, were brought as "sheep to the slaughter," and "their blood was shed like water. Both Cardinal and Regent visited Perth, and there put a large number of God's people to death. Among the martyrs of this and the previous years may be specially named, Forrest, the Vicar of Dollar, famous for his conversation with the Bishop of Dunkeld, who thanked God that he always lived in entire ignorance of what the Old and New Testament was; as also Gourlay, Straiton, Russell, Forrester, Kennedy, Simpson, Kyllor, and that noble woman Helen Stark, who was drowned at Monks Tower.

But the martyrdom of George Wishart was the death knell of Popery in Scotland. After an absence of some time in Germany and England, he returned to Scotland in the year 1544. He at once preached the Gospel to his countrymen and his trumpet gave no uncertain sound. But Cardinal Beaton soon got him into his hands and condemned him to be burnt for heresy, which was accordingly done in the year 1546. His disciple, Knox, was determined to accompany him to his martyrdom, but Wishart returned him back saying:—"go back to your pupils, one is sufficient for one sacrifice." The pile by which he was to be burnt was erected

opposite the Cardinal's palace, that himself and his Priests might have full view of the martyr in the fire, and feast their eyes with the sad spectacle of his torments. Wishart was led to the stake with an iron chain about his waist, his hands tied behind his back, and a rope round his neck. After the fire had kindled around him, and the gunpowder had exploded, the Captain perceiving him still alive, bade him be of good courage. Wishart, with unfaltering voice, replied:—"This fire torments my body but no ways abates my spirit." When looking towards the Cardinal, whose spirit rejoiced in his agony, he said:—"He who in such state from that high place feedeth his eyes with my torments, within a few days shall be hanged out at the same window, to be seen with as much ignominy as he now leaneth there in pride. According to this prophetic language, the Cardinal was soon after stopped in his bloody career by a well-merited death, and there was not in Scotland one patriot who lamented his removal, although they would not generally approve of the manner in which it was accomplished. On the 29th of May, 1546, sixteen men made their way to the Palace of St. Andrews, and slew the Cardinal with the sword in his own bed-room. The wretched man died, crying: "I am a priest, I am a priest. Ye will not slay me! fy! fy! all is gone?" "Thus," saith Hethrington, "died David Beaton without uttering one word of repentance or prayer leaving behind him a name unrivalled in Scottish annals for the fearful combination of evil qualities of which his character was composed—unscrupulous ambition, far reaching treachery, deliberate malice, gross licentiousness and relentless cruelty." It may be said that the general feeling as to the manner of his death was correctly expressed by Lindsay the, Scottish Poet, in the following lines:—

"As for the Cardinal I grant
He was the man we weel could want,
And we'll forget him soon:
And yet I think, the sooth to say,
Although the loon was weel away,
The deed was foully done."

The conspirators, joined with other friends, kept possession of the Castle of St. Andrews for nearly two years.

In a short time the Regent was convinced that he was not to reap the expected enjoyment from his elevated position. The Queen

Mother never ceased her plots and intrigues against him, until she got the Regency and government of the country into her own hands; which was given to Mary of Guise in 1554. The popish expectation was, that the Scottish Parliament would confer the Crown-matrimonial of Scotland on the Dauphin of France, to whom Mary had been betrothed; and that France and Scotland would have the same King and the same religion. Had this expectation been fully realized, there is little doubt that the independence of Scotland would have been destroyed, and the Reformation would have been utterly suppressed; and even the extent to which it had been realized was very near accomplishing both. At this time France and Spain, and indeed all the Popish powers, were in league to crush the Reformation throughout the whole of Europe. As England was the most powerful Protestant kingdom in the world, it was absolutely necessary for carrying out their contemplated arrangement, to place a Popish Monarch on the English Throne, which was so far accomplished during the brief, but cruel reign of bloody Mary. As there were always grave doubts entertained as to the legitimacy of Elizabeth—and as the young Queen of Scotland was the nearest heir to the Throne, the Papists fully expected her accession to the Sceptre of England. The Bartholomew massacre in France, in which the Protestants were so treacherously and cruelly murdered, was only the commencement of those woes with which the Papists had intended “to wear out the saints of the Most High.” Even the great Spanish Armada which made its way to the shores of England, Ireland, and Scotland, to subject them to Spain, and to crush the Reformation, and against which the very elements of nature contended, was the attempted execution of a part of their gigantic scheme; to effect the universal destruction of Protestants and Protestantism.

Such was the state of things in Scotland at the commencement of the Reformation—such was the determination to oppose that good work—such was the combination to crush it—and such were the efforts put forth to suppress it. Hence, the Scottish Reformation from Popery was not effected without a terrible struggle, arduous labors, and severe sufferings. The government of the country had prepared a “furnace seven times heated” for all the friends of the Reformation; so that the Reformers were compelled to unite in various solemn bonds or covenants, both for maintaining and promoting the Reformation, and for their own mutual defence. The

first of these covenants was subscribed at Edinburgh on the 3rd of December, 1557, because of the Queen Dowager's treacherous opposition to the Reformation. The second was dated at Perth, May 31st, 1559; the third at Sterling, in August of the same year; and the fourth, called "The last band of Leith," was formed April 27, 1560, when the Regent had fortified Leith, and was endeavoring to enslave the nation by means of French troops; just four months before Popery was abolished and the Reformation recognized.

JOHN KNOX AND THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

But the man, above all others, whom the Lord honored to accomplish the Reformation of the Church in Scotland, was the faithful and undaunted John Knox. He was born in the year 1505; and attended the Universities of his native country with the view of studying for the Priesthood. He was a disciple of Wishart, whose death had made a mighty impression upon his mind; and whose mantle no doubt had fallen upon him. When he saw the country "wholly given to Idolatry, his spirit was stirred in him;" and as "he went out unto his brethren and looked on their burdens," "the Spirit of the Lord began to move him in the camp." Although destined to be "The Man of his age"—he was like Gideon, unknown to his countrymen, when the Lord looked upon him and said:—"The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour. Go in this thy might and thou shalt save the church and the country from the hand of Antichrist; have not I sent thee." With fear and trembling—for Knox was a man of great tenderness of conscience—he was constrained from love to Christ, from love to his Church, and from love to his countrymen, whom he loved and served so well, to put his hand to the plough, and he never again looked back. It was in the year 1547 he appeared publicly as a Reformer. John Rough, and other discerning preachers, "perceiving the grace that was given unto him," were urgently pressing him to become a preacher and pastor. But he, like Moses, who "wist not that the skin of his face shone," was extremely reluctant to comply with their request, from an overwhelming sense of the responsibility and sacredness of the Ministerial office, and his own unworthiness. They would not, however, take his refusal, and consequently resolved, without his knowledge, that a call should be publicly given him to

become one of the Ministers of St. Andrew's, along with Rough.

Accordingly, on a day fixed for that purpose, Rough, who preached a sermon suited to the occasion, turned to Knox after the close of his discourse, and addressed him in these words:—"Brother, you shall not be offended, although I speak unto you, that which I have in charge, even from all those that are here present, which is this:—In the name of God and of his Son, Jesus Christ, and in the name of all that presently call you by my mouth, I charge you, that you refuse not this holy vocation, but as you tender the glory of God, the increase of Christ's Kingdom, the edification of your brethren, and the comfort of me, whom you understand well enough to be oppressed by the multitude of labors, that you take the public office and charge of preaching, even as you look to avoid God's heavy displeasure, and desire that he shall multiply his graces unto you." Then, addressing himself to the congregation, he said:—"Was not this your charge unto me? and do ye not approve this vocation." They all answered: "It was; and we approve it." "Overwhelmed" says Dr. MacCrie, "by this unexpected and solemn charge, Knox after an ineffectual attempt to address the audience, burst into tears, rushed out of the assembly and shut himself up in his chamber. "His countenance and behaviour, from that day till the day that he was compelled to present himself in the public place of preaching, did sufficiently declare the grief and trouble of his heart; for no man saw any sign of mirth from him, neither had he pleasure to accompany any man for many days together. This proof of the sensibility of his temper, and the reluctance which he felt at undertaking a public office, may surprise those who have carelessly adopted the common notion respecting our Reformer's character; but we shall meet with many examples of the same kind in the course of his life. The behaviour of Knox serves also to reprove those who become preachers of their own accord; and who, from vague and enthusiastic desires of doing good, or a fond conceit of their own gifts, trample upon good order, and thrust themselves into employment without any regular call."

Knox was about forty one years of age at this time. His first sermon was preached in the parish church, in the presence of his former preceptor, Major, and the other members of the University, with a great number of Canons and Friars of different orders. His

text was from Daniel, c. 7—v. 24, 25, and in his exposition of it, he shewed that the Papal Church was the Babylonian Harlot. As soon as he appeared in the pulpit as the leader of the Reformation, he sounded the trumpet of the gospel, summoned the nation, and roused them to action. He at once placed the controversy between the Reformers and the Papists on its proper basis. He attacked the Church of Rome, not only because it was burdened with unscriptural rites and ceremonies, not only because the lives of its priests were licentious and immoral, not only because it was persecuting in theory and practice; but chiefly because Popery was the "mystery of iniquity," and the Pope was "The Man of Sin." And accordingly, boldly stated, and offered to prove the proposition that the Papal Church of Rome is Antichrist. It was a struggle between light and darkness, truth and error, despotism and liberty, virtue and vice, and Christ and Belial. Other preachers declared against the abuses of the Church—but Knox declared the whole system to be Anti-christian; which made some of his hearers remark:—"Others had hewed the branches of the Papistry, but he struck at the root to destroy the whole." From this moment it was manifest that there could be no intercourse or compromise with Rome. "Knox laid the axe unto the root of the tree" to hew it down. What he wanted, was, not so much amendment as re-institution. In short, he called for the utter abolition of the Church of Anti-christ that it might be replaced by the Church of Christ. But as Knox was thus engaged in his great work, he was suddenly arrested and carried away prisoner by the French, who bound him with chains, and placed him as a slave, along with other friends of the Reformation, on board the French galleys, where he was confined for nearly two years. This happened by the fall of the Castle of St. Andrews, where Knox and others took refuge after the death of the Cardinal. On board the galleys he was brought to the gates of death by a violent fever; the effect of severe confinement. But, even then his great fortitude of mind did not forsake him, for he continued to the last to comfort his fellow-prisoners with the assured hope of release from their captivity. It was no doubt intended for good that the man who gave Scotland liberty had himself worn fetters:—

"Whose feet with tethers they did hurt,
And he in irons lay;
Until the time that his word came
To give him liberty;
The word and purpose of the Lord,
Did him in passion try."—Psalm, 105, 19.

After he had obtained his liberty he endured for six years the disappointments and sorrows of an exile. He first visited England, where he became Chaplain to Edward VI., and was offered the Bishopric of Rochester, which he declined, because he considered Prelacy had no Scriptural authority. On the accession of bloody Mary to the English Throne, he was obliged to leave the country. He set out for the Continent, like the Hebrew Patriarch of old, "not knowing whither he went." He first became Pastor of a Protestant Church at Frankfort, and afterwards of an English and Scotch congregation at Geneva, where, besides his pastoral labors, he took an active part in translating the Bible into English—commonly known by the name of "The Geneva Bible."

The removal of Knox must have been a dark and mysterious Providence to the friends of the Reformation in Scotland. After the work was commenced, and the deliverer of the country stood before them, an arrest was laid on both:—"Thy way is in the sea, and thy path is in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known," Psalms 77c.—19v. But it was all well ordered. He assuredly found the words of our Saviour true in his own experience:—"What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter," John 13c. 7v. When he became an exile he was much about the age of Moses, when he fled from the face of Pharaoh. He was sent to the school of affliction, that he might become inured to hardship, matured in experience, and patient under contradiction and provocation. In his exile, he, no doubt, greatly acquired that self-possession in difficulty and danger, that self-control, calm and resolute resistance to every unrighteous opposition which so remarkably distinguished him in after life. That man needed no ordinary training for his work, who was destined to "confront the hostility of a Popish Court, moderate the turbulency of factious Barons, and control the zeal of a people, who, till that time, had been strangers to the blessings of religion and liberty." Moreover, Knox in his exile came in contact with the great Reformers and Scholars of the age, so that he must have reaped untold benefits from his sojourn abroad. His intercourse with Calvin alone was worth all the sorrows of expatriation. It is beyond all doubt, that the mighty spirit of Calvin made a profound impression upon the penetrating mind of the Scotch Reformer. The most intimate friendship existed between

those illustrious fathers of Churches and founders of free nations. Dr. Henry in his life of Calvin, says:—"From the year 1554, we see frequently in Geneva, and in close intercourse with Calvin, a man of the most singular appearance, strongly built, with a bold, severe expression of countenance, of a firm but yet tender nature; this is the famous Scotchman, John Knox. It might have been imagined that two such powerful and ardent characters as these Reformers could not have agreed well together, but they cherished for each other a genuine affection—the one could submit himself to the other."

During Knox's absence, the seed already sown was leavening the community, and the Scriptures, which were still in the hands of many, were gradually opening their eyes. It is indeed true that the Popish party displayed more courage, and were taking bolder steps to crush the Reformation after his departure. They even prevailed on the Queen Regent to summon the Preachers before the Council of State upon a charge of sedition. But the Protestant gentlemen perceiving their design, on the appointed day, forced themselves without any ceremony into the presence of the Queen, sitting in Council with the Bishops; and Chalmers, of Gadgirth, a bold and zealous man, spoke thus, in the name of all:—"Madam, we know that this proclamation is a device of the Bishops, and of that bastard, the primate of St. Andrews, that stands beside you. We avow to God, that ere we yield, we will make a day of it. These idle drones oppress us and our tenants; they trouble our preachers, and would murder them and us. Shall we suffer this any longer? No Madam, it shall not be." Having so said, every man put on his steel bonnet and departed, but not without accomplishing their object.

Meanwhile, matters were rapidly maturing in Scotland for the establishment of the Reformation. The severe persecution raging in England during bloody Mary's reign, had driven not a few of God's people to Scotland, where their services proved eminently beneficial to the cause of truth. Perth, Dundee, Montrose and other districts had embraced the Reformed doctrines, which greatly enraged the Queen Regent. After long temporising, the intriguing Mary of Guise, at last cast off the mask and made a desperate effort to suppress the Reformation with the assistance of French troops. When the Protestants reminded her of her former promises to them,

she unblushingly replied, that it did not become subjects to burden the memory of their Sovereign with promises, nor expect her to keep to them further than it suited her convenience. At the urgent request of his friend at home, Knox left Geneva, and made his appearance once more in his native land, never again to leave it. His arrival was exceedingly seasonable at this crisis. His very presence terrified his enemies and infused new life into his friends.

For several days the Popish Clergy were sitting in Council in the Monastery of the Grey friars, maturing their plot against the supporters of the Reformation. But while thus engaged, on a sudden, just as Belshazzar saw fingers of a man's hand writing over against him on the plaster of the wall, one of their own friends rushed into the presence of the Council, breathless, with haste, exclaiming in broken words:—"John Knox, John Knox, is come! he is come! he slept last night in Edinburgh." The Council was panic-struck, and pale with terror! In great haste and confusion, they dispersed, contemplating in dumb dismay the ruin of all the plans they had concocted for the punishment of heretics. The Queen Regent, who was no less disturbed at this intelligence, instantly proclaimed Knox an outlaw and a rebel, expecting, no doubt, thus to frighten him out of the country.

Shortly after Knox's arrival in the country, he was invited by Lord James Stuart, and others, to preach in the Abbey Church at St. Andrews. The Archbishop hearing of this, gathered an army around him, and sent word to Knox if he would make his appearance that he would be shot in the pulpit. The Archbishop went to Church at the head of his army. His friends, who knew that the Papal Church was still a Goliath here, earnestly besought Knox to remain at home and not to hazard his life with his sling and stone. To which entreaties, "he who never feared the face of man," gave the following characteristic reply:—"I was first called to preach the gospel in this very Town, and was violently taken away from it by the violence of France, at the instigation of the Bishops—that now the opportunity is presented to me for which I had longed, and prayed, and hoped; I entreat you not to hinder me from preaching once more in St. Andrews. As for the fear of danger that may come to me, let no man be anxious, for my life is in the custody of him whose glory I seek. I desire the hand and weapon of no

man to defend me. I only crave audience, which if it be denied here unto me, at this time, I must seek further where I may have it."

It is needless to remark that the dauntless courage of the Reformer, communicated itself to his friends, and that they ceased to think of his danger. He preached in the same place on four successive days, to a large multitude, including the Archbishop and his soldiers, and with such wonderful effect that the Magistrates stripped the Church of its images and demolished the Monasteries. The hand of God was so mighty with him, that his enemies had not the courage to lift up their finger against him. It is very evident that Knox did not rest the hope of success in his arduous work on an arm of flesh; his own language was:—"We do nothing but go about Jericho, blowing with trumpets, as God giveth strength, hoping victory by his power alone."

Knox, however, clearly perceived, humanly speaking, that they were unable to deliver the country from the French without assistance from without. The Popish cause was now strengthened by the arrival of a fresh supply of troops from France. He was fully aware of his own unpopularity with the Queen of England, on account of his late book against female government; But Knox was as profound a statesman as he was a Reformer; and therefore was not at a loss how to secure the support of England politically. He at once, notwithstanding their prejudices against himself, urged upon the Lords of the congregation the necessity, and even the duty of presenting their application to the English Government for assistance. He, moreover, showed them the likelihood of their succeeding, if they would put their application solely upon the footing that in assisting Scotland in this critical moment, England would be only fortifying itself against the conspiracy of France and Spain, and that if they once conquered Scotland, they would soon conquer England also, and place Mary on the English Throne. He succeeded in convincing English Statesmen that the surest way of averting the gathering storm from themselves was by making common cause with Scotland at this juncture of affairs. Their application was favorably responded to, and they received a timely assistance in men and money from England. The French were soon driven out of Scotland. The Queen Regent died, and the government of the Kingdom passed into the hands of the Reformers. Every obstacle

was now taken away, and the nation was fully ripe to cast off the Popish yoke for ever.

PARLIAMENT RECOGNIZES THE REFORMED RELIGION AND THE FIRST
GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETS.

At length the time for which Knox had so much longed, and so

Richard, Earl of Cork, has preserved among his papers the following curious anecdote of the reign of bloody Mary:—"Queen Mary having dealt severely with the Protestants in England, signed a Commission for to take the same course with them in Ireland, and to execute the same with greater force—she nominates Dr. Cole one of her Commissioners: This Doctor coming with the commission to Chester on his journey, the Mayor of that city, hearing that Her Majesty was sending a messenger into Ireland, waited on the Doctor, who in discourse with the Mayor, taketh out of a cloak-bag, a leather-box, saying unto him: 'Here is a Commission that shall lash the heretics of Ireland, calling the Protestants by that title. The good woman of the house being well-affected to the Protestant religion, and also having a brother, named John Edmonds, of the same, then a citizen of Dublin, was much troubled at the Doctors words; but watching her convenient time, while the Mayor took his leave, and the Doctor complimented him down the stairs, she opens the box, takes the Commission out and places in lieu thereof a sheet of paper, with a pack of cards wrapped therein, the knave of clubs being faced uppermost. The Doctor coming up to his chamber, suspected nothing of what had been done, and put up the box as formerly. The next day he sails towards Ireland and landed on the 7th of Oct., 1558. at Dublin. Then coming to the Castle, the Lord Fitz-walter being Lord Deputy, sent for him to come before him and the Privy-Council; who, after he had related upon what account he came over, presented the box unto the Lord Deputy; who causing it to be opened that the Secretary might read the Commission, there was nothing save a pack of cards, with the knave of clubs uppermost; which not only startled the Lord Deputy and Council, but the Doctor, who assured them he had a Commission, but knew not how it was gone. Then the Lord Deputy said, 'Let us have another Commission, and we will shuffle the cards in the meanwhile.' The Doctor being troubled in his mind, went away and returned into England, and coming to the Court obtained another Commission, but staying for a wind on the water side, news came to him that that the Queen was dead; and thus God preserved the Protestants of Ireland. Queen Elizabeth was so delighted with the story, which was related to her by Lord Fitz-walter on his return to England, that she sent for Elizabeth Edmonds, whose husband's name was Mattershad, and gave her a pension of £40 during her life."

often prayed, arrived. = And like Elijah on Mount Carmel, "he repaired the Altar of the Lord that was broken down;" and addressing the nation, said: "How long halt ye between two opinions, if the Lord be God follow him, but if Antichrist, follow him." Immediately, his own zeal and energy vibrated throughout the nation, and their response was: "The Lord he is the God, the Lord he is the God." The Parliament that met in August, 1560, in adopting and establishing the doctrines of the Reformation, and in rejecting Popery, simply gave expression to the enlightened choice of the Scottish people, who embraced Protestantism, not because it was commanded, or even agreeable to their Sovereign and Rulers, but in spite of earthly "Potentates and Powers." It was this that gave such a footing to the Gospel in Scotland, and made it so lasting in its benefits and fruits; namely, that the Reformation was the choice of the people—that they fought for it, and understood what they were contending for. With what mingled feelings of joy and interest must the friends of the Reformation have watched over the proceedings of this memorable Parliament of 1560. How glad they must have been when they saw the Confession of Faith recognized as the national profession, by consent of the three estates of Parliament, and the Duke of Chattelhaurt, according to ancient custom, "gave a piece of silver to the Clerk of the Register, to have an instrument of the same!" We doubt not there were in Scotland not a few who felt with "The old Lord of Lindsay," when he said:—"I have lived many years, now that it hath pleased God to let me see this day, where so many nobles and others have allowed so worthy a work, I will say with Simeon: 'Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace.'"

No sooner had Parliament closed its labors than the Reformed Ministers, and other leading friends of the Reformation, agreed to meet in a spiritual capacity, as a Court of Christ, to consult upon those things which concerned God's glory and the welfare of his church. The Reformers made their appearance in Parliament to lay before the Rulers of the country what they considered a scriptural summary of the Christian religion; but they had no wish to occupy the places and authority of the Romish Hierarchy, or form a spiritual estate whereby they could share in the civil jurisdiction. It was on the 20th of December, 1560, the first meeting of the first

General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was held in Edinburgh. It was convened in the name, and by the sole authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, who alone is King and head of his church. They kept within their own spiritual sphere, without yielding subjection to the state, claiming superiority to it, or asserting co-equality with it. They were prepared to give to Cæsar what belonged to Cæsar, but were determined to render to Christ all that belonged to Christ. They were ever jealous of the encroachments of the civil power upon the liberty and prerogatives of the Church of Christ, and resisted it unto blood from the very beginning. This meeting of Assembly consisted of forty members, only six of whom were Ministers. They were men of deep piety and great abilities, and were eminently qualified by the King and Head of the Church, for the work to which he had called them. The Reformed Religion was now established in the Kingdom by the highest civil authority, but the friends of the Reformation felt that their work was only commenced, for it remained with them to proclaim the Gospel throughout the breadth and length of the land. But who can not only express, but even imagine their wonder, their joy and gratitude, as they found themselves thus met together? There were men here who could truly say with Paul, that they were often "pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that they despaired even of life" 2 Cor. 1c, 8v. One would almost suppose that their surprise was such that they felt like Peter when "he wist not that it was true which was done by the Angel; but thought he saw a vision"—Acts 12—9; or like the Disciples of our Lord when it is said of them, "They yet believed not for joy."—Luke 24c—41v. How applicable to their situation were the words of the Psalmist:—

When Sion's bondage God turn'd back,
As men that dream'd were we—
Then fill'd with laughter was our mouth
Our tongue with melody.—Psalm 126.

It may be truly said of this venerable Assembly, "There were Giants in those days." The times needed such men, and the Lord specially endowed them for their work, and expressly trained them for the occasion. The men who laid the foundation stone, and built the walls of the Reformation Temple in Scotland in those

troublous times, must have been no ordinary men. The strength and beauty of the superstructure declare the wisdom and skill of its founders and architects. Knox and his noble co-adjutors stamped the impress of their own manliness, intellectual force, and penetration on the Church and nation. At this time there was a constitutional life infused into the heart of Scotland in harmony with the mighty and thrilling influences of which it has never ceased to beat, rising at extraordinary times with the magnitude of the occasion and the emergency of affairs. They lighted a candle in Scotland which could never afterwards be extinguished. And, indeed, Knox plainly said such would be the case. The very name of Knox has ever since been enough to stimulate his countrymen to action, encouragement, and sustain them in danger, and impart new life and vigor to them on all great occasions. His gigantic energy, under God, brought about the Reformation, and the stamp he then communicated to the Church and country, they have ever yet retained, and we hope ever will.

“A vine from Egypt brought thou hast
 By thine outstretched hand ;
 And thou, the heathen out did'st cast
 To plant it in their land.
 Before it thou a room did'st make
 Where it might grow and stand ;
 Thou caused'st it deep root to take,
 And it did fill the land.”—Psalm 80c. ; 8, 9.

3. THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, AND THE PRESENT STATE OF RELIGION IN SCOTLAND.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the Reformers rested from their labors after Parliament had recognised the Reformed Religion, and the first General Assembly had held its first meeting. It is indeed true that it was with no small satisfaction they beheld the emancipation of their country from the superstition and tyranny of Popery, and the establishment of Protestantism upon its ruins. But well did they know that the Reformation could not be established by an act of Parliament, but that it must establish itself by taking an enlightened hold of the minds of the people, and saturating them

with its principles and influences. Knox and his worthy associates had a second battle to fight, and a second triumph to achieve, no less difficult than the first. In some cases, and under certain circumstances; it is more difficult to "hold fast that we have already attained" than obtain the possession of them at first. It may truly be said of Knox that he appeared greater in his second labors than he did even in his first.

John Knox was the real originator of popular education in Scotland, and it may be said, in Britain. He was emphatically the man of the people, and his noble sentiments regarding them were: "Let the masses of the people be educated." His grand aim was that "every several Kirk have one Schoolmaster appointed;" and that the country should be filled with Parish and Grammar Schools, Provincial Colleges, and munificently endowed Universities. He was the first man to see the new era that was dawning upon them—the first to see that the people were not always to continue the ignorant slaves and tools of Princes, Lords and Barons—the first to see that the common people were the best defenders of the country, and were therefore to have its destinies in their own hands—and the first to urge the absolute necessity of giving them a thorough education, secular and religious, that they might be qualified to discharge well the great trust that was to be committed them, politically and religiously. When submitting the details of his educational scheme to the Scottish Parliament, as contained in the First Book of Discipline, Knox concluded by saying:—"If God shall grant quietness, and give your wisdoms grace to set forward education in the sort prescribed, ye shall leave wisdom and learning to your posterity—a treasure more to be esteemed than any earthly treasure ye are able to amass for them." This was the grand characteristic of the Scottish Reformation, that it excelled all others in its recognition of the rights of the people, and of the duty of educating them. Mr. Dodds, in his speech at the Tri-centenary of the Scottish Reformation says:—"The education of the common people—a treasure more to be esteemed than any earthly treasure ye are able to amass for them." What am I reading from? From the work of some enthusiastic modern educationist? From some speech of Henry Brougham's delivered in 1836 or 1840? No, but the words of John Knox, written 300 years ago! He said to him-

self—if we may presume to contract into feeble words his swelling patriotic thoughts—"I will make my country great. I can't make it great in territory—nature forbids that. I can't make it great at present in wealth and capital—its recent and still existing turmoils, its revolutions and miseries prevent that. But I will make it great by intelligence, and great for the future. I will thus make the people a match for the other nations of Europe, and enable them to run the race of life with the swiftest, and fight the battle of life with the strongest."

Those enlightened and patriotic aspirations of Knox were only partially realized, on account of the covetousness of the nobility, who were fully determined to inherit the patrimony of the Popish Church, instead of appropriating it as the Reformer disinterestedly proposed, for educational, evangelical, and charitable purposes. But even the extent to which his views were realized, proved an invaluable blessing to the country. Our Reformer had first to contend with cruel Papists, afterwards with a crafty and covetous aristocracy, and lastly with an intriguing deceitful and unprincipled Queen, but by the help of God he proved more than a match for them all.

Another great characteristic of the Scottish Reformation was their great deference to the word of God. "The Bible, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants" was their maxim in the highest sense. In composing the confession of Faith, and drawing up a plan of ecclesiastical government, they consulted the word of God alone, rejecting tradition and all other Romish notions and ceremonies. "They took not their example," says Rowe, "from any kirk in the world, no, not from Geneva, but from the sacred Scriptures." They rejected every form, pomp and ceremony that had no countenance from Scripture. The Scottish Reformation began with the people, and was achieved in spite of Princes and rulers. They received and acted upon what they considered to be the truth of God in matter and form, regardless of the displeasure of kings and magistrates; and rejected any pretended right on their part to prescribe their faith, or interfere between God and their consciences.

In England, on the other hand, the Reformation did not begin with the people, but with their voluptuous King, Henry VIII, and

from him it descended to the people. Henry had renounced Popery from very suspicious motives, to say the least, and his Reformation was like himself, a motley system of religion, that proceeded no farther than suited his own capriciousness, and arrogant views. He did not quarrel with Popery, but with the Pope, and while he disliked the former, he still loved, and largely retained the latter. He just substituted himself as the head of the church instead of the Pope. In other words he became his own Pope and their Pope. He was alike opposed to Luther and the Roman Pontiff. And the friends of the Anglican Church must still confess that this is its greatest defect. Its bondage to the state, denial of the rights of the people, want of discipline, independence and self-government, leaves it in the power of each clergyman to do what seemeth good in his own eyes. The English government was determined from the beginning to retain as much of Popery in the Church, as they possibly could, and in this determination they have been only too successful. Hence the rise and growth of High-churchism, Tractarianism, and Puseyism in that Church. People will always reap according as they sow. They sowed the tares of tradition, ceremony, and ritualism, and reaped Tractarianism and Puseyism and other irregularities at variance with Scripture as the fruits. This, and this alone, accounts for the great number of the English Clergy that have gone over to Rome of late years.

"In Scotland" says D'Aubigne, "The Reformation proceeded from the conversion of souls among the people; it made its way from the inward to the outward, from low to high. In England, on the other hand, the movement which organized the Church proceeded from the King and a few Bishops; it operated from the outward to the inward, from high to low. The change of the ecclesiastical constitution was for the most part accomplished by the Government, and consisted at first of little more than the substitution of the King for the Pope as the Head of the Church. The state, by swallowing up the Church, has become great and powerful; but what is the condition of the people? Must not Statesmen themselves acknowledge that they are poorer and more vicious. This would not have been the case, if the Church, instead of appearing only by its dignitaries, on the Bishops, bench, and in the Privy Council, had also bestowed rights on her little ones—on those members of the flock

to whom the word gives so high a place in the church of the living God. "It was therefore natural to expect that the christian people should bear rule in the Church of Scotland, and the christian state, on the other hand, in the Church of England, where the people have but few rights, and must remain more or less passive; while the Church of Scotland is that in which in great measure are to be found the rights and the vitality of the christian people, (and) forms of all the Protestant churches the most decided contrast to the Papacy. "If they desire to oppose Rome (in England) it cannot be done by resembling her, or by placing dependence upon the Hierarchy, or upon the assistance of the state, as Rome herself does; but on the contrary, by a contrast with Rome, by seeking support in the faith and activity of a Christian people." D'Aubigne's Germany, England, and Scotland. P. P. 106, 110, 153, 154.

In Scotland, as already stated, things were very different, inasmuch as they kept at the greatest possible distance from Popery, both in matter and form; and the present state of religion in that country, as well as the history of the past, amply justify their wisdom and foresight so far. With them there was no attempt to mimic the mummeries and fooleries of Popery.

Thomas Randolph, the worthy envoy of Queen Elizabeth to Scotland, expressed his surprise at the interest manifested by the Scottish people in the Reformation, in the following terms:—"Still," says he, addressing the Reformers, "I do not see how the Reformation has become such a popular movement in Scotland, or why the people should have been so ready to cast off their old religion, with their old allies the French! In my country, had not Henry VIII. taken the matter in his own hand, it would have been long ere our clowns and yeomen would have quarreled with the Pope, or ventured to sack and burn Monasteries, far less to pull down altars, images, and crosses, and toss them about the streets as your Protestants have done."

"It was the rascal multitude," replied Knox, "that did these things. True, they did pull down all manner of Friars and some Abbeys, which willingly received not the Reformation: *and let me forwarn you, that to prevent the monks from returning, the best way is to pull down their nests.* But we protested against the wholesale demolition of Abbeys; and as to the Parish Churches, all

we did, was to cleanse them of images, and all other monuments of idolatry, and to order that no masses should be said in them. But in answer to your question, let me say, that our people have been well instructed in the truths of the holy Evangel, by the preaching of our Ministers. Take ye heed that your Queen rest ain not the liberty of prophecying. Scotland has sprung up into new life, and Scotland will continue to flourish by the preaching of God's word. It was opposition to this that ruined the cause of the Pope in Scotland. The brutish ignorance, the debauchery, the godless, scandalous lives of the popish shavelings, who had filled the country with their illegitimate children, all this was bad enough. Their oppression of the poor was still worse. And last year they lighted again the fires of persecution; burning four honest men for eating a goose on Friday, and dragging good old Walter Mill to the stake for saying the Lord's prayer in English. But it was hatred to God's word that put the last nail in their coffin." The English Ambassador was instructed to use all lawful means to influence and persuade the Scottish Reformers to conform to, and adopt as their model the English establishment; but he was soon convinced of the impracticability of this proposal; and was obliged to report his ill success in the following terms:—"Howbeit, I find them so severe in that which they profess, and so loth to remit anything of what they have received, that I see little hope thereof. Knox upon Sunday last, *gave the cross and the candle such a wipe*, that men as wise and learned as himself wished him to have held his peace."

In writing to Secretary Cecil, and when alluding to Knox, Randolph again says:—"Where your honour exhorteth us to stoutness, I assure you the voice of one man is able in an hour to put more life in us than six hundred trumpets continually blustering in our ears."

No doubt the English envoy would be surprised to hear the Scottish people so freely denounce, as Anti-cristian, Archbishops, Bishops, Deans and Archdeacons, as well as those forms and ceremonies which prevailed among them in England, and to which they were so much attached in the Anglican establishment.

MARY ARRIVES IN SCOTLAND.

Mary Stuart, the youthful and beautiful Queen of Scots, arrived in Edinburgh on the 19th of August, 1561. During her stay in

France, her uncles of the house of Guise had been specially training her for the great work of overturning the Reformation in Scotland. Of the uncles of Mary it may truly be said, that "instruments of cruelty were in their habitations." They were bad men, and their efforts to make Mary a bad woman were crowned with success. They strengthened her prejudices, and filled her mind with hatred to the Protestant Religion. They revealed to her the plot of the Popish Sovereigns of Europe to exterminate Protestantism throughout Christendom; and told her if she would only suppress the Reformation in Scotland, and restore its ancient faith, that Papal Europe would present her with the throne of England, the Sceptre of Elizabeth, as the reward of her labors. This was an object worth contending for, and Mary did struggle hard to accomplish it. In the first instance she was to endeavor to win them by smiles and caresses, tears and hypocritical promises. And those weapons made great execution, for the Aristocracy, and Court visitants in general, soon abated in their zeal for Protestantism, or were entirely gained over. But there was one man who dreaded from the very first the influence of "the holy water of the Court," and upon whom it had no other effect than that of stirring him up to greater watchfulness, determination, and action. I need hardly say that this was John Knox. To his great sorrow he soon perceived the wonderful effect the fawning arts of Mary had upon the Protestant leaders. Some apostatized and almost all began to temporize. The Reformed Religion was to be tolerated however, till the plot was fully matured, and stakes and gibbets prepared for such as proved still obstinate to "the holy water of the Court."

Meanwhile, Romish rites, one after another were introduced in the Chapel of Holyrood Palace; and Mary said that "she hoped, before a year was expired, to have the Mass and Catholic profession restored throughout the whole Kingdom." At this time the Papists of the North rose in arms to force Popery again upon Scotland; and they were not ignorant of the fact, that the Court was friendly to their enterprise. Knox, who was a great discerner of character, and a man of great penetration and sagacity, was not long in the company of Mary, when he expressed his judgment of her in the following terms: "If there be not in her a proud mind, a crafty wit, and an indurate heart against God, and his

truth, my judgment faileth me." Few will now deny the accuracy of his judgment in this, as well as in many other instances. The Queen found in the stern Reformer a man who could neither be flattered by her smiles, and caresses, nor melted by her crocodile tears, nor overawed by her frowns.

But now that the Papists had taken up arms, the Queen had assumed a more authoritative tone, and the nobility had become so lukewarm, Knox was alarmed. He was no doubt grieved to see his country thus retrograding fast towards that horrible abyss from which it had so recently been delivered; and falling so fast asleep upon the knees of Delilah." He at once stood "in the deadly imminent breach," and threw himself between the cause of Christ and those that sought to destroy it in the land. Knox was not an hireling, but a "good shepherd," who was ready to lay down his life for Christ and for his sheep. At this time, be it remembered, there was no free press, and no other organ of public sentiment in the country but the pulpit alone. And the pulpit of John Knox gave no uncertain sound, which indeed if it did, the Reformation would have been irretrievably ruined. In the pulpit he thundered against the cruelty, deceit, and sophistry of the Papists—rallied the ranks of the Protestant nobles and inspired them with courage—awakened the suspicions of the nation, and warned them of the treachery and evil designs of Popery—and he also defended the Reformation in the royal presence, with a courage and faithfulness energy and ability, that has never been excelled. Such was the success that crowned his perilous and long labors, that he got the Parliament of 1567, not only to ratify all the acts which had been passed in 1560 in favor of the Reformation, but even to give additional securities. It was thus Knox conducted the Reformation to its consummation, and preserved it in Scotland. The preservation of the Reformation this second time was by far the greatest and most arduous work of Knox. The enemies of the Reformed faith, had almost achieved their purpose, and would certainly have done so at this time, had it not been for Knox. It is no wonder then that they have never forgiven him for this good and great work. It is here particularly they calumniate and misrepresent him so furiously and unscrupulously. But it is here we love and admire him, as intensely as they hate him, for his patriotic, disin-

terested and faithful behavior. At the outset of this second struggle he warned the nation from the pulpit, "that one Mass was more fearful unto him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm, of purpose to suppress the whole religion."

I shall here give a specimen of what generally passed between the Queen and the Reformer, when he was favored with an intercourse with her. One one occasion "she charges him with having taught the people to receive a religion different from that which was allowed by their princes." To which Knox replied, "that true religion derived its origin and authority, not from princes, but from God; that princes were often most ignorant on this point; and that subjects were not bound to frame their religious sentiments and practice according to the arbitrary will of their rulers, else the Hebrews ought to have conformed to the religion of Pharaoh, Daniel to Darius, and the primitive christians to that of the Roman Emperors." The Queen said, "think you that subjects having the power, may resist their princes?" The Reformer replied: "if princes exceed their bounds," Madam, "no doubt they may be resisted, even by power. For no greater honor or greater obedience, is to be given to Kings and Princes, than God has commanded to be given to father and mother. But the father may be struck with a frenzy in which he would slay his children. Now, Madam, if the children arise, join together, apprehend the father, take the sword from him, bind his hands and keep him in prison, till the frenzy be over, think you, Madam, that the children do any wrong? Even so it is with princes that would murder the children of God, that are subject unto them. Their blind zeal is nothing but a mad frenzy; therefore to take the sword from them, to bind their hands, and to cast them into prison, till they be brought to a more sober mind, is no disobedience against princes, but just obedience, because it agreeth with the will of God." The Queen again said: "But you are not the church that I will nourish, I will defend the Church of Rome; for it is, I think, the true Church of God." "Your will, Madam, is no reason, neither doth your thought make the Roman Harlot to be the true spouse of Christ," replied Knox. "My conscience is not so," said the Queen. "Conscience, Madam," replied the Reformer, "requires

knowledge, and I fear that right knowledge you have none." As he was leaving the Palace, he overheard one of the Popish attendants saying, "He is not afraid." "Why," replied Knox, should the pleasing face of a *gentlewoman* afray me. I have looked in the faces of many angry men, and yet have not been afraid above measure."

On another occasion, being offended at the freedom with which he spoke of her marriage, she summoned him to appear instantly before her. After enumerating various instances of her condescension and kindness to him, the Queen said, "and yet I cannot be quit of you, I vow to God I shall be once revenged!" At this moment she burst into a flood of tears which interrupted her speech. Knox replied: "Out of the pulpit, he believed, few had occasion to complain of him, but there he was not his own master, but was bound to obey him who commanded him to speak plainly, and to flatter no flesh on the face of the earth." But she indignantly interrupted him by saying, "What are you in this Commonwealth?" "A subject born within the same," replied the Reformer, "And albeit I be neither Earl, Lord or Baron in it, yet has God made me (how abject soever I be in your eyes,) a profitable member within the same. Yea, Madam, to me it pertains no less to forewarn of such things as may hurt it, than it doth to any of the nobility; for both my vocation and conscience require plainness of me." At these words the Queen began again to sob and weep with great bitterness. After she had given vent to her feelings, Knox said, "that he never took delight in the distress of any creature; it was with great difficulty that he could see his own boys weep when he corrected them for their faults; and far less could he rejoice in Her Majesty's tears; but seeing he had given her no just reason of offence, and had only discharged his duty, he was constrained, though unwillingly, to sustain her tears, rather than hurt his conscience, and betray the Commonwealth by his silence." In a great rage, she commanded him instantly to leave her presence, "and wait the signification of her pleasure in the adjoining room." Here he addressed himself to the Court ladies who sat in their richest dress in the chamber; "O fair Ladies, how pleasing were this life of yours, if it should ever abide, and then, in the end, that we might pass to heaven with all this gay

gear! But fye upon that Knave Death, that will come whethier we will or not."

The Courtiers, knowing that Mary had a great dislike to the General Assemblies of the Church, absented themselves from the first General Assembly held after her arrival in the country. And when they were challenged for their absence they denied the propriety or lawfulness of such convocations without the permission of Her Majesty: "Take from us the liberty of Assemblies" replied Knox to Maitland, "and take from us the gospel. If the liberty of the Church must depend upon her allowance or disallowance, we shall want not only Assemblies, but also the preaching of the Gospel." It was shortly after this, the Lords who were present at the trial of Knox for treason, with one voice exclaimed, "God forbid that ever the lives of the faithful, or yet the staying of the doctrine, stood in the power of the Papists! for just experience has taught us what cruelty lies in their hearts."

Dr. Wylie at the late Tricentenary of the Scottish Reformation in Edinburgh, in speaking of Knox, gave utterance to the following weighty and truthful sentiments: "He had penetrated the design of Mary, inflexibly formed, and craftily, yet steadily pursued, of overturning the Reformation of her native land. He suspected what has since been discovered to be the fact, that she had put her hand to that bond of blood by which she engaged to become the executioner of her Protestant subjects, when the time should be fitting. He beheld, in fine, in the dark back-ground of Mary's throne, in terrible phalanx, the banded despots of Europe, who had made Scotland the key-stone in that arch of conspiracy, and assassination which rose, spanning Europe, and he stood boldly forward, in the name not of Scotland only, but of humanity, to denounce, and if possible, prevent the perpetration of the gigantic crime. In that Chamber of Holyrood, and in that pulpit of St. Giles, he fought the noblest battle ever waged upon Scottish soil, and defeated a more formidable foe than Wallace encountered at Stirling or Bruce at Bannockburn. Unassisted and alone, it may be said, he foiled the tactics of the most treacherous and cunning race of Princes the world has ever seen. He broke in pieces the firm knit leagues of Papal conspirators, plucked from their very teeth this poor country of Scotland, which they had marked for

their prey, and rescued it from the vile uses to which they had destined it, to become one of the lights of the world and a mother of free nations. Through all the ages of the future, the foremost place among Scotsmen must ever belong to Knox. He was the restorer of his country's faith, the founder of his country's liberties.

THE DEATH AND CHARACTER OF KNOX.

At length John Knox, after a short illness, rested from his labors. He died in the sixty-seventh year of his age, wasted and exhausted, not however so much from old age, as from the great labors of body, and the still greater anxieties of mind which he had sustained. No wonder that he was weary of the world, and weary of the corrupt and unprincipled men with whom he had to contend in it. On Wednesday, the 26th of November 1572, he was buried in the church-yard of St. Giles. His funeral was attended by all the nobility who were in the city, and a great concourse of people. When his body was lowered into the grave, the Regent, Morton, pronounced his eulogium in those well known words, "There Lies He who never feared the Face of Man." Never before was there a more deserving or a truer eulogium pronounced by any man. As the character of Knox has been so much abused and maligned by the enemies of true religion, I shall make room here for a few extracts bearing upon his character to show the estimation in which he was held by such as knew him best, and were therefore better qualified to form a correct opinion of him. Richard Bannatyne, who was Secretary to Knox, said in a speech which he delivered before the General Assembly: "It has pleased God to make me a servant to that man. John Knox, whom I serve, as God bears me witness, not so much in respect of my worldly commodity, as for that integrity and uprightness which I have ever known, and presently understand, to be in him, especially in the faithful administration of his office, in teaching of the word of God. Again, in speaking of the Reformer's death, he said: "In this manner departed this man of God; the light of Scotland, the comfort of the church within the same, the mirror of godliness, and pattern and example to all true Ministers, in purity of life, soundness of doctrine, and boldness in reproving of wickedness; one that cared not the favor of men, how great soever they were. What dexterity in

teaching, boldness in reproving, and hatred in wickedness was in him, my ignorant dullness is not able to declare, which if I should labor to set out, it were as one would light a candle to let men see the sun; seeing all his virtues are better known and notified to all the world a thousand fold than I am able to express."

Principal Smeaton's character of him, is equally honorable and flattering. He says: "I know not if ever so much piety and genius were lodged in such a frail and weak body. Certain, I am, that it will be difficult to find one in whom the gifts of the Holy Spirit shone so bright, to the comfort of the Church of Scotland. None spared himself less in enduring fatigues, bodily and mental; none was more intent on discharging the duties of the province assigned to him. Released from a body exhausted in Christian warfare, and translated to a blessed rest, where he has obtained the sweet reward of his labours, he now triumphs with Christ."

The venerable Dr. McCrie in his life of Knox, says: "He died in the sixty-seventh year of his age, not so much oppressed with years, as worn out and exhausted by his extraordinary labours of body and anxieties of mind. Few men were ever exposed to more dangers or underwent greater hardships. From the time that he embraced the reformed religion, till he breathed his last, seldom did he enjoy a respite from trouble; and he emerged from one scene of difficulty and danger, only to be involved in another, still more distressing. Obligated to flee from St. Andrews, to escape the fury of Cardinal Beaton, he found a retreat in East Lothian, from which he was hunted by Archbishop Hamilton. He lived for several years as an outlaw, in daily apprehension of falling a prey to those who eagerly sought his life. The few months during which he enjoyed protection in the Castle of St. Andrews, were succeeded by a long and rigorous captivity. After enjoying some repose in England, he was again driven into banishment, and for five years wandered as an exile on the continent. When he returned to his native country it was to engage in a struggle of the most perilous and arduous kind. After the Reformation was established, and he was settled in the capital, he was involved in a continental contest with the Court. When he was relieved from this warfare, and thought only of ending his days in peace, he was again called into the field, and although scarcely able to walk, was

obliged to remove from his flock, and to avoid the fury of his enemies by submitting to a new banishment. He was repeatedly condemned for heresy and proclaimed an outlaw; thrice he was accused of high treason, and on two of these occasions he appeared and underwent a trial. A price was publicly set on his head, assassins were employed to kill him; and his life was attempted both with the pistol and the dagger. Yet he escaped all these perils, and finished his course in peace and in honor. From the time that the standard of truth was first raised by him in his native country, till it dropped from his hands at death, Knox never shrunk from danger—never consulted his own ease or advantage—never entered into any compromise with the enemy—never was bribed or frightened into cowardly silence. No wonder that he was weary of the world and anxious to depart; and with great propriety might it be said at his decease, that “he rested from his labours.”

“In contemplating such a character as that of Knox, it is not the man so much as the *Reformer* that ought to engage our attention. The talents which are suited to one age and station would be altogether unsuitable to another. We must admire the austere and rough Reformer whose voice once cried in the wilderness, who was clothed with camel’s hair, and girt about the loins with a leathern girdle, who came neither eating nor drinking, but laying the axe to the root of every tree, warned a generation of vipers to flee from the wrath to come, saying even to the tyrant upon the throne “It is not lawful for thee.” To those who complain that they are disappointed at not finding, in our National Reformer, courteous manners, and a winning address, we may say in the language of our Lord to the Jews concerning the Baptist: What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? &c. Before the Reformation, superstition, shielded by ignorance, and armed with power, governed with gigantic sway. Men of mild spirits and of gentle manners, would have been as unfit for taking the field against this enemy, as a dwarf or a child for encountering a giant. What did Erasmus in the days of Luther? What would Lowth have done in the days of Wickliff? Or Blair in those of Knox? John Knox was austere, not unfeeling; stern, not savage; vehement, not vindictive. There is not an instance of his employing his influence to revenge any personal injury which he had received.”

THE COVENANTERS.

No sooner Knox was laid in his grave, the country was delivered from the thralldom of Rome, and the Church had entered upon its noble career of evangelization and education, than a terrible struggle for spiritual liberty commenced in Scotland with their Kings, which lasted for a whole century. This fierce battle was only terminated with the final overthrow of the infatuated race of Stuarts, in 1688. In their determination to destroy the Church of Christ, and the liberties of the people, they destroyed themselves; and in attempting to subdue Church and State under their despotic sway, they lost both. The Stuarts were determined from first to last to root Presbyterianism out of the whole of their dominions, and establish Prelacy or Popery on its ruins. They at once saw that Presbyterianism was essentially opposed to that absolute sovereignty and despotism which they wished to establish, because it too largely recognized the rights and liberties of the people, and utterly denied what was a first principle with them—"the divine right of Kings to govern wrong." And they saw no less clearly, on the other hand that Episcopacy denied the rights and liberties of the people; and the Bishops everywhere recognized the spiritual supremacy of the King, received him as the head of the Church, and preached the duty of absolute obedience to him, for the wealth and honors he bestowed upon them. As the Prelates derived all their power from the King's supremacy, it was only their interest to establish his absolute sovereignty over men and all things. In short, the burden of their preaching was the supremacy of the King, and the consequent duty of obedience and non-resistance on the part of the people. "Their employment now," says Hume, "is not to preach Christ, but the King." On the Sabbath before the meeting of Parliament, the Bishops of Galloway and Brechin told the people that the King had a right, not only to their property, but also to their lives. Brechin farther exhorted the women to retrench their superfluous expenses in dress, and the men to avoid excess in the use of wine, that they might have it in their power to give more to the King. Such is the doctrine of our Episcopal Church. We are to abstain from vice, not as vice, but in order to fill the royal coffers. "The King," says Kirkton, "even as his father, was

resolved for Bishops, notwithstanding his oath to the contrary—he knew well that Bishops would never be reprovers of the Court, and that the first article of their catechism was non-resistance. They are the best tools for tyranny in the world.” The grand and distinguishing characteristics of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism at that time were, that the former denied, while the latter asserted, the rights of the people; and that the former asserted, while the latter denied, the absolute sovereignty of Kings. The views of the Covenanters upon this point, agreed with those noble sentiments of Knox, which have long since become the foundation of the British Constitution, namely, that all power is founded on a compact expressed or understood, between the rulers and the ruled, and that no one has either divine or human right to govern, save in accordance with the will of the people and the law of God.” No men knew better than the Stuarts, that before Scotland could be enslaved, its Presbyterianism must be overthrown. No man knew better than they, that Prelacy with its ambitious bishops, was indispensable to set them up as despots in Britain. Hence their favorite maxim, *No bishop, no king*. But it is not our intention at present to enter at large upon the doleful history of this period. The very thought of the enormities committed, of the scenes of carnage, slaughter and blood witnessed, of the devastation of the country, and of the wholesale slaughter of the people of God, in Scotland and Ireland, during the reign of the bloody Stuarts, chills the blood, sickens the heart, and unnerves the hand.

As soon as James ascended the throne of England, notwithstanding that he formerly declared that “the Church of Scotland was the sincerest and purest kirk in the world” he attempted to mar its beauty and overthrow its constitution. To accomplish this the more effectually, he published a book entitled *Basilicon Doron*, or Royal Gift. The conceited Monarch—for there never was a more conceited man than James the Sixth—maintained in this book, that the office of a king is of a mixed kind, partly civil and partly ecclesiastical; that a principal part of his function consists in ruling the Church; that it belongs to him to judge when preachers wander from their texts, and that such as refuse to submit to his judgment in such cases, ought to be put to death, that no ecclesiastical assemblies ought to be held without his consent; that no man is more

to be hated of a king than a proud puritan; that purity among ministers is irreconcilable with monarchy, inimical to order, and the mother of confusion; that the chief persons among the puritans should not be allowed to remain in the land; that Episcopacy should be set up, and all who preached against Bishops rigorously punished. In his *True Law of Free Monarchies*, a book which he published the previous year, his Majesty graciously allows that Kings owe a duty to their subjects, but he says, "*it is not needing to be long*" in the declaration of it. He says: "A good king will frame all his actions according to the law, yet he is not bound thereto but of his good will; although he be above the law, he will frame and subject his actions thereto of his own free will, but he is not subject or bound thereto." Such is a specimen of the statements made, and topics discussed in those silly books by the royal author. And accordingly, James declared himself Head of both Church and State in 1606; restored the Bishops to their ancient honors and livings, and established Courts of High Commission to ferret out all who were obnoxious to the Bishops. In spite of the opposition of the Scottish people, he imposed the name and office of Archbishop and Bishop upon the Church as early as the year 1572; and although the General Assembly of 1580 declared that "those offices had no warrant in the word of God;" yet the antipathy of James to Presbyterianism was daily increasing, and his determination to root it out of the country was growing stronger and stronger. The General Assembly of 1580 declared, "that the office of one Bishop, as it is now used and commonly taken within this realm, has no sure warrant, authority, or good ground out of the Scripture of God, but is brought in by folly and corruption, to the great overthrow of the Kirk of God; the whole Assembly of this National Kirk in one voice, and liberty given to all men to reason in the matter, not any one opposing himself in the defence of the said pretended office, finds and declares the same pretended office, unlawful in itself, as having neither fundament, ground, nor warrant within the word of God."

But at this time, as on many other occasions, Presbyterianism had the disadvantage of fighting as in an intrenchment, against foes without and traitors within. There were in the Church as of old, Balaams, Judases and Demases, who betrayed Christ, his cause

and their own brethren for filthy lucre, of whom that well known renegade, the traitorous and infamous Archbishop Sharpe, was the chief. The General Assembly held at Perth in 1618, passed the following five Prelatic or Popish articles, by a majority of the members, chiefly through intimidation, "kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's supper; private communion; private baptism; confirmation of children; and the observance of festivals;" all of which were ratified by a small majority in the Parliament of 1621, to the inexpressible grief of the people of God in Scotland. Having thus obtained the sanction of the law for Prelacy, the King wrote to the Bishops and said: "So that hereafter, that rebellious and seditious crew (the Presbyterians) must either obey or resist God, their natural King, and the law of the country. It resteth therefore to you, to lose no more time in procuring a settled obedience to God and to us. The sword is put into your hands; go on therefore to use it, and let it rest no longer." Immediately many faithful preachers and pious private christians were subjected either to imprisonment or banishment, for not recognizing the spiritual jurisdiction of the King, and his *creatures*, the Bishops, for not renouncing their Presbyterianism and sacrificing their consciences and their liberties at the shrine of a prowling Prelacy.

It was at this time the banishment of the famous John Welch, who used to spend eight hours daily in prayer to God, took place. He went with his family to France, where he continued for sixteen years, and where his services proved eminently beneficial to the Church of God. Such was the assiduity with which he applied himself to the acquisition of the French language, that he was able to preach in it in the course of fourteen weeks, after which he became Minister of a Protestant congregation at Nerac. But having lost his health, the physicians informed him that the only prospects he had of recovering it was by returning to his native country. Accordingly Mr Welch arrived in London in the year 1622, but the King absolutely refused to give him permission to return to Scotland, dreading the influence of a man who was on the brink of eternity with a consumption. Mrs. Welch, who was a daughter of the great Reformer, John Knox, obtained access to the King, and petitioned him to grant the liberty to her dying husband of returning to his native air. The King asked her who was her father.

She replied, "John Knox." "Knox and Welsh," exclaimed his Majesty, "the devil never made such a match as that." "It is right like, sir," said Mrs. Welch, "for we never asked his advice." James asked her how many children her father had left, and if they were lads or lasses. She said three and they were all lasses. "God be thanked" cried the King, lifting up both his hands, "for if they had been three lads, I had never enjoyed my three Kingdoms in peace." Upon again urging her request that he would give her husband his native air—"Give him the Devil," replied the King. "Give that to your hungry Courtiers," answered Mrs. Welch. The King at last said if she would only persuade her husband to submit to the Bishops, he would allow him to return to Scotland. Mrs. Welch lifting up her apron, and holding it towards the King, replied in the true spirit of her father, "Please your Majesty, I would rather receive his head there." Mrs. Welch was truly worthy of her father as a daughter, and of her husband as a wife. But the sainted Welch was soon released both from the power of that despot and from his own sufferings. He died in London, in May, 1622, an exile from his native country on account of his faithfulness to Christ and his love to the truth.

But Andrew Melville was the champion of the Scottish Church after the death of Knox. He was a successor in all respects worthy of the great Reformer, and was not a whit behind him in boldness and fortitude. He returned to Scotland after an absence of ten years on the continent, where he spent the most of his time with Calvin and Beza. On a certain occasion he was one of a deputation sent by the Commissioners of the General Assembly to the King to remonstrate against his Majesty's conduct in receiving the Papists into favor, and appointing them to the highest offices in the Government of the country, when at the same time he was cruelly persecuting the Presbyterians. James Melville, Andrew's nephew, was appointed their speaker, because he was a man of courteous manners, and in favor with his Sovereign. But he had scarcely begun to address the King, when his Majesty abruptly stopped him, and accused the Presbyterians of sedition. As James Melville was about to reply in his usual courteous and submissive tone, his uncle, unable to restrain himself, and judging that the occasion demanded a fearless statement, and an uncompromising maintenance of the

whole truth, stepped forward to address the King. His Majesty summoned up all his authority to silence him, but to no avail, for Melville took him by the sleeve and calling him *God's silly vassal*, addressed him in the following faithful and truthful strain: "Sir," said the valiant servant of Christ, "We will always humbly reverence your Majesty in public; but since we have this occasion to be with your Majesty in private, and since you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and along with you the country and Church of God, are like to go to wreck, for not telling you the truth, and giving you faithful counsel, we must discharge our duty, or else be traitors to both Christ and you. Therefore, sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two Kings and two Kingdoms in Scotland; there is King James, the head of this Commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose Kingdom he is not a King, nor a Lord, nor a head, but a member. Sir, those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over his Church, have power and authority from him to govern his spiritual Kingdom both jointly and severally; the which no Christian King should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of his Church. We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience, but again I say you are not the head of the Church, you cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us freely then to meet in and to attend to the interests of that Church of which you are the chief member. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land in spite of all his enemies; his officers and Ministers convened and assembled for the ruling and welfare of his Church, which was ever for your welfare, defence and preservation, when these same enemies were seeking your destruction and cutting off. Their assemblies since that time continually have been terrible to these enemies, and most steadable to you. And now when there is more than extreme necessity for the continuance and discharge of that duty, will you (drawn to your own destruction by a devilish and most pernicious counsel) begin to hinder and dishearten Christ's servants and your most faithful subjects, quarrelling them for their convening, and the care they have of their duty to Christ and you, when you should rather coun-

tehanee them as the godly Kings and Emperors did? But sir, if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove mere and mad folly; his curse cannot but light upon it; in seeking both ye shall loose both; whereas in cleaving uprightly to God, his true servants would be your true friends, and he would compel the rest counterfeitly and lyingly to give over themselves and serve you." So spoke Andrew Melville. It would have been well for poor kings if they always had men about them possessed of the fortitude and faithfulness of this valiant and sterling man, instead of the flatterers and sycophants who generally resort to them and compose their courtiers. This confounding speech terrified the King and those around him as much as the hand-writing on the wall did Belshazzar of old. He dismissed the deputation with fair promises, which of course he never meant to perform.

In May, 1606, letters were received from the King, who was then in London, by eight Ministers, including Andrew Melville, and his nephew, summoning them to London to a friendly conference with his Majesty, under the pretence of a strong desire on his part, as well as in great condescension, to ameliorate the state of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland. This was a piece of the most outrageous hypocrisy, and consummate villany on the King's part, as his base conduct towards them after going to London clearly proved; where he imprisoned them, and treated them with every possible contempt and cruelty. When they were in London he compelled them to attend the Royal Chapel, where special sermons, by his authority, were preached against them; when at the same time, the right of reply, or any sort of self-defence was denied to them. This was certainly a singular and cowardly mode of conducting a controversy, where the speaking was all on one side. On the 28th of September all the Scotch Ministers received a message from his Majesty to be in the Royal Chapel early next day; and Andrew Melville and his nephew received a particular charge not to be absent. It was the day of St. Michael, and was celebrated with much superstitious pomp. On entering the chapel, and hearing it resound with all kinds of music, James Melville whispered to his uncle that he suspected the great popish display of the day was designed to ensnare them, and put their patience to the test. "On the altar were placed two shut books, two empty chalices, and two candle-

sticks with unlighted candles. And the King and Queen approached it with great ceremony, and presented their offerings. When the service was over, the Prince de Vadumont said, he did not see what should hinder the Churches of Rome and England to unite ; and one of his attendants exclaimed, "There is nothing of the Mass wanting here but the adoration of the host." On returning to his lodgings, Andrew Melville composed a few verses in Latin on the scene which he had just witnessed in the Church ; and which have been translated to English as follows :—

" Why stand there on the royal altar high,
Two closed books, blind lights, two bags dry ?
Doth England hold God's mind, and worship close
Blind of her sight, and buried in her dross ?
Doth she with Chapel put in Romish dress
The purple whore religiously express ?

By means of some court spies, who frequented Melville's lodgings, a copy of these verses was conveyed to the King, who pretended to discover treason in them, and to be highly incensed against him for them. Incredible as it may now appear, he was instantly summoned to appear before the Privy Council of England on this account. Melville at once acknowledged that he was the author of the verses in question, which he composed, as he said, under feelings of indignation and grief, at seeing such superstitious vanity in a reformed Church, but that he was not conscious of any crime for what he had done. His accuser, Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, argued that such a libel on the worship of the Church of England brought the offender within the laws of treason. In the days of Queen Elizabeth this same Bancroft wrote a book "against the title of King James to the Crown of England," and of which, no doubt, he would be very sorry to hear any mention at this time. But to sit silently under a charge of treason against himself on such a silly pretext, and by a man of whom he had such an unfavorable opinion, was more than Andrew Melville could do. And he therefore indignantly exclaimed, "My Lords, Andrew Melville was never a traitor. But my Lords, there was

one Richard Bancroft (let him be sought for) who, during the life of the late Queen, wrote a treatise against his Majesty's title to the crown of England; and here (pulling the corpus delicti from his pocket,) here is the book which was answered by my brother Mr. Davidson. Bancroft was thrown into the utmost confusion by this bold and unexpected attack. Meanwhile Melville went on to charge the Archbishop with his delinquencies. He accused him of profaning the Sabbath, of maintaining an anti-christian Hierarchy, and vain, foppish, superstitious ceremonies, and of silencing the true preachers of the Gospel for scrupling to conform to those. Advancing gradually as he spoke to the head of the table where Bancroft sat, he took hold of his lawn sleeves and shaking them, and calling them "Romish rags," he said, "If you are the author of the book called *English Scottizing for Geneva discipline*," then I regard you as the capital enemy of all the Reformed Churches in Europe; and as such I will profess myself an enemy to you, and to your proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of blood; and it grieves me that such a man should have his Majesty's ear and sit so high in this honourable Council." The poor Archbishop, and indeed all the sycophants that sat with him, were utterly confounded before this noble servant of Christ. The undaunted Andrew Melville, however, was never again permitted to return to his native country, but was imprisoned in the Tower of London, where none of his friends had access to him. Even his nephew was not permitted to see him; and he was denied the use of pen, ink and paper. No creature was allowed to see him but the person who brought him his food, for at least ten months. All those Ministers whom the King had, on a friendly pretext, invited up to London, were proscribed in their liberty, although not so exclusively deprived of it as Andrew Melville. James Melville was not allowed to return to Scotland, but was strictly confined to Newcastle.

After four years imprisonment in the Tower, through the interposition of the Duke of Bouillon, one of the grandees of France, Melville was permitted to go to France, if he preferred banishment to imprisonment. In France he became Professor in the University of Sedan, and was in all ten years in that country at the time of his death. He died at the advanced age of seventy-seven years.

It was thus James the Sixth and his unprincipled bishops treated Andrew Melville, the most distinguished scholar and theologian of his day in Britain. Their pretext for his imprisonment is so ridiculous, and their general carriage towards him was so base, that both are far beneath contempt, and are only worthy of St. Dominic and his cruel disciples. The following notice of Melville's death was found in the obituary of Boyd, Principal of the University of Edinburgh: "As to the death of that venerable father of our Church, the ornament of his nation, and great light of this age, in all virtue, learning, vivacity of spirit, promptitude, zeal, holy freedom, and boldness, and invincible courage in a good cause, with a holy course of life and resolution, who died at Sedan last year, 1622, aged about 80 years. He was rejected from his native country by the malice of the times, and men, because he had with fortitude and firmness maintained the truth, and given testimony to it before the princes of this world. He had kept a good conscience without changes, either out of fear or by the flattery and favors of men, after his imprisonment in the Tower of London, and his living an exile for more than ten years."

The venerable Dr. McCrie thus closes his "Life of Melville." "If the love of pure religion, rational liberty, and polite letters, forms the basis of national virtue and happiness, I know no individual, after the Reformer, from whom Scotland has received greater benefits, and to whom she owes a deeper debt of gratitude, and respect than Andrew Melville."

In the year 1637, and on the 23rd of July, a bold attempt was made in Edinburgh in the Cathedral of St. Giles, to force the English or rather the Popish service upon the people. The Privy Council, the Lords of Session, and the Magistrates of the city, with a large multitude of the common people, were present in the Church. The Dean of Edinburgh in his white surplice commenced reading the Service; but he had scarcely commenced, when suddenly an old woman of the name of Jannet Geddes started up, and seizing the stool on which she had been sitting, hurled it at the Dean's head, and exclaiming, "Villain! dost thou say Mass at my lug." Immediately her example was followed by others, and the Church became the scene of great confusion. The Dean, afraid of his life, left his surplice and Mass Book behind him, and fled. Lindsay, the bishop of Edinburgh, ascended the pulpit, and

summoned up all his authority to restore order, but in vain; for the people clearly perceived that there was an attempt made that day to overthrow their Presbyterianism and their liberties; and their indignation knew no bounds. Tidings of what had taken place in Elinburgh spread all over the country, and were received by Presbyterians throughout the land as a warning to rise in defence of their liberties. But more of this anon. Another anecdote related of a worthy Scotchwoman of a kindred spirit with Jannet Geddes may not be out of place here. It is as follows: When Cowper was made bishop of Galloway, an old woman who had been one of his parishoners at Perth, and a favorite, could not be persuaded that her Minister had deserted the Presbyterian cause. Resolved to satisfy herself, she paid him a visit in the Cannongate, where he had his residence as Dean of the Chapel Royal. The retinue of servants through which she passed, staggered the good woman's confidence, and on being ushered into the room where the bishop sat in state, she exclaimed, "Oh, Sir! what's this? and ye hae really left the guid cause, and turned Prelate?" "Jannet," said the bishop, "I have got new light upon these things." "So I see Sir," replied Jannet, "for when ye was at Perth, ye had but ae candle, and now ye've got twa before ye; that's a' your new light."

THE SECOND REFORMATION.

The King had by this time cast off the mask, and publicly declared his determination to root Presbyterianism out of the country and establish Prelacy on its ruins. He was resolved to force the nation into conformity with his own religious views. What the Stuarts all the while aimed at was Popery, and as Presbyterianism was its strongest foe, and at the greatest possible remove from it, they knew well enough by destroying it, that they were taking out of the way by far the greatest obstacle to the establishment of Romanism again in the country. As Prelacy has always been considered the half-way house between genuine Protestantism and real Popery, Charles was aware if he only got the nation to receive it, they would be at least half way to Rome, and having thus got over the first half of the journey, there would be a greater likelihood of getting them to travel the last half of the road. But the Presbyterians were determined to defend their rights, civil and religious,

to the effusion of the last drop of their blood. They were not prepared to put their necks under the yoke of despotism in the Church and arbitrary power in the State—a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear—without a desperate struggle in behalf of those blessings and privileges, of which their fathers could truly say, “with a great sum obtained we this freedom.” Accordingly, the leaders of the Presbyterian cause agreed to renew the national covenant, which had been sworn by King James and his household in the year 1580, and by persons of all ranks in 1581, 1590, 1596, and ratified by several acts of Parliament. The National Covenant consisted of three parts: first, the Old Covenant of 1581; the second, the Acts of Parliament condemning Popery, and ratifying the Acts of the General Assembly, which was written by Johnston; and the third part was adapted to the present circumstances of the country, and reviewing the encroachments made upon their liberties since the Reformation, which was written by Henderson. It plainly declared their determination to maintain the great principles of the Reformation in their original integrity.

The 28th of February, 1638, was set apart for solemn fasting and prayer, and for subscribing the Covenant. And on the appointed day, the people resorted in vast numbers to the Grey Friar's Church, where, after prayer by Henderson, the Earl of Loudon explained and vindicated the object for which they had assembled, and Johnston read aloud the Covenant, the *Magna Charta* of Scotland. Thereafter the nobles, gentry, ministers, and the people in general, amidst tears and with uplifted hands, vowed in the presence of God, faithfully to observe all its stipulations, and joyfully affixed their seals to it. There were no less than sixty thousand people present on the occasion. Some after their names, added the words, *till death*. Others opening a vein wrote their names with their own warm blood. The covenant was brought under the notice of the people in all parts of the country, and was numerously signed. In the annals of Scotland, rich in memorable events and heroic deeds though it be, there are a few or no events in moral and religious sublimity, to be compared with this great day of her sacred National Covenant. It inspired the people of God with courage and renewed zeal for the cause of Christ, and filled the

enemies of religion with fear and dismay. "Now," exclaimed Spotswood, Archbishop of Glasgow, in despair, "all we have been doing those thirty years past is at once thrown down;" and he immediately thereafter left the country and went to London, where he shortly died. The Privy Council felt almost equally paralyzed:

"But when they did beho'd the same
They wond'ring wou'd not stay,
But being troub'd at the sight
They thence did haste away.
Great terror there took ho'd on them
They were possessed with fear." Ps. 48 56.

The King was no less astounded at this national movement than the Prelates. He appointed the Marquis of Hamilton, Lord High Commissioner for Scotland, and secretly instructed him to beguile them with fair promises, and even concessions, so as to give him time to make warlike preparations against them. The instructions of Charles to Hamilton were in those terms: "These are therefore to assure you, that if need be, hereafter to testify to others, that whatsoever ye say to them to discover their intentions, ye shall neither be called in question for the same; nor yet shall it prove in any way pre'judicial to you." It is unnecessary to characterize the Jesuitical and treacherous behaviour of the perfidious Charles in this instance. Shortly after Hamilton's arrival in Scotland, the Privy Council called the General Assembly to meet at Glasgow in November, and summoned Parliament to meet at Edinburgh, in May 1639, for settling the affairs of the country both in Church and State. The declaration of the King prohibited the enforcement of the Book of Canons, the Liturgy, and the Five Articles of Perth, and abolished the Court of High Commission. The heart of Scotland leaped for joy at the near prospect of a General Assembly. And no wonder, for there had been no pure General Assembly for forty years previously, and none at all for twenty years. In spite of Hamilton and all his Prelatical adherents, elders were admitted members of Presbyteries; and a ruling elder from each Presbytery was returned as a member of Assembly. In short, by the zeal and activity of the Covenanters, the most faithful friends to their cause, were chosen members of the Supreme Court.

On the 21st of November, 1638, the General Assembly met in the High Church in Glasgow, and Mr. John Bell, the oldest minister of Glasgow preached the opening sermon from Rev. 1, 12, 13, and solemnly constituted the Assembly in the name of Christ, as the only King and head of the Church. Alexander Henderson, of Leuchars, the worthy successor of Knox, and Melville, was then chosen Moderator, and Archibald Johnston, Advocate, Clerk. After examining the commissions, a paper from the bishop declining the judicature of the Assembly, chiefly on account of the presence of ruling elders or laymen in it, was received and read. After satisfactorily disposing of the reasons urged by the Prelates for their absence, the Assembly declared themselves competent judges of the bishops, notwithstanding their declinature. Hamilton, the representative of royalty, being determined to support the dignity of the now fallen Prelates, protested against any further procedure against the "Lords of the Clergy" as he was pleased to style the bishops: and even threatened to dismiss the Assembly if they persisted in that course. "All that belongeth to us we are ready to render unto his Majesty," said Henderson, "our lives and our goods. But what belongs to God and to the liberties of his house, we cannot sacrifice them. Even if your Grace should leave the Assembly, it will continue to sit until it has performed its duty." "I stand," replied Hamilton, "to the King's prerogative, as supreme judge over all causes civil and ecclesiastical. To him the Lord's of the Clergy have appealed; and therefore, I will not suffer their cause to be farther reasoned here." He then commanded the Moderator to close the Assembly with prayer, which Henderson refused to do. Upon which Hamilton dissolved the meeting in his Majesty's name, and prohibited them from transacting any further business. Next day the commissioner issued a proclamation commanding the Assembly to dissolve under pain of treason, but he was met by a protest in the public street, and no farther notice was taken of the matter. The representative of Charles I. had left the Assembly, but the servants of God who composed that noble meeting felt that his presence was among them who said: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Meanwhile, the General Assembly, regardless of the departure of the Commissioner, and unintimidated by his threats, resolved to continue their sittings, and to carry forward the great work of reformation. They at

once proceeded with their business, and condemned the five articles of Perth, the Service Book, Book of Canons, and the High Commission Court. They annulled the six corrupt Assemblies by which Prelacy had been introduced, viz: Linlithgow in 1606 and 1608, Glasgow 1610, Aberdeen 1616, St. Andrews 1617, and Perth 1618. In short, this Assembly completely abolished Prelacy and restored Presbyterianism to its original purity. It also re-enacted that no person be intruded into any parish, contrary to the will of the congregation; and that the General Assembly henceforth should meet in virtue of its own intrinsic powers, whether it should be convened by the King or not. And accordingly, the next General Assembly was appointed to be held at Edinburgh on the third Wednesday of July, 1639. The most critical business before the Court was the trial of the bishops, against whom charges were given in of oppression and tyranny, "Arminian and Popish doctrines, and the most flagrant disregard to morality, such as adultery, drunkenness, sabbath-breaking, bribery, profane swearing, and many other grievous and abominable crimes." All of which being indisputably proved against them, the Assembly appointed Henderson to pronounce sentence of deposition and excommunication against them, after a sermon to be preached by him suitable to the occasion. His text was Psalm 110, 1, from which he preached a powerful discourse to the great multitude assembled to witness the restoration of the Church of Scotland to its primitive Presbyterian purity. After the sermon Henderson in the face of the whole Assembly pronounced the sentence of deposition and excommunication against the bishops; two Archbishops and six Bishops were excommunicated, four were deposed, and two suspended from their ecclesiastical functions. There were also some Ministers whose character was immoral, either suspended or deposed from the office of the Ministry. The Archbishop of Glasgow was so affected that he fainted when the committee appointed to intimate his sentence to him, had announced their message, and besought them for God's sake to use lenity to him. After an eloquent and impressive address the labors of this admirable and important Assembly terminated by pronouncing the Apostolic benediction. "We have now," said Henderson, as they were about to separate, "Cast down the walls of Jericho; let him that re-buildeth them beware of the curse of

Hiel the Bethelite." "And so," adds Baillie, "we all departed with great comfort and humble joy, casting ourselves and our poor church in the arms of our God." The awful malediction of Hiel was fulfilled in the destruction of the Stuarts from the first-born to the last of their posterity. This was perhaps the most important Assembly the Church of Scotland ever held, and the epoch is therefore called the Second Reformation.

The solemn League and Covenant was also written by Henderson, and he was Moderator of the Assembly of 1643, which approved of it. It was read in the General Assembly on the 17th of August; and afterwards carried to the Convention of Estates, and unanimously ratified by them. It was subsequently sent to London and subscribed by the English Parliament and the Westminster Divines on the 25th of September. This noble document commonly called the Solemn League and Covenant, "bound the United Kingdoms to endeavour the preservation of the Reformed Religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, and the reformation of religion in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland, according to the word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches—the extirpation of Popery and Pseacy—the defence of the King's person, authority, and honor—and the preservation and defence of the true religion, and liberties of the Kingdom in peace and unity."

Henderson rested from his labors on the 19th of August, 1646. Little before his death he said to Sir James Stewart, "Well I am near the end of my race, hastening home, and there was never a school-boy more desirous to have the play, than I am to have leave of this world, and in a few days I will sicken and die." "Thus," says Hethrington, "passed away from earth one of those gifted men, whom the Ruler of all events sends forth in time of great emergency, to mould the minds of his fellow men, and aid in working out the will of the most High. He was one of the most distinguished of an age, fertile in great men; and with all due veneration for the names of Knox and Melville, we do them no discredit when we place that of Henderson by their side—the first three of the Church of Scotland's worthies."

The Second Reformation was completed when the General Assemblies of 1647 and 1648 ratified the Confession of Faith of the

Westminster Assembly of Divines, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. The Directory for Public Worship, and the Form of Church Government were already ratified by the Assembly of 1645. And those books have ever since continued, and we trust ever will continue, to be the authoritative standards of the Presbyterian Churches.

THE KILLING TIME.

The struggles and sufferings of the Presbyterians in Scotland, from the time of Patrick Hamilton to the death of Henderson, were truly severe; and that period of trial and persecution extended over a century and a half. But the cruelties of the past were light in comparison with those of the future. The words of the Lord to the Prophet are very applicable here—"Hast thou seen this, O Son of Man? Turn thee yet again and thou shalt see greater abominations than these." Ezek. 8, 15. The period from 1660 to 1688 is commonly known by the name of the Second Captivity of the Scottish Church. The barbarities and cruelties committed upon the Covenanters in Scotland during this period, by the House of Stuarts to force Episcopacy upon them were scarcely exceeded by the cruelties of the Pharaohs of Egypt, the Herods of the New Testament, Nero, and the Cæsars of Rome. During the reign of the First Charles, and at his instigation, and by his authority, the Papists massacred no less than two hundred thousand Protestants in Ireland in a few months. In the Province of Ulster alone, which was chiefly inhabited by Protestants, there were one hundred and forty thousand cruelly murdered, which of course almost depopulated it. But Charles I. might with truth say to the Scottish people: "My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke; my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." 1 Kings, 12, 14. This perfidious monarch, to lull their suspicions and put them off their guard, subscribed the National Covenant, and the Solemn League and Covenant; and took the oath to defend and support the Church of Scotland. The awful oath which he received, kneeling and holding up his right hand, is as follows: "By the Eternal and Almighty God, who liveth and reigneth forever, I shall observe and keep all that is contained in this oath."

But it is not my intention to enter upon the history of this period, or attempt to give an account of the sufferings of the Covenanters during those 28 years of blood. Suffice it to say that they suffered all the miseries that could possibly be inflicted upon men; they were scourged, were tortured, were banished; they were suffocated, were starved, were burned, were drowned, were hanged, were shot, and they were slain with the sword. The Apostle Paul in the description he has given us of the sufferings of the saints of old, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, has by anticipation given us a description of the sufferings of the saints of the Covenanting period also. One would actually imagine that he was drawing the picture of the latter period when he says: "And others had trial of cruel mockings, and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted and tormented. Of whom the world was not worthy; they wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth." Heb. 11, 36, 38. But who can form an adequate conception of the deprivations and anguish of those who were in hundreds thrown promiscuously into cold and damp dungeons? Of those who were transported and sold like sheep to savages in desolate and barbarous colonies? And of their great sufferings on their long voyages from ruthless and brutish sailors? Who can render an account of all the murders committed under the cloak of justice? Who can relate all the inhuman tortures to which the Covenanters were subjected to compel them to bear witness against themselves, their nearest relatives, and their beloved brethren? Who can fully declare the hardships of those who were driven out of the society of men, obliged to assemble on Mountains, to seek refuge in the caves and dens of the earth, and were hunted from place to place? Who can sufficiently characterize the barbarity of sounding drums on the scaffold to drown the voices of the martyrs? Or of punishing with death such as dared to express their sympathy for them, or pray in their behalf? "They suffered," says a famous author, "extremities that tongue cannot describe, and which heart can hardly conceive of, from the dismal circumstances of hunger, nakedness, and the severity of the climate—lying in damp caves and in hollow clefts of the naked rocks,

without shelter, covering, fire or food: none durst harbour, entertain, relieve, or speak to them, upon pain of death. Many for venturing to receive them, were forced to fly to them, and several put to death for no other offence. Fathers were persecuted for supplying their children, and children for nourishing their parents' husbands for harbouring their wives, and wives for cherishing their own husbands. The ties and obligations of the laws of nature were no defence, but it was made death to perform natural duties; and many suffered death for acts of piety and charity in cases where human nature could not bear the thoughts of suffering it. To such an extreme was the rage of these persecutors carried." "Their ears were cropped, and their faces branded with hot irons. The tortures of the inquisition—the rack, the boot, the thumbkin, the faggot, were common modes adopted by their persecutors." It was Claverhouse's custom to collect children together under ten years of age, and give his soldiers orders to fire over their heads, in order to extort information from them regarding their parents. "What," says the venerable Dr. MacCrie. "persons of judgment and candour will condemn the Covenanters, or say that they acted otherwise than it became men of conscience, integrity and spirit to act? Men who had been betrayed, insulted, harassed, pillaged, and treated in every way like beasts, rather than reasonable creatures; and by whom? By a perfidious, profane, profligate junto of atheists and debauchees, who were not fit for governing even a colony of transported felons, aided by a set of Churchmen, the most despicable and worthless that ever disgraced the habit which they wore, or profaned the sacred function in which they impiously dared to officiate."

On the last Sabbath of October, 1662, there were 200 Presbyterian Ministers deprived of their stipends, and banished from their churches and flocks, because they would not receive Prelacy, and renounce Presbyterianism. And in a few months there were nearly four hundred Ministers subjected to a similar treatment throughout the country. Their places were filled by a drunken, profane, ignorant and immoral set of men, who were a great disgrace to religion. "But the sheep did not hear them." "I believe," says Kirkton, "there was never such a sad Sabbath in Scotland, as when the

poor persecuted Ministers took leave of their people. The lamentations of the people resembled the wild wailings of a city taken by storm:—”

“ At the risk of their lives with their flocks they would meet,
In storm, and in tempest, in rain, and in sleet;
Where the mist in the moor-glens lay darkest, 'twas there,
In the thick cloud concealed, they assembled for prayer.
In cities the wells of salvation were sealed,
More brightly to burst in the moor and the field,
And the Spirit which fled from the dwellings of men,
Like a manna-cloud rained round the camp in the glen.”

Before closing this part of our subject, we shall give an instance of the horrible cruelty of those times, and we confess it is with some reluctance we do so, as we are well aware that such a tragedy must shock the feelings of all who read it.

“ *Accipe nunc Danaum insidias et crimine ab uno, Disce omnes.*”

Hackston, of Rathillet, with three other prisoners, was carried wounded and bleeding to Edinburgh, where the Magistrates received them at the foot of the Canongate, and had previously received from the Council the following disgraceful orders concerning them:—“The Magistrates of Edinburgh are appointed, as soon as the body of Dr. Hackston of Rathillet is brought to the Watergate, to receive him, and mount him on a bare-backed horse, with his face to the horse's tail, and his feet tied beneath his belly, and his hands flittered with ropes; that the three other prisoners be conveyed on foot, bareheaded after him, with their hands tied to a goad of iron; ordain the said executioner to carry the head of Cameron upon a halbert from the Watergate to the Council-house,” &c. The Council commanded that Rathillet should be put to death in the following inhuman manner: “That his body be drawn backward on a hurdle to the Cross of Edinburgh, that in the first place his right hand is to be struck off, and after some time his left hand, then he is to be hanged up and cut down alive, his bowels to be taken out, and his heart shown to the people by the hangman: then his heart and his bowels to be burned in a fire prepared for that

purpose on the scaffold: that afterwards his head be cut off, and his body divided into four quarters, his head to be fixed on the Netherbow, one of his quarters with both of his hands to be affixed at St. Andrews, another quarter at Glasgow, a third at Leith, a fourth at Burntisland, that none presume to be in mourning for him, or any coffin brought: that the heads of Cameron and John Fowler be affixed on higher poles than the rest." This atrocious sentence was accordingly carried out to the very letter upon Rathillet, but he endured it all with the greatest fortitude and christian resignation.

"In a dream of the night I was wafted away
To the moorland of mist where the martyrs lay,
Where Cameron's Sword and his Bible are seen,
Engraved on the stone where the heather grows green.
'Twas a dream of those ages of darkness and blood,
When the Minister's home was the mountain and wood;
When in Wellwood's dark moorlands the standard of Zion,
All bloody and torn 'mong the heather was lying."

No sooner James the VI. the last of the despicable Stuarts, was crowned King, than his actions betrayed his determination to restore Popery to its ancient glory in Britain, and to force it upon the people. The iniquity of the Stuarts was now full, and the decree had already gone out against them, *Mene, Mcne, Tekel Upharsin*. In short, James was obliged to abandon the throne, and flee the country, "a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth."

It was in the year 1688—a year memorable in the annals of civil and religious liberty—that William, the Prince of Orange, arrived in Britain, "a good Samaritan to relieve the three afflicted nations, afflicted indeed—robbed, wounded as having fallen among thieves." He at once restored its Presbyterianism to Scotland, and wrested the sword of persecution out of the hands of the bishops; and no sooner they lost the sword than they lost the people. "Presbytery was restored to the Church, and liberty to the nation of Scotland, and the sufferings of a twenty-eight years persecution were terminated by a bloodless and glorious revolution. The Council attempted to obliterate, as far as possible, the remaining vestiges

of their despotism. They hastened to set at liberty those whom Claverhouse had imprisoned, and to take down and bring out of sight the beads of the martyrs—some of which had remained bleaching in the sun for twenty-eight years, on the gates and market crosses of the town—lest the horrid spectacles might be appealed to as monuments of their cruelty, and might occasion the question to be moved, by whom, and for what purpose were they set up there. “When the landing of the Prince of Orange,” says Hethrington, “and the revolution which followed, put an end to the persecution which had continued for twenty-eight years, a computation was made, from which it appeared that above eighteen thousand had suffered by death, slavery, exile or imprisonment, inflicted in the vain endeavor to destroy the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and establish Prelacy on its ruins.” The number of those who perished through cold, hunger, and other privations, in prison, or in their wanderings upon the mountains, and their residence in caves, cannot be well calculated, but will certainly make up the sum total to eighteen thousand people. But under the altar and about the throne of the Lamb, where their heads are crowned, and their white robes seen, there an exact account of their numbers will at last be found.”

“There worthy of his masters came
The despot's champion, *bloody Graham*
To stain for aye a warrior's sword,
And lead a fierce, though fawning horde,
The human bloodhounds of the earth
To hunt the peasant from his hearth!
Tyrants! could not misfortune teach,
That man has rights beyond your reach?
Thought ye the torture and the stake
Could that intrepid spirit break,
Which even in woman's breast withstood,
The terrors of the fire and flood.”

“Wonderful,” says Woodrow, “were the preservations of the persecuted about this time. The soldiers frequently got their clothes and cloaks and yet missed themselves. They would have gone by the mouths of the caves and dens in which they were lurk-

ing, and the dogs would snook and smell about the stones under which they were hid, and yet they remained undiscovered."

Our limits precluded the possibility of our entering upon the history of this interesting period. But those who wish to know more about the sufferings of their fathers in those days, will find full accounts of the same in MacCrie's sketches of Church History; Aikman's History of that period; and Simpson's Traditions of the Covenanters. We shall close this part of our subject with the following lines, inscribed on the moss-grown stone under which Andrew Murray, one of the martyrs of that period, lies in his moorland bed :

Halt passenger, a word with thee or two,
Why I lie here, would'st thou truly know ?
By wicked hands, hands cruel and unjust,
Without all law, my life from me they thrust;
And being dead they left me on the spot,
For burial this same place I got;
Truth's friends in Eskdale, now rejoice their lot
To wit, the faithful for truth my seal thus got."

THE PRESENT STATE OF RELIGION IN SCOTLAND.

We have taken no notice of the era of Moderatism and Erastianism in Scotland. We can speak as contemptuously of the eighteenth century, in a religious point of view, as Thomas Carlyle speaks of this present century. This barren and uninteresting period—we mean the reign of Moderatism—of the history of the Church extended over a century and a half. In the frigid embrace of Moderatism the Church was like the mount ins of Gilboa without dew and rain. But it is not our intention to trace its rise and progress in the Church. Suffice it to say that a considerable number of those Ministers who were in the Episcopal ranks in the days of the persecution, found their way into the Church at the revolution settlement, and did all they could to overthrow its constitution. The storm that had lately passed over the country was now succeeded by a deadening calm. Moderatism and Erastianism denied the rights, and encroached upon the liberties of the people as well as Popery and Prelacy, although of course in a milder form. Moreover, Moderatism equally denied the gospel to the people at

home, and to the Heathen abroad, and waged war against pure and evangelical religion in every shape and form. During its reign, the soldiers when they were not better engaged, were generally called upon, in cases of disputed settlements, to force worthless Ministers upon reclaiming congregations; and Presbyteries have been known, with their help, to settle Ministers over the walls of Churches after the people had fled from the "thieves, robbers, and hirelings," that were thus "climbing up some other way." "But the sheep did not hear them, but fled from them." In musing upon this period, it is a relief to turn our eyes to the worthy Erskines, and their noble associates, "brethren and companions in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." They raised up the tabernacle of David that was fallen, preached the gospel in all its power and purity, and fed the people of God throughout the land with the true bread that came down from heaven. The few faithful that were in the Church, however, continued to protest against the encroachments of the State and the defection of the Church, until at last their number was increased, and the little one became a thousand. Thompson, Chalmers, and other worthies whose names cannot now be mentioned within the pale of the Church, and MacCrie, with his writings, beyond its pale, were the honored instruments of bringing about the emancipation of the Church of Scotland, and of restoring her ancient constitution.

In the disruption of 1843, the true and loyal sons of the reformed Church of Scotland, the successors of Knox, Melville, Henderson, and the Erskines, vindicated her rights and maintained her prerogatives when they refused to be governed by the Civil Courts instead of the word of God—when they broke asunder those chains by which the State sought to keep her in bondage—when they severed their connection with the State, rather than violate her original and dearly bought principles—rather than betray the rights and liberties of the people, deny the doctrine of the Kingship and Headship of Christ, or his right to rule in his own house. In short, the Church of Scotland, rather than deny those Scriptural principles for which their fathers suffered and died, sacrificed all State emoluments and declared herself free; and thus, in the nineteenth century, startled a sceptical world with the evidence that the spirit and power of primitive christianity still exist. And this disinterested-

ness and faithfulness to Christ's cross and crown on the part of those men who did what they could to maintain the honor and glory of both, will go down to posterity as the greatest event of the nineteenth century, in a religious point of view at least, that has yet transpired.

The three great divisions of the history of the Church, subsequent to the Reformation may be thus viewed :—

1. The Anti-Popery period of the Church in the sixteenth century.

2. The Anti-Prelacy period of the Church in the seventeenth century.

3. The Anti-patronage period of the Church in the eighteenth century.

Since the Reformation, Scotland has confessedly taken the foremost rank among the nations of the world in intelligence and morality, and in its attachment to the Christian religion. Probably no other country has given stronger proofs of the reality and power of religion, or of its religious sincerity and earnestness than Scotland. And we have no hesitation in saying that religion was never more flourishing in that country than it is at the present moment. But instead of giving our own observations upon this point, which might either be partial, or at least liable to be suspected of so natural a tendency, we shall present the views of others upon it ; and their testimony will have the merit of being purely disinterested.

D'Aubigne says : "Scotland appears to me to present the best proof of the Reformation. Christianity has sunk deeper into them than into any other nation, comparatively speaking, it is of all Protestant nations, that in which the gospel has worked the best, and in which its effects have been the most durable. This gives to Scotland a great importance in that christian restoration which we should wish our age to witness. It is perhaps destined at the present period to be the vanguard of Christ's army. All things considered, better preachers are to be found in Scotland than in any other country of Christendom. It is in Scotland we find all that distinguishes in the most striking manner the Evangelical from the Papal Church. As to the instruction of the people, it is much more generally diffused in Scotland than in England. The Bible and the catechism are familiar to every Scottish child. Scotland, Holland, and our French Switzerland, which are the three coun-

tries in which the Reformation was the most complete, and the most pure, are also of all the countries of Christendom, nay, even of the world, those over which intellectual culture is most universally spread."

The Rev. M. Cohen Stuart, of Utrecht, in a speech at the Tri-Centenary of the Reformation in Edinburgh, in August last, said: "But amongst a good many remarkable things he admired, three especially had struck him. The first was the Scotch Sabbath. He saw the quiet streets, the crowded churches, the eloquent preachers, the prayer meetings, and he felt, a people so attached to the law of God, must be happy and blessed. Such a day passed here, was better to him than a thousand spent any where else. The third thing that struck him, was this great meeting itself. When he had to form to himself a clear idea of what the true living Church of Christ is, he will have merely to recollect what he saw here; an English meeting in Edinburgh's Free Church Great Assembly Hall. They ought to look backward on the glorious deeds of their noble ancestors, on what was wrought here during the last three centuries, with the gratitude of a just pride and of a religious heart."

The English correspondent of the *Zion's Herald*, a Methodist Journal, thus speaks of the extraordinary liberality of the Free Church of Scotland: "The Presbyterian Free Church of Scotland is, in every way an example to the other Churches of the land. That wonderful community have achieved a work with which there is nothing to be compared in the whole course of ecclesiastical history. The Church only dates its existence from the disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843, and an aggregate of the money raised in the course of the sixteen years since, amounts to the fabulous sum of nearly twenty-five millions of dollars. She has paid to her Ministers—whose number originally was 538, has now swelled to 812, very nearly ten millions of dollars. Her colleges have cost \$225,000, while upon general education she has disbursed \$1,000,000; on Home Missions \$590,000; on her 800 Churches \$3,625,000; on her Manses \$1,600,000; on her Schools \$110,000; on her Colleges and Church offices nearly \$500,000. And about \$650,000 have been invested in order to yield annual endowments of various kinds. Her membership is estimated at rather under a

quarter of a million, and the average contributions is therefore \$100 for each member, or at the rate of \$6 per year.

The Free Church have provided for their Ministers in a manner superior to any Church in the Kingdom. Their minimum salary, nearly \$700 and a house and garden, is double that of the majority of most other bodies. They carry on Home Missions in a manner with which there is nothing any where to be compared."

Dr. Buchanan, at the celebration of the Tri-Centenary of the Reformation in Glasgow, said: "On that memorable day 40 men met in Edinburgh, and organized the Protestant Presbyterian Church; of these 40 only six were Ministers. But from that small beginning what immense results have followed! At this moment there are no fewer than 2600 Presbyterian Ministers in Scotland; and at this day, and after the lapse of 300 years, the stamp of that Presbyterian system of Church Government, and of that Calvinistic theology which Knox and his noble coadjutors impressed on the Scottish nation three centuries ago, is broader and deeper, and to all human appearance, more indelibly engraven in the heart and mind of Scotland, than ever it was at any former period of our national history. That glorious old Protestant and Presbyterian flag, which Knox and his noble coadjutors unfurled 300 years ago, has floated bravely out in many a conflict; it has stood both the battle and the breeze; but it has never been hauled down. It has been carried oftentimes through persecution's hottest fire. Like the burning bush which it bears emblazoned upon it, it is still unconsumed. Nor is it in Scotland alone, that it rallies men around it. In England and Ireland, in Canada, and in the United States, in far-off New Zealand and Australia, there are large and flourishing Protestant and Presbyterian Churches, that proudly trace their origin to Scotland, and to that memorable meeting of the General Assembly at Edinburgh, which we are here to celebrate, and from which as Churches, we ourselves have sprung."

"Land of Bruce and Wallace
Where Patriot hearts have stood,
And for their country and their faith
Like water poured their blood.
Where wives and little children
Were steadfast to the death,
And graves of martyr warriors
Are in the desert heath.

I. THE THEOLOGY AND ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

There is reason to believe that Scotland was Calvinistic in its theology, and Presbyterian in its ecclesiastical polity since the first introduction of Christianity into that country to the present time—the Popish period of course excepted. Columba, and indeed all the Culdees, were strenuous advocates of the doctrines of grace and of the ⁺purity of the clergy; and were therefore in all the essential elements of both, Calvinists and Presbyterians. In all likelihood, Patrick Hamilton, the forerunner of the Reformation in Scotland was Lutheran in his theology, as it was in that School he was instructed in the Christian religion; and George Wishart was Helvetic in his theological views, as he visited Switzerland, studied in their schools, and translated the first Helvetic confession into his mother tongue. But then all the Reformers, and all those teachers at whose feet they sat, were Calvinists. Luther, Zwingli, and Melancthon were Calvinists, and so were the English Reformers, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, and Rogers.

The practice of lecturing, or expounding a large portion of scripture in one discourse, which afterwards became so popular, and we may add profitable, in Scotland, is said to have been introduced by Wishart. And the book on which he lectured,—the epistle to the Romans—and the practice of exposition which he inaugurated, have alike ever since been national favorites.

It was in the days of Knox, however, that the theology of Scotland, accurately speaking, assumed the Calvinistic or Genevan type. But it is beyond all controversy that John Knox was a Calvinist before he ever met with Calvin. It was in the Scriptures which he studied so earnestly and prayerfully that he found his Calvinism and Presbyterianism. It is indeed true that he thoroughly studied the writings of Augustine and Jerome, and was not a little assisted by them in forming his theological views. The Scotch Reformer, has not, like Luther, given us an account of his spiritual conflicts and trials; of the struggles and anguish of spirit which attended his first discoveries of truth, and preceded his triumphant entrance on the possession of peace in believing; but there can be no doubt that his ardent and penetrating mind must have undergone a great turmoil, and sustained a desperate struggle before he got himself extricated from the superstition and errors in which he

x *Parity*

was born and brought up. His case was truly represented by the good soil, in which the seed was slow in making its appearance, and in its first growth, but which finally brought forth abundant fruit. The patient and tedious years which he spent in seclusion, in seeking truth and wrestling with God, in reading, prayer, and meditation, were the most profitable years of his life, to himself, to his country, and to the Church of Christ, inasmuch as they formed the turning point in his eventful career, and the crisis of the Scottish Reformation. One of his logical and comprehensive mind, could not be satisfied with anything short of knowing truth in all its relations and harmonies. Considering the active life which he led, Knox has written largely, and all his writings show that he was a man of great strength of mind, natural sagacity, and genius. His Treatise on Predestination alone, shows, if he had the leisure requisite for it, that he would have taken high rank as a thinker among the theologians of his day.

The first Confession of Faith, which was laid before Parliament in the year 1560, although it was drawn up in the short space of four days, contained a brief but able summary of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and embraced the leading points of the Calvinistic theology, as did all the other creeds and confessions of the Churches of the Reformation. This confession was chiefly drawn up by Knox, and on the whole is an able document. And it is a remarkable fact that no change has since taken place during three centuries, in the theological views of the Scottish people, notwithstanding the fiery trials and severe persecutions to which they had been subjected, to make them change their religious views. The theology of the old Scots' confession, is just the theology of the Scottish people this day.

The next important period in the theological history of Scotland is the time in which the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, was received and adopted by the Church of Scotland as their Confession of Faith. During the interesting period between the adoption of the First Confession, and that of the Westminster Confession, there appeared not a few great and learned men in the Church, "who bore the burden and heat of the day." The learned and upright Andrew Melville, author of a Latin Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, was certainly the greatest light of this whole period.

His Commentary, though brief, is comprehensive, and displays great logical accumen and intellectual vigour.

The Commissioners from the Church of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly, were Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Robert Baillie, George Gillespie and Samuel Rutherford, Ministers, with the Earl of Cassilis, Lord Maitland, and Sir Archibald Johnston, Elders. Of Henderson we have already spoken, and of Gillespie we may say that he was the most powerful controversialist of his years, and we might add, of his day, in Britain, on ecclesiastical subjects, and his writings which are still considered a standard work, will amply bear us out in saying so. Of Samuel Rutherford, the author of the most precious and heavenly "letters" ever written by any uninspired man, suffice it to say that he was, not only one of the most learned men of his day, but also one of the deepest thinkers of the century in which he lived, as his various writings will amply testify.

As to the venerable Westminster Confession, and the two Catechisms, we can truly say, that time, and a more intimate and thorough acquaintance with them, only tend to a growing attachment and admiration of them on our part. We have no hesitation in pronouncing those authoritative standards of our Church, the most scriptural, the most logical and philosophical, and altogether the most complete, comprehensive and exhaustive summary of the christian religion that has ever been written by uninspired men. The illustrious authors of the Confession and Catechisms, did not turn to the right hand or to the left from Scripture to accommodate their theological views to the natural prejudices of men, but on the contrary declared the whole counsel of God. It is to those books, or rather to the theology set forth in them, that Scotland owes its proud position for three centuries, morally, intellectually, and religiously. These formularies have been the guardian of their faith, and the bulwark of pure and undefiled religion; while at the same time they have been a wall of adamant against the onsets of seductive error, and against heterodoxy in every shape and form. Whether tried by the unerring rule of Scripture, or at the tribunal of a true philosophy, or by the standard of a rigid logic, the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms will be found impregnable in their statements of doctrine and exposition of truth. "These Westminster Divines have erected a

monument in almost every heart in Scotland. Next to the introduction of Christianity, and the translation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, the framing of the Confession of Faith and of the Catechism, has conferred the greatest boon on every christian in our country."

The Methodist Quarterly Review says of the Westminster Assembly of Divines and the Confession of Faith: "The influence of the labors of the Assembly has been extensive and controlling over multitudes of the better class of the inhabitants wherever the English language is spoken."

To their formularies millions have owed their preservation from destructive errors, their theological knowledge, and saving, sober piety, ever since, it (the Confession) has exerted a most salutary influence in the world. By it the Romanizing tendency of the English Establishment has been kept in check; its opposition to uniformity has perpetuated religious liberty, while its deep toned orthodoxy has stood as a bulwark against the onsets of every form of seductive error."

The Calvinistic theology has been much owned of God in the salvation of sinners and edification of saints. It by the grace of God, not only sustained the Covenanters and Puritans in the fire, in the water, and on the scaffold, but was also eminently successful in awakening their spiritual nature, developing their intellectual faculties, and in moulding and maturing their christian character. As a system of theology, apart altogether from its saving efficacy, it is beyond all controversy, superior to any other in rousing the mental faculties, and summoning them to action. The moment it presents itself to the intelligent mind, it at once demands the exercise of its highest faculties. It has been well remarked by a certain author that the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism "cannot long be held by an ignorant community. Either the mind will lose its grasp of the doctrines, or the doctrines will quicken the mind to greater intelligence. They stimulate the thinking powers by the demand they make upon them, and thus excite a thirst for increased knowledge." This theology not only survived a century of painful struggles and of the severest persecutions, but also sustained the nation through the fiery ordeal, and upheld them even in the burning furnace. And after those terrible convulsions had culminated in the famous Revolution, its bow still

abode in strength, its quiver was still full, and like Aaron's rod that blossomed, its savour was still fragrant.

Such was the success of the gospel in Scotland, such was the sanctifying influence of this theology, and such was the piety of its Preachers, that the very enemies of true religion were constrained to acknowledge its good fruits and moral power.

Bishop Burnet, an opponent to the Covenanters, thus speaks of their preachers: "They were a grave, solemn sort of people, and had an appearance that created respect. They used to visit their parishes much—were full of the Scriptures—were ready at extempore prayer—and had brought the people to such a degree of knowledge, that cottagers and servants would have prayed extempore. Their Ministers brought their people about them on the Sunday nights, where the sermons were talked over, and every one woman as well as men were desired to speak their sense and their experience, and by these means they had a comprehension of matters of religion greater than I have seen among people of that sort anywhere. The preachers all went in one tract, of raising observations on points of doctrine out of their text, and proving these by reasons, and then of applying those, and showing the use that was to be made of such a point of doctrine, both for instruction and terror, for exhortation and comfort, for trial of themselves upon it, and for furnishing them with the proper directions and helps, and this was so methodical that the people grew to follow a sermon quite through, every branch of it. As they lived in great familiarity with their people, and used to pray oft and talk with them in private, so it can hardly be imagined to what a degree they were loved and revered by them. They kept scandalous persons under a severe discipline for breach of Sabbath, for an oath, or the least disorder in drunkenness, persons were cited before the Church Session, and were solemnly reprov'd for it."

Burnet further says of the people: "We were indeed amazed to see a poor commonality so capable to argue upon points of Government, or on the bounds to be set to the power of princes in matters of religion; upon all these topics they had texts of Scripture at hand, and were ready with their answers to anything that was said to them. This measure of knowledge was spread even among the meanest of them, their cottagers and their servants."

Such is the testimony of an opponent, to the intelligence, morality, and piety of the Covenanters, to the practical working and good fruits of Scottish theology. We may hear now the testimony of a friend on the same point: Kirkton says; "At the Kings return every parish had a minister, every village a school, every family a Bible; yea, in most of the country all the children of age could read the Scripture, and were provided with Bibles either by their parents or their Ministers. Nobody complained more of our Church Government than our Taverners, whose ordinary lamentation was, their trade was broke, people were become so sober."

It has been the custom for many a day to represent the Covenanters as fanatics and hypocrites, and their preachers as unlettered demagogues, who were alike ignorant of civilization, literature and theology. But it is unnecessary now to say, that in piety and learning, in native talents and theological attainments, in knowledge of God and themselves, and in short in all the essential qualifications for ambassadors of Christ, they would favorably compare with the Preachers of that or any other time since the Apostolic age. It was of one of the Covenanting preachers, William Guthrie, author of that famous book, "The Christian's great interest," that the great theologian of the seventeenth century, John Owen, said to one of the Ministers of Scotland, who chanced to visit him: "You have truly great spirits in Scotland; there is for a gentleman Mr. Baillie of Jerviswood, a person of the greatest abilities I almost ever met with; and for a divine, said he, (taking out of his pocket a little gilt copy of Mr. Guthrie's treatise) that author I take to be one of the greatest divines that ever wrote. It is my *vade mecum*, and I carry it and the Sedan New Testament still about me. I have wrote several folios, but there is more divinity in it than in them all." Such was the estimation in which the great Owen held Guthrie's book, and such was the humility of the greatest divine of the seventeenth century. It was surely very difficult for the Covenanters to prosecute their studies, or extend their knowledge, when they were driven from the Society of men, and living on Mountains and in caves and dens of the earth.

But the man above all others, who stamped the theology of the Westminster Confession upon Scotland, and who has been instrumental in making its common people theologians and thinkers, was the thoughtful, the grave, and pious Thomas Boston. There may

have been others his superiors in some departments of theology, and who may have been better acquainted with its literature and history, but for bringing out the theology of the Scriptures in a style adapted to the capacities of men in general, and withal in a profound, accurate and edifying manner, Thomas Boston is, beyond doubt, the theologian of Scotland. In exhibiting the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, in bringing the truth home to the consciences of unawakened sinners, in comforting and edifying the Church of God, and in the savour and unction which accompanied the gospel from his lips, Boston had no superior. His writings may be considered somewhat repulsive in our day, on account of their many divisions and subdivisions, and their unpolished style, but we venture to assert that there are few modern authors whose pages are so pregnant with thought, are so clear and logical in argument, and are so rich in Scriptural doctrine.

Were the question put to us by one wishing to know what Christianity really is, "what one book within a moderate compass would you recommend to give me an idea what Christianity is, and in short to tell me in sum and substance, what the Bible teaches," we would unhesitatingly reply, get "Boston's Fourfold State," for, as David said of the sword by which he slew Goliath, *There is none like that*. In the dark days of Moderatism, when the majority of the Ministers of Scotland did not preach the gospel, many a pious family spent the Sabbath profitably reading the "Fourfold State," and many of the children of God when meeting together for prayer, and who could apply the language of Mary to their preachers, "they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him," were fed and strengthened by its savory instructions. It was the preaching and writings of such men as Boston and the Erskines, that kept the candle of the gospel from being utterly extinguished in Scotland during the dismal reign of Moderatism. There are many who are under the impression that the "Fourfold State" is all that Boston wrote, but instead of that he was perhaps the most voluminous writer of his day, and indeed one of the most extensive theological authors of any period, and we might truly add, one of the most profitable and edifying. At his death the famous Ralph Erskine composed the following lines:—

"The great, the grave, judicious Boston's gone,
Who once like Athanasius bold, stood firm alone
Whose golden pen, to future times, will bear
His name, till in the clouds his Lord appear."

The "Marrow controversy," in which Boston took such an interest, although of such an ethereal nature as not to admit of being tested by the crucible of any existing creed, was not without its good results to Scotland. This controversy could only create interest and meet with sympathy among thinking and intelligent people. It was its abstruseness, embracing largely, and from the nature of the subject necessarily, metaphysical and abstract questions, and nicely theological terms and distinction, that rendered it so beneficial to the people; because it made such a demand on the mental faculties to comprehend the controverted points, and thereby the intellect was awakened, and all its powers exercised and strengthened by that very exercise, for further pursuits. It is by exercise the mind is cultivated and sharpened, and the physical system is regulated. If we recollect well, it is somewhere in the writings of Thomas Carlyle, we saw it remarked, that a child placed in a basket, by his every effort to get out of it, strengthens his muscles and joints. The Apostle Paul tells us that it is by reason of use the senses are exercised to discern both good and evil. Heb. 5. 14. As regards this now obsolete controversy, it may be hardly necessary for us to say, that in regard to both the spirit and letter of it, our whole sympathy is with the "Marrow Men," with Boston, and his noble associates.

Miller in his "First Impressions of England," in drawing a contrast between the English and the Scotch says: "But the broader foundations of the existing difference seem to lie rather in moral than in natural causes. They are to be found I am strongly of opinion in the very dissimilar religious history of the two countries. Religion in its character as a serious intellectual exercise, was never brought down to the common English mind, in the way in which it once pervaded, and to a certain extent still saturates, the common mind of Scotland. Nor is the peculiar form of religion best known in England so well suited as that of the Scotch to awaken the popular intellect. Liturgies and ceremonies may constitute the vehicles of a sincere devotion, but they have no tendency to exercise the thinking faculties; their tendency bears rather the other way—they constitute the ready-made channels, through which abstract unideal sentiment flows without effort. The Arminianism, too, so common in the English Church, and so largely developed in at least one of the more influential and numerous bodies

of English Dissenters, is a greatly less awakening system of doctrine than the Calvinism of Scotland. It does not lead the earnest mind into those abstruse recesses of thought to which the peculiar Calvinistic doctrines form so inevitable a vestibule. The man who deems himself free is content simply to believe that he is so, while he who regards himself as bound is sure to institute a narrow scrutiny into the nature of the chain that binds him; and hence it is that Calvinism proves the best of all schoolmasters for teaching a religious people to think. I found no such peasant metaphysicians in England as those I have so often met in my own country—men who, under the influence of earnest belief, had wrought their way, all unassisted by the philosopher, into some of the abstrusest questions of the Schools. And yet, were I asked to illustrate by example the grand principle of the intellectual development of Scotland, it would be to the history of one of the self-taught geniuses of England, John Bunyan, the inimitable Shakespeare, of theological literature, that I would refer. Had the tinker of Elstow continued throughout life what he was in his early youth—a profane, irreligious man—he would have lived and died an obscure and illiterate one. It was the wild turmoil of his religious conviction that awakened his mental faculties. Had his convictions slept, the whole mind would have slept with them, and he would have remained intellectually what the common English still are; but as the case happened, the tremendous blows dealt by revealed truth at the door of his conscience aroused the whole inner man; and the deep slumber of the faculties, reasoning and imaginative, was broken for ever.”

An Englishman having said to Miller when travelling in England, “You Scotch are a strange people. When I was in Scotland two years ago, I could hear of scarce anything among you, but your Church question. What good does all your religion do you?” “Independently altogether of religious considerations,” replied Miller, “it has done for our people what all your societies for the diffusion of useful knowledge and all your Penny and Saturday Magazines will not do for yours; it has awakened their intellects, and taught them how to think. The development of the popular mind in Scotland is a result of its theology.”

But Scotland has all along been no less Presbyterian in Church Government, than Calvinistic in theology; and it has been more directly persecuted for its Presbyterianism, than for its Calvinism.

The Presbyterianism of Scotland, from its commencement, embraced and boldly recognized the two great Scriptural principles of the independence of the Church, as to the state, and the right of the people to elect or choose their own Pastors, and to be represented in the Courts of the Church by ruling elders. It has been alike zealous in the maintenance of the honor and glory of Christ's crown, and the rights and liberties of the people. The maintenance of those two grand principles, that Christ is the alone King and Head of his Church, and that it belongs to the people as their sacred right to take a part in the Administrative Government of the Church through their representatives, constitutes the peculiar distinction of the true Church of Scotland among the Churches of the Reformation. It was on account of its unflinching advocacy of those two great truths, that the despotic House of Stuart dreaded and hated Presbyterianism. Here they found a wall of adamant against their cherished despotism. Hence their favorite maxim—*No Bishop, no King.*

The First Book of Discipline says:—"It appertaineth to the people and to every several congregation to elect their Minister. Altogether this is to be avoided, that any man be violently intruded or thrust in upon any congregation; but this liberty with all care must be reserved to every several Church to have their votes and suffrages in the election of Ministers." And the Westminster Confession says:—"The Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a Government in the hands of Church officers distinct from the Civil Magistrate."

The contentings and sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the days of Knox, downwards, might be said to have been in defence of those two scriptural positions. In behalf of those principles many of the noble sons of Scotland, yea, and noble daughters too, shed their blood. In England where such principles were ignored, and the rights of the people denied, Church and State have been so mingled and confounded, that the temporal and spiritual interests have all along been blended together. Hence the English could never sympathize with the Scotch in their struggles with the State. In fact they could never understand the grand cause of the quarrel, because they never enjoyed spiritual liberty in its ecclesiastical sense. Such knowledge was too wonderful for them; it was high, they could not attain unto it. This was particularly evident

from the way in which the Government treated the Church of Scotland during the crisis that resulted in the Disruption. But in Scotland spiritual and temporal matters have been distinguished and separated with the greatest possible exactness. It is precisely the same old struggle that is again renewed in the present contest between the Free Church and the Court of Session, in the famous or infamous "Cardross case." But the Free Church—the undoubted representative of the Reforming Church of Scotland—will and must be victorious in this struggle, and must come out of the furnace triumphant. And it is to be hoped that the result of the whole affair will be, that the arrogance of the Court of Session and its assaults on the Church, will be restrained; and that this will be the last of its encroachments upon the liberty of the Church of Christ.

"Of all the Churches of the Reformation," says D'Aubigne, "the Church of Scotland is the one in which the principle of the independence of the Church as to the State, has been carried to the greatest extreme. It is the glory of the Church of Scotland, that she has been intrusted of God with this work, and admirably has she accomplished it. To this her whole history bears witness. The history of Scotland is that of the struggle between the State and the Church. Scarcely does the Church come into existence, when the State begins to make war upon her. Combats to the death or else deep slumber—behold in two words the history of the Scottish Church. One of these phases succeeds the other, and the slumber is no sooner broken than the combat is renewed."

Not only that, it was in spite of the State the true Church of Scotland has hitherto maintained her existence, but it was in spite of the State she came into existence at all. Such is the opposition of human governments to every Church that takes the word of God alone as her guide! "The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." Ps. 2, 2, 6.

The principles of Presbyterianism then are, that the people have a right to a voice in the government of the Church, in all questions pertaining to doctrine, worship and discipline, the purity of the Clergy, and that a smaller part of the Church is subject to the

whole. It discards, as a popish dogma, the principle that all Church power is vested in the clergy, and that the people have nothing to do but obey them. It is to us a wonder how such Protestant Churches as deny the rights of the people, as deny the presence of the laity in the Courts, and their counsel in the government of the Church, can, amid the light of the nineteenth century maintain their position. Surely it is high time that such priestly arrogance and exclusiveness should be forever done away with, and that men should not only know their rights, but know also how to maintain the same. But Presbyterianism, whilst thus recognizing the rights and liberties of the people, and the purity of the Clergy, does not ignore legitimate authority and order, by way of resolving the Church into a mob; nor does it introduce any such disorder as if every man has a law to himself, free to do and believe what he pleases. On the contrary, it embraces the elements of law and organized authority. It secures liberty without confusion, and order without despotism. In short, it proves the perfect harmony of liberty and order. Presbyterianism is no less opposed to the lawlessness of the mob, than to the despotism of the State or the Church. It asserts the rights of the people in spiritual matters, and teaches them to maintain them in civil affairs. As a system, it is well adapted to train people to maintain and value civil and religious liberty.

"No less significant," says Dr. Humphrey, in his admirable discourse, "is the history of the Church of Scotland, where our theology has been perpetuated for three hundred years. Its developments in the way of order have been infinitely remarkable. In the first place, the persuasions of the English Court, and the bayonets of her armies, have not been able to fasten an episcopacy on the Kirk. Secondly, a representation of the people, sitting in all the Church Courts, has ever been of the substance of her polity. Thirdly, the Kirk, although condescending to be by law established, has never been Erastian, and the moderate party so called, which verged towards Erastianism in policy, exhibited at the same time the most unequivocal tendencies towards Arminianism in doctrine; while the opposite party contended both for orthodoxy in faith, and for the rights of God's people in the free choice of their Pastors. Lastly, the unexhausted forces of our theology, having delivered the Kirk from every other element of bondage, is perpetually

struggling through a series of agitations and disruptions to purge her from the remaining iniquity of patronage. These disturbances will be incessantly renewed, from generation to generation, until the venerable Kirk must take her choice between disowning her patronage, or losing all her children, or abandoning that ancient faith which teaches them to vindicate their rights, even unto a separation from her sacraments. Either her theology, as in England, or her subjection to the State, as in this country (America) must disappear from the crucible, or the crucible itself will be broken by the antagonism of its ingredients. So intolerant is this theology of any other than a polity absolutely free."

"Unlike the English," says Miller, "the Scotch form, as a people, not a heap of detached particles, but a mass of aggregated ones; and hence, since at least the days of Knox, Scotland has formed one of the most favorable soils for the growth of Protestantism, in a Presbyterian type, which the world has yet seen. The insulating bias of the English character leads to the formation of insulated Churches, while the aggregate peculiarity of the Scottish character has a tendency at least equally direct to bind its congregations together into one grand Church, with the area, not of a single building, but of the whole kingdom for its platform. It is not uninteresting to mark in the national history how thoroughly and soon the idea of Presbyterianism recommended itself to the popular mind in Scotland. Presbyterianism found a soil ready prepared for it in the national predilection; and its paramount idea as a form of ecclesiastical government, seemed the one natural idea in the circumstances. An Englishman might have thought of gathering together a few neighbors, and making a church of them; the Scotchman at once determined on making a church of all Scotland. The attempt to establish a Scottish Church on an English principle filled an entire country with persecution and suffering, and proved but an abortive attempt after all."

THE SCOTTISH PULPIT.

The Scottish pulpit has been instrumental in no small degree in forming and developing the religious and intellectual character of the country. It combined with remarkable harmony the expository and doctrinal, and the experimental and practical modes of preaching. Greater prominence was given to preaching in Scot-

land for the last three centuries, than in any other country. With them the sermon was considered by far the most important part of the services of the sanctuary. And we believe the intelligence of the country is to a considerable extent a result of their preaching; as their style of preaching is a result of their theology. Their Calvinism necessarily imparted solidity, strength, and logical order to their discourses. The Scottish preachers usually began the sermon by way of clearing away the rubbish, and after laying the foundation, proceeded to erect the building, and generally concluded by applying the doctrines and lessons of the text to the hearts and consciences of their hearers. Whilst their tendency was to dwell largely on subjective truth, the objective was by no means neglected by them. The quotation already given from Bishop Burnet's writings, shows what kind of preaching was prevalent in Scotland in his day. He says, that "they were in the habit of raising observations on points of doctrine out of their text, and proving those by reasons, and then of applying those and shewing the use that was to be made of such a point of doctrine, both for exhortation and comfort, for trial of themselves upon it, and for furnishing them with proper directions and helps." It was under such profound and searching preaching Scotland attained to its present moral and religious condition. It was by means of such preaching that the Reformation was first established in Scotland, and was maintained in spite of all opposition, and the people became so thoroughly acquainted with the scriptures. It was such preaching that stamped their well-known characteristics of thoughtfulness and intelligence upon the people and grounded them so well in the principles of the christian religion.

So generally were they brought under the influence of the gospel in days gone by, that we are told one might have travelled a good while in Scotland without hearing an oath, and that one could scarce have lodged in a house where God was not worshipped by singing, reading the word, and prayer. When the Duke of Rothes, who greatly persecuted the Presbyterians when he was Lord High Commissioner, was dying, a certain nobleman who sat in an adjoining room with several lords and Bishops said, upon hearing one of the covenanting preachers at prayer with the Duke, "that is a Presbyterian Minister praying," and turning to the bishops added, "there is not one of you can pray as they do, though the welfare

of a man's soul should depend upon it." "We banish these men from us," said the Duke of Hamilton, "and yet when dying, we call for them." "All things considered," says D'Aubigne, "better preachers are to be found in Scotland, than in any other country of chrstendom. We generally see mingled in due proportion in their discourses, the objective truth, and the individuality of the preacher. The developement of the latter principle, the subjective element, is very prominent among some of the leading men in Scotland, but not to the injury of the other. Perhaps on the contrary, among the mass of the preachers, the former element is too predominant."

The *Princeton Review* in speaking of the Free Church deputation who visited the American Churches after the disruption, says: "And the impression made by the sermons delivered in our churches by these distinguished men, was altogether favorable. The impression indeed was made on some minds, that from these specimens, the preaching of the Scottish ministers, at least of the Free Church of Scotland, was superior to that of any other body of christians in the country. As a class, perhaps, it may be true that the pulpit of the Free Church is superior to that of any other body of christians in the world."

Under the blighting and deadening influence of Moderatism, however, things were very different. The Scottish pulpit then gave a very uncertain sound. But there were noble exceptions. Beneath the shadow of Moderatism, Arminianism made great progress; and even Socinianism was not ashamed to walk abroad. The Moderates substituted the covenant of works for the covenant of grace; preaching "do this and live," instead of faith in Christ. They substituted sapless moral essays and sentimental episodes for doctrinal and instructive preaching. Many of them ignored the peculiar doctrines of the gospel altogether, and gave the people husks for bread. Laxity in discipline, as might be expected, kept pace with laxity in doctrine. The Autobiography of Dr. Carlyle, lately published, shows how hostile Moderatism was to evangelical religion and vital godliness; and what a curse it must have been to Scotland. It also discloses, or rather confirms, what was well-known before, what a drunken set the Moderates were, and how regardless they were of the eternal welfare of their flocks. Poor flocks! It was the blind leading the blind. It is no wonder that religion

was at a low ebb, under such wretched hirelings. And yet it was from the pen of one of these dry Moderates, we mean Dr. Hill, that we have got the most massive and profound exposition and defence of Calvinism that Scotland has yet produced. Probably it is the most logical and philosophical system of theology in our language; and altogether possesses more calibre and strength than any other.

In popish countries there is no preaching and no exposition of scripture. Popery substituted music and useless ceremonies, such as garments, candles, water and genuflections, instead of preaching. Hence the great ignorance of the poor people! It was popery that first corrupted the christian church with the substitution of instrumental for vocal music, and that introduced those foppish ceremonies which proved so burdensome and injurious to christianity. It was by music and ceremonies the Church of Rome managed to keep the people in ignorance and darkness. Even in some of our Protestant Churches, the great attraction on Sabbath is their fine music and ceremonies. They find those popish vanities pleasing both to the thoughtless and sentimental, and they must therefore pander to their appetites. Others go to church that they may get excited, and are generally pleased when their feelings are immoderately moved. What they want is heat, not light; confusion, not order. In Scotland, however, things have all along been different. They were not attracted to the house of God either by organs or fiddles, or by excitement or novelty. On the contrary, they went to the sanctuary for scriptural knowledge and instruction, that they might thereby be better enabled to worship God, who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth. The greatest fault of the Scottish pulpit, was their long prayers. But we believe in this there is a reformation, which certainly was much needed. The Moderates were particularly lengthy and formal in their prayers.

But the Scottish pulpit has survived the effete moralism of Moderatism. It is not, however, exempt from danger. Its danger now lies in another direction, in the opposite extreme of Moderatism. The rapid progress made by evangelical religion for the last sixty years, the enthusiasm of men under the influence of revivals, and the sentimentalism, new light and shallowness so characteristic of "modern theology," almost threaten to "run to oil and set on fire" the marrow of the good old theology. Our "light modern

divinity" therefore has much need of the solidity, massiveness, and its substantial ingredients of the old theology, "to qualify fervor and convert it into wholesome aliment." We still prefer the sermons of Boston, the Eskins, Edwards and the Great Puritans, to the eloquent discourses of the preachers of our own day. Greatly as we admire some of the popular preachers of the day, we consider their sermons but light food indeed, in comparison with the thoughtful and savoury sermons of Thomas Boston and John Favel, not to speak of others. Many are now so captivated by beauty of language, melody of voice, and grace of manner in the preacher, that they are quite pleased with the shell without the kernel.

CALVINISM AND PRESBYTERIANISM, IN THEIR BEARING ON SPECULATIVE AND DOCTRINAL SUBJECTS, AND IN THEIR PRACTICAL INFLUENCE ON CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

Did circumstances permit it, we would like to survey the history of Calvinism and Presbyterianism for the last three centuries, with the view of shewing their influence on speculative and doctrinal subjects, and their practical influence on christian churches. But this we cannot do at present. Our space is already more than exhausted; and all that we can do is briefly to refer to some leading points relating to this vast and important subject.

Augustine, the greatest of the christian fathers, expounded and defended the Calvinistic theology a thousand years before Calvin was born, and his writings were the main source of sound doctrine, true piety, and evangelical life in the church, during the dark and dismal reign of popery. And whenever a warning voice was heard within the church, against its growing corruption and great apostacy, that warning proceeded from the followers of Augustine, and wherever the least spark of light appeared during the reign of this thick darkness, that light was reflected from the pages of Augustine.

After those doctrines had been buried for ages, through the superstition and corruption of Rome, Luther brought them again to light, and exhibited the scriptural doctrine of the justification of sinners more clearly than it was done even by Augustine; more clearly than it was done since the apostle Paul expounded it in his epistles to the Romans and Galatians. This was Luther's great work, and such was the importance the Reformer himself attached to his

doctrine of gratuitous justification, that he called it the article of a standing or falling church. Luther, however, did not accomplish much by way of connecting the doctrine of justification with the other doctrines of the christian religion.

It was the work of a Calvin to systematize and consolidate the doctrines of revelation, and to unite together the various parts of the christian system, in all their relations and harmonies. For this great work the Lord had abundantly qualified him. His profound and comprehensive mind grasped the doctrine of justification as taught by Paul, and afterwards by Luther, and combined it with the great mass of scriptural doctrine scattered throughout the works of Augustine and other christian fathers and schoolmen, and as the result of this survey of Divine Revelation, and of the christian writers that preceeded him, he presented the Church of God with his immortal "Institutes." Calvinism is therefore the combination of Augustinianism and Lutherianism upon the cardinal doctrine of the sinner's acceptance with God. Calvin has been so grievously misrepresented and maligned by his enemies, that it may not be out of place here to make room for a specimen of what his friends and foes say of him.

That schoolarly Unitarian, John Scott Porters, who wrote so virulently against Calvin, says of him: "His life was frugal, chaste and temperate. He lived and died a poor man, while he wielded the power, and dispensed all the honors of his adopted country. If suppose no man ever read the Institutes of Calvin, without acknowledging it to be the ablest work on Divinity that he ever perused. Its merits as an intellectual effort, are unapproached by those of any prior, contemporary, or even subsequent work. For zeal, for perseverance, for unremitting diligence, for the efforts which he made, and was throughout life continually making, as a writer, as a scholar, as a theologian, as a pastor, as a correspondent, as a legislator, as a statesman, as a jurist, as a poet, he stands far above all men that I have read of. The Calvinistic system was perhaps the most logically faultless that ever was invented."

Dr. Killen says: "Calvin was at once the soundest politician, and the most profound divine of his generation. We know of no one since the days of the Apostles, who has rendered greater service to the cause of Christianity. Christendom has yet to learn the full amount of its obligations to this eminent man of God. It is a

scholarly

fact which cannot be disputed, that, at the present day, those countries which are most largely leavened with his theology, are the arbiters of nations, as well as the lands of civilization, of freedom, and of progress.

Principal Cunningham says: "But whether we look to the powers and capacities with which God endowed him, the manner in which he employed them, and the results by which his labors have been followed, or to the christian wisdom, magnanimity and devotedness, which marked his character and generally regulated his conduct, there is probably not one among the sons of men, beyond the range of those whom God miraculously inspired by his spirit, who has stronger claims upon our veneration and gratitude."

John Calvin was the theologian of the sixteenth century; John Owen was the theologian of the seventeenth century; and Jonathan Edwards was the theologian of the eighteenth century. And although it would be premature yet to speak of the theologian of the nineteenth century, we are strongly of the opinion that America will have the honor of the theologian of the nineteenth century as well as that of the past century. Dr. Owen was by far the most profound divine that Britain has yet produced. The very objections that are made to his writings in our shallow age, because of their prolixity, constitute their peculiar excellence and highest merit. It is because the colossal Owen sounded the depth of every subject on which he wrote, that his works are such an invaluable treasure and storehouse in divinity. In short he has been well and deservedly called "the Prince of Divines." The late Dr. Hamilton, of Leeds, in speaking of Owen, said: "You will find that in him the learning of Lightfoot, the strength of Charnock, the analysis of Howe, the savour of Leighton, the raciness of Heywood, the glow of Baxter, the copiousness of Barrow, the splendour of Bates, are all combined."

At present however, it is not our design to expound the peculiar doctrines to the gospel commonly denominated Calvinism, or enter upon the discussion of the Calvinistic theology in its sources and evidences. Suffice it here to say, that the peculiar or distinctive features of Calvinism are, that it traces the salvation of sinners to the sovereign and electing love of God the Father, to the death and work of Christ, to the agency or effectual working of the Holy Ghost, and that to the exclusion of everything else. It moreover

makes the purpose of the Father, the death of the Son in its intention and results, and the saving work of the Holy Ghost, co-extensive and co-equal. Calvinism ascribes the place and share the Scriptures assign to them in the salvation of sinners to the Triune Jehovah, and refuses to divide the glory of salvation between God and man. It alone of all the systems of theology, denies any merit to the sinner, excludes boasting, and gives him the scriptural place in working out his own salvation. Calvinism assigns their respective places, according to Scripture to the sovereignty of God, the work of Christ, the agency of the Holy Ghost, and to the sinner himself in the great work of salvation. It was because it thus struck at the root of all creature merit, denied any saving efficacy to the sacraments, good works, the intercession of saints and priests, that Calvinism was so well adapted, and proved so eminently successful in up-rooting popery, overthrowing its idolatry, and resisting its encroachments.

"It is impossible," says Principal Cunningham, "to bring out fully and definitely, the sum and substance of what is taught in Scripture concerning the place which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost hold in the salvation of sinners, without asserting the fundamental doctrines of Calvinism. The distinctive characteristic of Socinianism is that it virtually invests men with the power of saving themselves. Arminianism virtually divides the work of saving men between God and men. Calvinism, and that alone, gives to God the whole honor and glory of saving sinners, making men, while upheld and sustained in the possession and exercise of all that is necessary for moral agency, the unworthy and helpless recipients at God's hand of all spiritual blessings."

The Calvinistic doctrine of predestination is often objected to on the ground that it makes God the author of sin, is inconsistent with the divine goodness, and is incompatible or irreconcilable with human liberty and accountability. These objections, we freely admit, are somewhat plausible, and well fitted to startle men at first sight. But we are no less convinced, that intelligent and candid men after reflecting much upon the subject, and examining it carefully in the light of reason and revelation, must feel satisfied that it is alike supported by both. We say reason and revelation, because we are strongly impressed with the fact, that the arguments in favor of Calvinism, or predestination, derived from reason,

"or general considerations, are equally triumphant, viewed as a mere appeal to the understanding, with the arguments derived from Scripture." It has been profoundly remarked by Lord Bacon, that a little learning has a tendency to atheism, but that greater knowledge tends to establish men in the belief of a God., The same is true of Calvinism; a superficial examination of its fundamental principles, often terminates unfavorable to its claims, but a more profound examination of them in the light of Scripture reason and providence, generally terminates in a verdict in its favor. We solemnly believe that such is the prominence given to the doctrine of predestination in Scripture, that no one who takes the word of God as his guide, would ever think of disputing that it is there, did it not clash with his cherished notions, prejudices and pride. Man's aversion to God's sovereignty and government is the great secret of its unpopularity.

If men once admit that there is a God, that he is an intelligent being, and that he is the author and moral governor of the universe, the conclusion must irresistibly force itself upon them, that he must have formed a plan for regulating his own procedure in the government of the universe. It is a moral axiom that every wise being acts upon a plan previously digested and arranged. It is in this the great distinction between wisdom and folly consists. To deny this to God, is to impute to him conduct such as would be unworthy of any intelligent being. We meet with such order and adaptation in every department of God's works, as necessarily proves original design and arrangement. Let those who can believe the monstrous absurdity that God acts without plan or design; that he created the universe and yet does not govern it; that he established general laws in his providential government, and yet could not foresee the reach and operation of these laws, and did not intend to produce the individual results which flow from their operations, for our part we cannot believe it. It is equally plain, and admitted by all who believe in the existence of the Deity, that whatever God does in time he purposed in eternity to do it. The intelligence of God necessarily proves that he must have a plan or purpose before he proceeds to action; his nature and attributes prove that that plan must date as far back as his own being or existence; and the necessary conclusion is that predestination is a rational as well as a Scriptural doctrine. Hence let men say what

they will, we must take one of two alternatives here, either predestination or infidelity; either we live and move and have our being in God, or else there is no God at all. Do not the Scriptures tell us that a sparrow cannot fall to the ground, that none of the hairs of our head can fall to the ground, without his providence, that it is in God we live and move and have our being; that the disposing of the lot that is cast into the lap is from the Lord.

We maintain then that the phenomena of the universe which displays such order and arrangement, adaptation and design, necessarily demands not only the admission, but also the assertion of predestination; and that the actual government of God cannot be philosophically established or explained without it. And we also maintain that the being and attributes of God cannot be philosophically defended if we deny foreordination, which is inseparable from His being and attributes.

The existence of an intelligent first cause necessarily proves design and arrangement, and design and arrangement necessarily establish predestination. Whatever certainty or proof we have for the existence of an intelligent first cause, we have the same evidence for predestination, and the one cannot possibly be without the other. If we abandon this ground, we must embrace the skepticism of Unitarianism, which declares, in opposition to reason and revelation, that the Almighty is quite ignorant to-day of what is to take place to-morrow, and has nothing to do with the moral government of the universe. See Acts 15, 18. Isaiah 46, 10.

The doctrine of predestination can easily be proved from Scripture, reason and Providence. And so can the fact that God is not the author of sin, and that man is a free agent, and therefore responsible for his fate and conduct. As each of those positions can be established separately or by itself, we are not prepared to surrender either of them for any apparent inconsistency between them or our inability to harmonize them. It would be highly unphilosophical to do so. We say that it is highly unphilosophical to reject any doctrine that can be clearly and indisputably established on its own proper grounds and merits, by direct argument, on the ground of inferences, or what is called inferential arguments. We have the support of the great name of Sir James MacIntosh in saying so: "There is no topic" says Sir James, "which requires such strong grounds to justify its admission into controversy as that

of moral consequences; for, besides its incurable tendency to inflame the angry passions, and to excite obloquy against individuals, which renders it a practical restraint on free inquiry, the employment of it in dispute seems to betray apprehensions derogatory from the dignity of morals, and not consonant either to the dictates of reason or the lessons of experience. The rules of morality are too deeply rooted in human nature to be shaken by every veering breath of metaphysical theory." And John Locke, the greatest of British Metaphysicians also says: "If you will argue for or against liberty from consequences I will not undertake to answer you." This mode of argument should never be resorted to, without great caution, inasmuch as it is liable to great abuse and is commonly adopted only by such as are unwilling or incompetent to argue questions upon their own proper merits. The limitation of our faculties, "our ignorance and prejudices," often render us incompetent judges what is, and what is not consistent with the divine character. What may appear to us now inconsistent with the divine character, might, and no doubt would, upon more ample means of judging, appear perfectly harmonious with it. It is by this mode of argument Socinians and Unitarians attempt to overthrow the doctrine of the atonement, and Arminians attack Calvinism.

Arminians are particularly loud and incessant in their declamation on this topic. And what makes their conduct particularly so contemptible and offensive is that their own system is encumbered with the same difficulties they press upon us, and liable to the same objections they urge against our views. We now proceed to prove that this is the case. Arminians, however reluctant, acknowledge the foreknowledge of God; acknowledge that God knew in eternity everything that transpires in time. We say however reluctant, because many of them denied God's foreknowledge, and clearly showed that their sympathies were in that direction. Arminians, at least many of them, have not scrupled to divest God of his attributes of omnipotence and foreknowledge, whilst at the same time they have not scrupled to invest man with the attributes of perfection. They were equally prepared to pronounce God imperfect and man perfect. But generally speaking they admit the foreknowledge of God. What we maintain then is, that there can be no foreknowledge without predestination; and even should there

be, that foreknowledge is liable to the very same objections made to foreordination—"The great articles of divine foreknowledge and predestination are both embarrassed by the self-same difficulties," says Sir William Hamilton.

The decree of God in predestination is the only foundation of foreknowledge, because God could not foreknow that things would be, unless he had purposed that they should be. We maintain that it is impossible to foreknow certainly what is to be further than God or some other cause has foreordained it. If God, as Arminians admit, foreknows all things, as they shall come to pass, then they shall come to pass, at the time and place, and manner in which he foresaw and foreknew them. If one solitary thing he foreknew from eternity, does not come to pass precisely as he foreknew it, his foreknowledge would be defective, and if he foresaw them from eternity, then they could not but take place. But how did he become certain? Unless there was a certainty in the thing, it could not be foreknown. An uncertain occurrence could not be certainly known to be, and therefore everything certainly known must certainly be. But who gave these things that certainty? The cause of their certainty was either the purpose of God that they should be, or the cause of it was in the things themselves. But the things themselves did not as yet exist, and could not therefore give certainty to themselves; for that which is not cannot be the cause of certainty to anything. Either then God in eternity gave these things the certainty of their existence by his decree or purpose, or else the things themselves gave certainty to themselves while as yet they had no being. That they would infallibly exist is an effect, and the certain foreknowledge of that existence is also an effect, consequent upon God's purpose or some other cause. But what was the real cause both of the existence of the things and the certain foreknowledge of them as such? The cause of it was not from themselves for an effect cannot be its own cause, and as yet they had no being even as an effect except in the purpose of God; and there was no being in the immensity of space but God alone; and if they were certainly foreknown, there was no being in eternity to give them that certainty but himself. Therefore the certainty both as to their existence and the foreknowledge of it, could only arise from

and was only consequent upon God's purpose to bring them into existence, for there was no being then but himself.

Thus we find, and there is no possibility of evading the conclusion, that foreknowledge infers foreordination, and drags predestination after it; and it is as Sir William Hamilton states, "embarrassed by the self-same difficulties" as predestination. Nothing but stupidity, prejudice, or something worse can possibly prevent people from seeing and acknowledging the validity of this argument. Every consistent and intelligent person must admit that the whole of the difficulty now under consideration, consists in the unalterable certainty of free acts, and must also admit that foreknowledge supposes or infers certainty, as sure as foreordination secures it. If foreknowledge, which establishes certainty, be consistent with liberty, predestination which secures it cannot be incompatible with it; and if certainty be inconsistent with liberty, foreknowledge is just as subversive of it as foreordination. A predestinated act is no more necessary than a foreseen act, so that predestination no more necessarily interferes with accountability than foreknowledge. "This argument is so conclusive that most theistical advocates of the doctrine of contingency, when they come to deal with it, give the matter up, and acknowledge that an act may be certain as to occurrence and yet free." Hence the Arminian theory of divine foreknowledge without divine foreordination, is a great absurdity alike opposed to reason and revelation; and is simply a sophistical mode of speaking by which Arminians attempt to evade a difficulty, and to approximate to scriptural language without admitting scriptural truth, and by which they manage to bring the whole subject into confusion, and thereby impose upon people who are superficial in thought and knowledge.

When we press the argument from the divine foreknowledge upon Arminians, they are in the habit of saying by way of reply that foreknowledge has no causal influence upon what is to be, and that as God is omniscient nothing is successive or future to him. We grant that foreknowledge as such, and of itself, has no causal influence upon what is to be, or upon the things foreknown, but the question is, and it is not to be evaded in that childish and sophistical manner: Does foreknowledge suppose the unalterable certainty of the things foreknown? Has God who foreknows what is to be any causal influence upon what he thus foreknows? Can God's

foreknowledge be separated from himself? We grant that to God nothing is successive and future, but still the fact remains, that we exist in time, and that to us there is a future as well as a present, and that human acts are known before they occur in time, and consequently foreknown and certain. Dr. Adam Clarke endeavored to evade the force of this argument by saying that although God might foreknow all things, yet that he does not choose to foreknow the free acts of men. But then, if God could foreknow them, as Clarke admits he could, in that case they were equally certain, as God could not certainly foreknow what was uncertain, and therefore God's purpose or choice to remain ignorant of them, does not in the least affect the argument or abate its force. It would seem *ignorance* was an essential attribute of the Deity in Clarke's view, and one without which he could not govern his creatures. But surely it is unnecessary to say more about such a foible, and such a feeble sophism.

In corroboration of the line of argument we have been pursuing, we have much pleasure in giving an extract from an able author of our own day, and one who is not a Calvinist, but who has, notwithstanding candidly acknowledged the soundness of our position, and the conclusiveness of our argument with Arminians here. We mean the well-known Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin. We attach the more importance to his statement, and look upon it as a concession due to the force of truth, and as an important contribution to the establishment of sound doctrine, although not so intended, as he tells us he is not a Calvinist.

The Archbishop says: "Before I dismiss the consideration of this subject, I would suggest one caution relative to a class of objections frequently urged against the Calvinistic scheme, those drawn from the conclusions of what is called natural religion, respecting the moral attributes of the Deity, which it is contended, rendered the reprobation of a large portion of mankind an absolute impossibility. That such objections do reduce the predestinarian to a great strait, is undeniable; and not seldom are they urged with exulting scorn, with bitter invective, and almost with anathema. But we should be very cautious how we employ such weapons as may recoil upon ourselves. Arguments of this description have often been adduced, such as I fear, will crush beneath the ruins of the hostile structure the blind assailant who seeks to overthrow it.

It is a frightful but an undeniable truth, that multitudes even in christian countries, are born and brought up under such circumstances as afford them no probable, often no possible chance of obtaining a knowledge of religious truths, or a habit of moral conduct, but are even trained from infancy in superstitious error and gross depravity. Why this should be permitted, neither Calvinist nor Arminian can explain; nay, why the Almighty does not cause to die in the cradle every infant whose future wickedness and misery, if suffered to grow up, He foresees, is what no system of religion, natural or revealed, will enable us satisfactorily to account for.

“In truth, these are merely branches of the one great difficulty, *the existence of evil*, which may almost be called the only difficulty in theology. It assumes indeed various shapes; it is by many hardly recognized as a difficulty, and not a few have professed and believed themselves to have solved it; but it still meets them, though in some new and disguised form, at every turn, like a resistless stream, which, when one channel is dammed up, immediately forces its way through another. And as the difficulty is one not peculiar to *any one* hypothesis, but bears *equally* on all *alike*, whether of revealed or of natural religion, it is better in point of prudence, as well as of fairness, that the consequences of it should be pressed as an objection against any.” (Essays p. p. 86, 85.)

“I cannot dismiss the subject without a few practical remarks relative to the difficulty in question (the origin of evil.)

First, let it be remarked, that it is not peculiar to any one theological system; let not therefore the Calvinist or the Arminian urge it as an objection against their respective adversaries; much less an objection clothed in offensive language, which will be found to recoil on their own religious tenets, as soon as it shall be perceived that both parties are alike unable to explain the difficulty. Let them not to destroy an opponent's system, rashly kindle a fire which will soon extend to the no less combustible structure of their own.

Secondly, let it not be supposed that this difficulty is any objection to revealed religion. Revelation leaves us, in fact, as to this question, just where it found us. Reason tells us that evil exists, and shows us in some measure how to avoid it. Revelation tells of the

nature and extent of the evil, and gives us better instructions for escaping it; but why any evil at all should exist, is a question it does not affect to clear up, and it were to be wished that its incautious advocates would abstain from representing it as making this pretension, which is in fact wantonly to provoke such objections as they have no power to answer." (Bampton Lectures, p. 555.)

There is nothing new to us in the above extract; all that is novel about it is the fact that Archbishop Whately is not a Calvinist. We say that this feature of it is novel, because we never knew any Arminian before to speak so candidly and judiciously upon this subject. It is to be hoped therefore that "this concession, so honorable to him, may put an end to the coarse and offensive declamation in which Arminians have commonly indulged on this branch of the argument, and which has usually formed a very large share of their whole stock in trade as polemics."

Can Arminians, upon their own principles, reconcile the origin or existence of evil with the natural and moral goodness of God, seeing he is Almighty, and was consequently able to prevent it. Can they reconcile it with the divine goodness, that no provision whatever was made for fallen angels, but were devoted to destruction? Can they make it consistent with the divine goodness that there is so much evil and wickedness now in the world; seeing that God is omnipotent, and therefore able to prevent it? Can they make it consistent with the divine goodness that murderers and tyrants are allowed to come into being and come into maturity, when God foreknew and foresaw their wickedness, and also foresaw the eternal misery into which He was to plunge them? Can they make it consistent with the divine goodness, and with their own principles, that the great majority of the world in all ages never heard of the provisions of mercy for sinners? Our object in making these remarks is simply to show Arminians that they should be a little more modest and cautious in their assaults upon Calvinism; and to remind them that men who live in glass houses should not be throwing stones. They are equally embarrassed with us upon these points, and they need not, and they will not be allowed to shut their eyes to the fact.

We beg now to state some of the grounds upon which we object to Arminianism:—

1st. We object to Arminianism because it virtually dethrones God from the moral Government of the universe, inasmuch as it denies that God determines anything, or exerts any real efficiency in the production of anything among his rational creatures; but leaves everything bearing upon their character and eternal condition undetermined and indeed uninfluenced by their Creator and Governor, and virtually beyond his control. We object to it because it degrades God to the condition of a mere spectator, who only sees what is going on among his creatures, or forsees what is to take place among them, but must be guided in all his dealings with them, by what he thus sees or forsees in them.

2nd. We object to Arminianism because it represents God as looking from the heights of heaven to see whence the salvation of the human family is to come, and because it represents God as unable to save some sinners notwithstanding his Almighty power and ~~unwillingness~~ ^{unwillingness} to save them. They say that God wills, but that men do not get mercy, because they will not meet him. God cannot and leave them in possession of their liberty, break their hard hearts, and therefore it is only those good sort of people, who are not so wicked as others, and who are of clay more easily moulded, that are made unto vessels of honor; but although God is willing to save all, yet he is not able to do so, his omnipotence notwithstanding.

3rd. We object to Arminianism, because it makes salvation to be of debt, inasmuch as it says that God could not justly have left the human family without the provision of the gospel, which would render salvation of justice or debt and not of grace. We object to it because it robs God of the glory of redemption, makes the sinner, partly at least, the author of his own salvation, and thereby gives him occasion to boast before God, and overthrows salvation by grace. We object to it because it places the effect before the cause, inasmuch as it founds the salvation of the sinner upon his foreseen faith and good works, whereas there is nothing good in the children of men until God first creates or produces it in them. We further object to this system because it represents us as choosing God before he chose us, contrary to what the Apostle says:—"We love him because he first loved us." 1 John, 4, 19. It represents the sinner to be before God in the matter of salvation,

A willingness

To save

and represents God as simply attracted to the sinner by the good he sees or forsees in him. It moreover represents the sinner himself as the cause of his own election, inasmuch as he must first, and before it exists, and independent of special grace altogether, possess or produce the qualities or properties upon which it is founded.

4th. We object to Arminianism, because all that it allows to God in effecting the salvation of sinners, amounts to no more than this : that He foreknew that such sinners would believe and persevere to the end, and that on this ground—"this being the cause or condition moving him thereto,"—He admits them to heaven and gives them everlasting life. But it is sinners themselves that cause the difference between them and others, and God simply recognizes them as persons who have made their way to heaven by their own good efforts, and without His special assistance, or without receiving anything from God farther than *common grace*, which is equally given to all men, to those who are in hell as well as to those who are in heaven. How contrary to all this are the words of our Lord to his disciples:—"It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." Math. 13, 11. We further object to this system, because it represents God as merely making choice of certain qualities or features of character, and resolving to treat them according to their proper nature, in whatever persons they might at last turn out to be found, whilst he left it with sinners themselves in the exercise of their free will to comply or not with the terms he had prescribed. It is thus Arminianism subverts the grace of God, and affords an opportunity of boasting to the sinner. It possesses great charms for the carnal mind, and lays hold upon and gives ample scope to the exercise of the self-righteous principle in man. The attempt of Arminians to found election or the salvation of men upon the foreknowledge of their faith, perseverance, and other good qualities, leads to these consequences, but many who hold this theory are ignorant of the fact that it does so. "It is to be remembered also," says Dr. Humphrey, "that the Arminian scheme has yet to be reduced to a systematic and logical form." Where are its written formularies, pushing boldly forth to their final and inevitable conclusions, all its doctrines touching predestination, free will and efficacious grace? We have its brief and informal creed, in some

five-and-twenty articles ; but where is its complete confession of Faith, in thirty or forty chapters ? Where is its Larger Catechism ? Nay, where is even its Shorter Catechism ? Where is its whole body of Divinity, from under the hand of a master, sharply defining its terms, accurately stating its belief, laying down the conclusions logically involved therein, trying these conclusions no less than their premises by the word of God, refuting objections, and adjusting all its parts into a consistent and systematic whole ? It has furnished us indeed with some detached negations and philosophical theories. We have, for example, its flat denial of our doctrine of predestination, but has it to this day met for itself, the problem of foreknowledge infinite by a more plausible solution than the celebrated sophism, that although God has the capacity of foreknowing all things, he chooses to foreknow only some things ? We have also its notion of the freedom of the will, wherein was supposed to be the germ of a systematic Arminianism ; but this budding promise was long since nipped by the untimely frost of Jonathan Edwards's logic. It is clear that an exposition of this theology, which shall satisfy the logical consciousness, is indispensable to its perpetuity, otherwise it cannot take possession of educated and disciplined minds—educated by the word and spirit of God, and disciplined to exact analysis and argument ; otherwise again, although it may exert a temporary influence, it will retire before advancing spiritual and intellectual culture. It is also clear that the first century of its existence has not produced that exposition. Another century may demonstrate that such a production is impossible, by showing that the scriptural and logical element is not in the Arminian system ; that the law of affinity and crystallization is wanting to its disjointed principles ; that this theology, combining many precious truths, and many capital errors, resembles a mingled mass of diamonds and fragments of broken glass and broken pottery, which no plastic skill of man or power of fire can mould into a single transparent, many-sided, equal sided-crystal, its angles all beaming, and its points all burning with light—a Koh-i-noor indeed."

If the doctrine of Predestination and the divine foreknowledge be true, as we believe it is, there is no doubt a necessity of some kind, attaching to all our actions, but that does not preclude their having also a liberty attaching to them. God has created us rational and responsible beings, and notwithstanding that He ever

infallibly executes His decrees by his Providence, He ever leaves us in full possession of such a liberty as is consistent with that rationality and responsibility with which He has endowed us. If God's decree in predestination should interfere with the moral nature of an action, then the actions of God are not moral because all His actions are predestinated, for, as we have already shown, whatsoever God does in time He purposed in eternity to do it. Nor would the human actions of Christ be moral, because all his actions were predestinated and foretold. Hence, predestination does not destroy the liberty of the actor or the morality of an action, otherwise when God decreed His own actions, He destroyed His own moral nature and His liberty as an actor. We therefore conclude that predestination is not inconsistent with liberty, and does not destroy the liberty of the actor or the moral nature of actions.

It is manifest from the Scriptures "that the inspired writers perceived no inconsistency between a purpose of God that a certain event should occur, and that it should be brought about by the free and accountable agency of man." The Scriptures throughout ascribe the occurrence of all events to God, and yet represent man as free and accountable in bringing forth those occurrences; and not only so, but "represents him as acting most wickedly in those very transactions which are most expressly declared to be determined by the will of God." The brethren of Joseph, Pharaoh, and Shimei were respectively accountable for their wickedness, because they acted freely and in full accordance with their dispositions, feelings, and nature; and yet Joseph tells his brethren:—"So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." Gen. 45, 5, 8., Ch. 50, 20. And of Pharaoh we are told "the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh." Exodus 9, 12. And of Shimei David said, "Let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him." 2 Sam. 16, 11. The Apostle Peter thus addresses the Jews who crucified our Saviour:—"Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts 2, 23. "For of a truth against thy Holy child Jesus, whom thou hast annointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together. For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." Acts 4, 27, 28. Here we find the death of Christ was predestinated, and therefore those who put him to death, only did "whatsoever the hand and counsel of God determined before to be done;" and yet they put him to death "by wicked hands," which could not be the case were they not free agents, as otherwise there would be no wickedness in their act. Hence we find that predestination is invariably maintained in the Scriptures to be consistent with the liberty and responsibility of

those who produce the act, and that action predestinated. Our liberty, or moral agency, consists in the power of acting in accordance with the laws of our nature, such as our convictions, inclinations, feelings, and immanent dispositions, and in our being determined in all that we do by what is within ourselves, free from any natural necessity or outward compulsion, and may be called a liberty of rational spontaneity. The decree of God in predestination, be it ever remembered, does not constrain any one to act in opposition to his own sacred and cherished propensities. It does not force a man to wickedness, if his nature is inclined to holiness, and it does not force him to what is good if his whole heart is set on evil. To act in accordance with their respective natures is the highest liberty that can be enjoyed by God, angels or men.

Our consciousness, which is a first principle, equally establishes our liberty, and our dependance on God, "in whose hand our life is," and "in whom we live and move and have our being." We have the same evidence for our liberty and accountability as we have for our existence. We believe both in the sovereignty and omnipotence of God, and in the freedom and accountability of man, their apparent inconsistency notwithstanding. We cannot deny either without contradicting our deepest feelings, and our very nature. We cannot deny to God "who giveth to all life and breath and all things," Acts 17, 25; the control of all our actions, without robbing him of his glory, deifying man, and running into atheism. Nor can we, on the other hand, deny to man liberty and self-action without making him a mere machine or an irresponsible agent, and without contradicting his consciousness. If we give up the rational and scriptural doctrine of predestination, we drive God out from among men, and make him at best but an idle spectator of our actions. In short we hold that God decrees, and yet that man retains his liberty; that God is omnipotent, and yet that man is free. We are not ashamed to confess our inability to perceive the harmony between predestination and human liberty, and yet that we believe in both. The tie which connects them is invisible to us, so that we do not know their relations to each other, but we believe in both simply because God reveals both to us, and calls upon us to believe them:—"Such knowledge is too wonderful for us, it is high we cannot attain unto it." Psalm 13, 9, 6.

"Who for any metaphysical difficulty—who, because he is not able to comprehend how God can effectually govern free agents without destroying their nature, would give up the doctrine of Providence? Who would wish to see the reins of universal empire fall from the hands of infinite wisdom, and love to be seized by chance or fate? Who would not rather be governed by a Father than by a tornado? If God cannot effectually control the acts of free agents, there can be no prophesy, no prayer, no thanksgiving, no promises, no security of salvation, no certainty whether in the end God or Satan is to be triumphant, whether heaven or hell is to

be the consummation. Give us certainty—the secure conviction that a sparrow cannot fall, nor a sinner move a finger, but as God permits and ordains. We must have either God or Satan to rule. And if God has a Providence, he must be able to render the free acts of his creatures certain, and therefore certainty must be consistent with liberty.”

It is undeniable that indissoluble difficulties attach to this subject, and that no positive contribution can be made towards the explanation of them now, either from natural or revealed religion. But it is consummate folly for men to pretend to remove them by shifting them either backward or forward from the place in which the Scriptures leave them. Nothing short of the atheism or infidelity of Unitarianism and Socinianism will relieve us here, for as long as men acknowledge that there is a God, and that he is the moral Governor of the universe, no views they can adopt whether they believe it or not, will enable them to scale this height, or fathom this depth, which is nothing but a part of the one great difficulty, the origin of evil. Arminians, with all their shifts and expedients, do not really get over one particle of the difficulty which they so vehemently and incessantly press upon us. They simply manage to put it one step backwards, but must after all meet it there, not only in all its original strength but with additional incumbrances, which it has gathered and carried along with it in its progress. The only advantage their error gives them is, that it enables them to make ignorant and simple people believe that they have crushed it out of existence, when in reality they have increased it. Their cavil, such as it is, concerns themselves as much as us, unless they are prepared to swallow the monstrous absurdity, that what is to be will not be, and that what God foresees as certain may never come to pass. No other proof need be asked of the conclusiveness of our argument against the Arminian hypothesis than the subterfuges to which they resort to relieve themselves from its pressure. Some of them have maintained not only that God is defective in knowledge, but also in power, that his will is constantly resisted, and his purposes often thwarted beyond his power of control; that he is anxiously desirous to have things in the universe different from what they really are, but is constantly defeated by his own creatures, and consequently unable to accomplish his purposes or have his will done.

Many of the greatest masters of human reason have acknowledged their inability to reconcile the omnipotence of God with the liberty and responsibility of man, but yet avowed their belief in both as natural and revealed truths. True philosophy, as well as the word of God, “inculcates humility upon us in the investigation of truth because of the limitation and imperfection of our faculties; and warns us of the unwarrantableness and absurdity of making our capacities of distinctly conceiving and fully comprehending doctrines, the measure and standard of their absolute truth, or of their consistency with each other, and the perfect rea-

sonableness of believing upon sufficient grounds, things which in some respects are beyond our grasp, and that cannot be fully taken in or comprehended by the exercise of our faculties, when brought distinctly to bear upon them."

John Locke says:—"I cannot have a clearer perception of anything, than that I am free, yet I cannot make freedom in man consistent with omnipotence and omnipresence in God, though I am as fully persuaded of both as of any truth I most firmly assent to, and therefore I have long since given over the consideration of that question, resolving all into the short conclusion, that if it be possible for God to make a free agent, then man is free, though I see not the way of it." Vol. 3, p 487. "If all things must stand or fall by the measure of our understandings, and that denied to be where we find inextricable difficulties, there will very little remain in the world, and we shall scarce leave ourselves so much as understandings, souls or bodies." *King's Life of Locke*, p 92.

Sir William Hamilton says:—"The philosophy therefore which I profess annihilates the theoretical problem—How is the scheme of liberty, or the scheme of necessity to be rendered comprehensible?—by showing that both schemes are equally inconceivable, but it establishes liberty practically as a fact, by showing that it is either itself an immediate datum, or is involved in an immediate datum of consciousness." *Reid's Works*, p 599. How the will can possibly be free must remain to us under the present limitation of our faculties, wholly incomprehensible. We are unable to conceive an absolute commencement, we cannot therefore conceive a free volition." How therefore moral liberty is possible in man or God, we are utterly unable speculatively to understand. But practically, the fact that we are free is given to us in the consciousness of an uncompromising law of duty, in the consciousness of our moral accountability." "We are though we know not how, the true and responsible authors of our actions, not merely the worthless links in an adamant series of effects and causes." *Discussions*, p 624.

John Wesley says:—"And if any one ask how God's foreknowledge is consistent with our freedom, I plainly answer I cannot tell." *Misc. Works*, Vol. 2, p 277.

5th. The duty devolving upon us to maintain the doctrines and principles of the Reformation, and to transmit them to future generations.

As we have already extended our remarks far beyond our original intention, we regret that we cannot enter upon this part of our subject. We have briefly glanced at the results of three centuries of Calvinism and Presbyterianism in Scotland; and all that we now ask is, that they should be judged by their fruits. If the tree is known by its fruits Calvinism cannot be that bad tree, that

its enemies represent it to be. The fruits of Calvinism are intelligence and piety, morality and christian enterprise. It has always been so, not only in Scotland, but throughout Christendom. The Encyclopedia Britannica at the close of a long article on Predestination, and against Calvinism, makes the following remarkable concession:—"There is one remark which we feel ourselves bound in justice to make, although it appears to us somewhat singular. It is this—that from the earliest ages down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the modern Calvinists and Jansenists, when compared with that of their antagonists, the Epioureans, the Sadduces, the Arminians and the Jesuits, we shall find that they have *excelled, in no small degree, in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues*, and have been the *highest honor* to their own ages, and the *best model for imitation* to every age succeeding."

We think the following extract from the *Princeton Review* explains the cause of Scotland's moral and religious superiority:—

"It has been the glory and blessing of Scotland that education has gone hand in hand with religion. The school-house has always stood near the Church. The system of doctrines taught in the Shorter Catechism has there, more thoroughly than elsewhere, been the real pabulum of the people. And to this fact is, in a great measure to be attributed, whatever of mental or moral superiority distinguishes their national character. This is the great source of that discrimination of intellect, that firmness of purpose, that logical adherence of principle, that independence of character, which appears so conspicuously in Scottish History."

Could we reach the ear of all the Presbyterians of Canada, we would earnestly say to them, make it your special duty to instruct your children in the Shorter Catechism, and it will do for them what it did for our fathers in days gone by. This duty can easily be discharged in the family and in the Sabbath School, where it is not elsewhere attended to. Its sound doctrine, correct use of terms, and logical order, make the Shorter Catechism the best mental discipline for the young intellect, both in developing the reasoning faculties, and in laying a solid foundation for enlarged intelligence. We have a thorough contempt of the pretended new light and liberality of those conceited men who represent the Reformers and great Divines of the seventeenth century as behind our enlightened age. What our age chiefly wants is a return to the masculine theology and sound principles of the Reformation. The Covenanters and Puritans were the fathers of civil and religious liberty, and are incomparably the greatest theologians that Britain has ever produced. The Constitutional Government and popular education for which Knox and the Covenanters contended have long since become the foundation stones of the British Constitution, and the guardian of the rights and liberties of the people. "What are the passages in the national history of our fore fathers, which we read with the most thrilling interest and which we would

wish to be engraven on the minds of our children? What are the scenes in their land of mountain and flood on which we gaze with feelings too deep for utterance? Are they not the passages which record the faithful contendings of our forefathers for a pure gospel and a free Church? Are they not the scenes where many of them lie buried as martyrs in the cause of civil and religious freedom? They won by their blood the privileges which we are called to maintain by our efforts and prayers; and would we willingly have it said by posterity, that we relinquished without a struggle the birth-right of our children—or that in the calm and sunshine of outward prosperity we suffered that noble vessel to go down which was reared in the tempest and rocked by the hurricane.”

“Yes, though the sceptic’s tongue deride
Those martyrs who for conscience died—
Though modish history blight their fame
And sneering courtiers hoot the name
Of men who dared alone be free,
Amidst a nation’s slavery,—
Yet long for them the poet’s lyre
Shall wake its notes of heavenly fire.
Their names shall nerve the patriot’s hand,
Upraised to save a sinking land,
And piety shall learn to burn
With holier transports o’er their urn.”

ERRATA.

Owing to the Author’s distance from the Press, he could not see proof-sheets before their undergoing a final revision, and as a necessary consequence some typographical errors have crept into the Pamphlet—such as “scholarly” for “scholarly” on page 85; “purity” for “parity” on page 68; and “unwillingness” for “willingness” on page 96. He hopes the candid reader will make due allowance for all such mistakes.

