

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1840.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Sectarianism is Heresy, in three parts, in which are shown its Nature, Evils and Remedy.* By A. Wylie. Bloomington, Ia. 1840. 8vo. pp. 132.

OUR church has occasion to rejoice whenever those who go out from her undertake to give their reasons. Who will venture to predict how many heedless lapses into high-churchism, on the one hand, and no-churchism on the other, have been already, or may yet be, prevented by the printed arguments of Mr. Calvin Colton and of Dr. Andrew Wylie? In this respect, if in no other, these distinguished writers may assure themselves, they have not lived in vain.

The work before us is a series of dialogues between one Gardezfoi, one Democop, and Timothy, an alias for Andrew Wylie. As he gives the outlandish names to his opponents, so he does his best to give them all the nonsense, but without success. The book is not so violent as we expected from the author's temper. He is a man of talents, and of reading, but inaccurate, and sadly wanting both in taste and judgment. He makes sectarianism to consist in bigotry and carnality. By bigotry he understands a disposition to lay stress on doctrines; and by carnality all zeal for particular denominations. His great point is, that faith is trust in God, not

visible,) without destroying the attachment which we ought to cherish towards our own communion. And at last, it may be soon, the Christian, weary of contention, shall no more have occasion to exclaim, "How long shall I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet?"* For human standards shall then cease to wave, and the only trumpet shall be that of the archangel, calling God's army, not to battle, but to triumph. And then, as they lay down the weapons of their warfare at the feet of the Captain of Salvation, names and forms shall be forgotten; they shall all see eye to eye; emulation and suspicion shall be lost forever in a perfect unity of spirit and affection; and the Saviour shall at length receive a plenary answer to the prayer which he offered, not only in behalf of his immediate followers, but of those who should believe upon him through their name—*ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσι*—THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE.†

John Aiton

ART. II.—*The Life and Times of Alexander Henderson, giving a History of the Second Reformation of the Church of Scotland, and of the Covenanters, during the reign of Charles I.* By John Aiton, D. D., Minister of Dolphinton. Edinburgh: 1836. 8vo. pp. xx. 674.

THE name of Alexander Henderson is not so familiar to the ears of American Presbyterians as it ought to be, and as it was with our Scottish ancestors, and still is, we trust, among the old-school men of the modern Kirk. After Calvin, Knox, and Melville, place must be given to Henderson, as it regards the reform of our church polity. For it was he who proposed and partly framed "the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Directory or Platform of Church Government and Worship," besides forwarding the venerable translation of the Psalms still used in the Scotch churches. The period in which he lived—from 1583 to 1646—is crowded with great events of our church-history, and of the fortunes of civil and religious liberty. To the whigs of Scotland, Hume has traced the

* Jer. iv. 21.

† John xvii. 21.

liberal principles of English politics, and he has admitted only what it would be effrontery to deny. We do not canonize the Covenanters; but we would not willingly let the moss grow over the inscriptions on their grave-stones.

Henderson was chief actor in a great drama, and he has left others to record his acts. Burnet complains that his writings are flat and heavy. They are so, compared with the light and effervescent gossip of the excellent prelate; but then who would compare the acts of the one with those of the other? Laud very naturally stigmatized him as a most violent and passionate man, and a moderator without moderation. Maxwell called him the Scottish pope. Clarendon described him as one who meddled more in civil matters than all the bishops. Hume and Laing allude to him as the Apostle of the North; and while they record his blind assurance, bigotted prejudices, ridiculous cant, provincial accent, barbarism and ignorance, they leave us to guess how he contrived to move the whole nation. Pemberton uses a term, in describing him, which will be understood by Americans: he was the Franklin of the Scottish commotions. In the General Assembly of 1647, by which the Confession was adopted, Baillie expressed the wish that Henderson's memory might be fragrant among them "as long as free and pure Assemblies remain in this land; which," says he, "I hope will be till the coming of our Lord. You know," adds Baillie, "he spent his strength, wore out his days, and that he did breathe out his life, in the service of God and of this Church. This binds it on us and our posterity to account him the fairest ornament, after Mr. John Knox, of incomparable memory, that ever the Church of Scotland did enjoy." He was equally respected, as we learn from the same great authority, "by his most serene Majesty and the Parliaments of both kingdoms." "A more modest, humble spirit, and of so great parts and deserved authority with all the greatest of the Isles, lives not this day in the reformed churches." Again, he says, Henderson was for some years, THE MOST EYED MAN OF THE THREE KINGDOMS. Here is enough, surely, to make us unwilling to be wholly ignorant of his personal history.

The volume before us, is graced with an engraving from an original portrait by Vandyck, belonging to the Hendersons of Fordel. The existence of no less than six admirable original portraits of Henderson shows the esteem in which he was held by the noble families and universities in

whose collections these pictures are extant. According to the best accounts, Henderson was rather below the ordinary size, of a slender frame, and of a gentle carriage of body. In the portraits by Vandyck and Jamieson, the sedate and softening features predominate. His countenance bespeaks mild determination, indicative, in the earlier stage of public life, of anxiety, but in after years of melancholy and even disease. His forehead does not seem to have been remarkably high or prominent, but it is deeply furrowed with the wrinkles of care, even in those paintings which represent him in perfect health. All the artists have given him an eye expressive of benignity and passive courage. His jet black hair, his short beard on the chin and upper lip, his black gown over a dark coloured cassock, and the sombre hue of his complexion, give the whole canvass the cast of a saint in deep mourning. In the very furnace of controversy, in which he was so much occupied, the serene and amiable qualities of the Christian, and the native courtesy of the gentleman, never gave way. Baillie, indeed, admits that "the man had by nature a little choler not yet quite extinguished." Knox, Melville and Henderson, says Dr. Aiton, were all conspicuous for the *fortiter in re*, but Henderson alone combined with it the *suaviter in modo*. His ruling passion was the love of Presbytery. To this he devoted his wisdom and his eloquence, if indeed he did not sacrifice his life in the cause.*

The personal biography of Henderson is meager, and we must look for his history in that of the Church and the State, during the earlier years of the great Civil War. He was born, as we said, in 1583, so that he was nearly coeval with the erection of presbyteries in Scotland. The parish of Creich in Fife was his birth-place. The Hendersons of Fordel claim him as a cadet of their family. Sir John Henderson of Fordel, of that day, was a leading Covenanter, and one of the three Fife lairds who brought the strength of that country to fight Montrose at Kilsyth.

We hear of him first at the University of St. Andrews, whither he went during the same year in which Cromwell, his great rival in after life, was born. He was matriculated in the college of St. Salvator, on the 19th of December, 1599; being about sixteen years old. He passed the first

* We often make free use of Dr. Aiton's language, without the marks of quotation.

course of four years' study in the languages, rhetoric, and parts of the Aristotelian logic and physics, under the superintendence of James Martin, a noted teacher. The name was at that time written *Henryson*, which is that of one of the earliest and best of the Scottish poets, who came of the same family. He took his master's degree in 1603—" *Alexander Henrisonus*." It is unknown at what time he became a student in divinity, but before he was twenty-seven years old he had acquired a name for learning and philosophy. In 1600, he was a Professor, and also a Questor of the Faculty of Arts. In the year 1611, he subscribed the accounts of the said faculty, "*Mr. Alexander Henrysone*."

Being then an Episcopalian, he was in favour with men in power, and, at the laureation of his class, made choice of Archbishop Gladstones for his patron, and wrote him a flattering dedication. The primate soon after presented Henderson to the church of Leuchars, in the Presbytery of St. Andrews: the induction must have taken place at some time between the end of the year 1611, and the 26th of January 1614. Whatever celebrity Henderson had acquired with the members of the university, says Dr. Aiton, was lost on his parishioners. As Fife was truly said by Gladstones to be the most seditious province in the kingdom, Leuchars was situated in the very hotbed of opposition to Prelacy. The presentee of an archbishop, whoever he might be, could not look for a cordial reception on the part of the stanch Presbyterians of that county. Gladstones was odious in the estimation of the whole peasantry of the district. Part of the odium directed against the patron fell deservedly on his protegee. Henderson's own sentiments on matters of religion had often been expressed, so that the Presbyterians already looked on him as the rising Goliath of the Philistines. On the day of his induction the parishioners rose in a body to arrest the strong arm of power in the execution of the law. Awed by the terrors of the High Court of Commission, they durst make no actual assault on the clergymen present, but means had been previously taken to secure the church doors inside, so that no entrance could be effected by them. In spite of public opinion thus strongly manifested, Henderson and his friends got into the church by a window, and went quietly through the solemnities of the occasion.

For a time he was regarded as a stranger, and he seems to have had very little sense of his ministerial responsibility;

but before he had resided more than two or three years in his parish, his mind began to undergo a change. He became acquainted with his neighbour, Mr. William Scott, minister at Cupar, an aged but zealous Presbyterian. The death of his patron, Gladstones, in 1615, relieved him from any embarrassments in that quarter. And especially a desire to be useful to his people, and to know the truth himself gained strength in his mind. But Providence threw him about this time under more special influences. Robert Bruce of Kinnaird, well known as one of the greatest of the Scottish divines, was at this period in the zenith of his powers and celebrity. He attended a communion in some parish near Leuchars, and Henderson was naturally desirous to hear so heroic a servant of Christ preach. Intending to be incognito he went, and seated himself in an obscure corner. Bruce is described, says our biographer, as having been one of the most authoritative speakers of his age, and also as having at times manifested singular evidences of the spirit. Above all men, even since the apostles, he is said to have had the faculty of dealing with the consciences of his hearers, delivering the word of God with a weight which made the stout-hearted tremble. Henderson, from his lurking-place, saw the veteran ascend the pulpit with his usual easy carriage and majestic countenance. In prayer Bruce was short, but every sentence like a strong bolt shot up to heaven. When he rose to preach, he, as his custom was, stood silent for a time. This surprised Henderson a little, but he was much more moved by the first words the preacher uttered, *He that cometh not in by the door, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber.* The text and the sermon were employed as the means of his conversion. Of many thousands gained by the labours of Bruce, Henderson was justly esteemed "the best fish caught in the net."

It is not known at what precise time Henderson ceased to be a prelatist. Wodrow says vaguely that it was shortly after his settlement, and before the pretended Assembly at Perth: but he had been four or five years a minister when this Assembly met. Dr. Aiton conjectures that this conversion took place between June, 1615, when Gladstones died, and July, 1616, when the first batch of Doctors of Divinity were inaugurated by the university of St. Andrews. Hen-

derson was not included in the list of the new primate, probably in consequence of his change of opinion.*

At all events, it is certain that Henderson had taken his new ground before August, 1616, when Spotswood first attempted to make the worship and rites of the church of Scotland resemble those of the English hierarchy. In these attempts the primate used great craft. A General Assembly was appointed to be held at Aberdeen, ostensibly for the purpose of suppressing popery in the north, but really to give full powers to the bishops. Henderson was present not only at the sittings of the Assembly, but also at many private conferences. The Primate of St. Andrews acted as moderator, without any election. After some laws had been passed favouring the reformed faith, and after many of the Presbyterian ministers had left the city, under the impression that their business was over, a new Confession of Faith and Catechism were proposed by Mr. A. Hay. These were sound in doctrine, but corrupt as to discipline. The bishops, together with certain ministers, were empowered to revise the Book of Common Prayer, contained in the Psalm Book, and to provide a uniform liturgy. And in order to enforce this uniformity it was ordered that a Book of Canons should be compiled from former acts of Councils and Assemblies. When these were afterwards offered for the king's approbation he added several canons. The acts of this Assembly and these additions of his majesty were afterwards condensed into the famous Five Articles of Perth, of which more hereafter.

Henderson does not appear very actively in the altercations between the Presbyterian clergy and the king, when the latter visited Scotland in 1617. On that occasion, James proposed that whatever conclusion was taken by him, with

* "The Academic title of Doctor in Divinity (says Dr. Aiton) had never been given in Scotland till this time since the Reformation. It was now introduced, that the ministers might in all things be conformed, as much as possible, to the English usages. But it had been laid down in the Second Book of Discipline, that Doctors were officers ordinary in the Church by Divine institution, and that, by virtue of their office, they were admitted to act in church judicatories. Carmichael, and those of his party who were so complimented, did not think that universities had the power to constitute church officers, and they opposed this creation of Doctors as introducing confusion among the ecclesiastical officers of Christ's appointment. The first hint given about making bachelors Doctors of Law and Divinity is to be found in Archbishop Gladstones' letter to the King, dated September, 1607. He requests the order and form of making them 'to encourage our ignorant clergy to learning.'"

the advice of the bishops, should have the power of law. This was opposed as subversive of the ecclesiastical constitution, and the king consented that the advice of a competent number of ministers should also be taken. But as it was still left with the bishops to decide what clergymen should be joined with them, and how many should be a competent number, the Presbyterian ministers, from all parts of the country, protested against the proposed measure in language so strong as to bring down the royal vengeance on their chief abettors. Simpson, minister of Dalkeith, who subscribed the protestation in the name of the brethren, was imprisoned, and afterwards warded at Aberdeen. Hewit, one of the ministers in Edinburgh, who had undertaken to present the supplication, was deprived; and Calderwood, then minister of Crailing, was condemned to be banished. It is conjectured that Henderson was one of the subscribers of this protest, and that he was one of the thirty-six ministers who met the King and bishops at St. Andrews, respecting the same oppressive acts. These attempts, as well as those of the Assembly at St. Andrews, 1617, failed, and James, by way of intimidation, ordered the stipends of the refractory ministers to be withheld, and sent down a warrant to discharge both Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions. In compliance with a general wish of the dissatisfied people, an Assembly was cited to meet at Perth, in August, 1618.

THE PERTH ASSEMBLY is as memorable as any in our annals. Henderson was one of the clerical commissioners. Spotswood acted at it, in the whole matter, under the assurance that not a mere majority but a unanimity would be obtained in favour of the notorious Five Articles. He took the chair, and derided all attempts to elect even himself. In a long harangue, he enforced the very points to be afterwards discussed. The King's mandates were read several times *in terrorem*. It was stated that, in case of refusal, the whole order and estate of the Church would be overthrown, that some ministers would be banished, others deprived of their stipends, and all brought under the wrath of the King. To prevent even the appearance of opposition, business was transacted in privy conferences; and here the court majorities were overwhelming. Henderson and a few of his associates were admitted, only on the conviction that their struggles would be unavailing. Liberty of speech in the Assembly was avowedly granted, but was in effect prevented. The question was put, Whether will ye consent to the Article, or disobey the

King? and it was declared that to vote against any article was to oppose every one of them. The primate threatened to report at Court the name of every opposer, and, for this purpose, he ostentatiously marked the votes with his own hands. But, notwithstanding this, "Mr. Alexander Henrysone, Mr. William Scott, Mr. John Carmichael, and Mr. John Weems," voted in the negative. These and especially Henderson, are mentioned by Calderwood and Wodrow as having been the chief reasoners in support of Presbytery, both in the private conferences, and in the General Assemblies.

About this time an attempt was made to translate Henderson to Edinburgh, but without success; probably in consequence of the primate's opposition. Such opposition was natural, for Henderson attacked the Perth Articles in public and private, especially in a pamphlet which he, with two other ministers, published under the title of "Perth Assembly." This showed that the Articles were inconsistent with the Scripture, and opposed to the principles of the first Reformers, and argued that the Assembly was unlawfully constituted. The zeal of Henderson and other clergymen, forty-five in number, affected the people, and called into action the well-known hierarchical engine, the High Court of Commission. The archbishop of St. Andrews announced to his clergy that the church-polity was about to be overthrown: the threat had the usual effect of such comminations. Several ministers were deprived, and others were confined. Henderson was marked out for vengeance, and cited, some have said, before the High Commission.

Until about the year 1630, Henderson does not appear to have taken the lead in church matters. This was the year of the great awakening at the Kirk of Shotts.* And while the work of grace was advancing among the people, Henderson was silently fitting by prayer and patience for the public services in which he was to engage. From the synodal records of this period, it appears that he was a person of some consideration. Scott and Carmichael were as yet the champions of the party, but the death of Carmichael and the increasing years of Scott gradually gave Henderson the ascendancy, till finally, to use the words of Dr. Aiton, he became almost the dictator in bringing about the second Reformation.

General Assemblies ceased after that held at Perth, but

* See an article on the *Life and Times of John Livingston*, *Biblical Repository* for 1832, p. 428.

there were private conferences from time to time, and often with the permission, if not in the presence of the prelates. At these Henderson made a point of being present. His conduct at this critical period evinced great courage. Instead of being terrified by the fate of Melville, Calderwood, and others, who had suffered exile for the like boldness, he had no reserve in his defence of civil and religious liberty. When he was settled at Leuchars nothing had been required which could alarm his scruples. But archbishop Spotswood "broke the mainspring, and changed the internal wheels of the whole machine in such a way as at once to upset the established habits of the people." The reformers had avoided the practice of kneeling at the communion, but Spotswood enjoined it. In the beginning of his primacy, also, it was commanded that no one should be prevented, after divine service on the Lord's day, from public dancing, May-games, and Whitsun-ales, and the feasts were restored from which they had been so happily released at the Reformation. When therefore (says his biographer) Henderson found that the successor to his patron required the people to relinquish forms of worship which Knox had taught their fathers to venerate—when he found the holy communion connected with what his whole flock esteemed to be idolatry, and that they were to be compelled against their consciences to keep festival days more sacred than the Sabbath of the Lord—when he found that the King's rage for uniformity in the religion of the two nations would turn many of the most loyal Scotsmen into rebels, and, if countenanced on his part, direct the attention of his whole parishioners against himself, then, as a faithful subject and a pious minister, he could not but see the matter in a different light from that in which it had been formerly presented to him; and perceiving the danger, he could not but do what was in his power to avert it.

The first twelve years of the reign of Charles I. form, as Dr. Aiton justly observes, the darkest and most silent period of ecclesiastical history since the Reformation from Popery. During it, there was but one meeting of Parliament, and not a single Assembly of the elergy. Most of the clergy who had followed Melville, and fought the battles of the preceding age, were removed by imprisonment, exile, or death. The bishops remained masters of the field, but allowed Presbyteries, of which they were the constant moderators. Yet it was false doctrine more than unscriptural rites which distressed the hearts of the people. "When they troubled us

but with ceremonies” (said Baillie) “the world knows we went on with them (whereof we have no cause to repent) so far as our duty to God or man could require; but while they will have us, against standing laws, to devour Arminianism and Popery, and all they please, shall we not bear them witness of their opposition, though we should die for it, and preach the truth of God, wherein we have been brought up, against all who will gainsay?”

The circumstances of the King’s visit and coronation in 1633 were so arranged as to throw the pomps of the ritual into a bright light; and the disgust of the people was extraordinary. Charles did not leave Scotland without an open rupture with the parliament, and the establishment of the High Commission Court in every diocese. These were gross assaults upon a church which had enjoyed independence from the earliest times, and the Book of Canons and Liturgy, like the Trojan horse, brought treachery and bloodshed into a whole nation. The notion of entire conformity was introduced as early as 1624, when Spotswood sent up a memorial to Court recommending a ritual constitution almost identical with that of England. Then came the attempts to establish the English Liturgy in Scotland, in 1630, and 1631. Soon after this period, during the King’s visit, strong remonstrances against the infraction of their liberties were offered. But Charles, as Clarendon admits, had come to Scotland, in June, 1633, not merely to be crowned, but to settle the Liturgy at the same time. Accordingly he and Laud went on with their scheme, and the books sent northward were of such a nature as to gladden the hearts of all who prayed for war. Even Clarendon says that it was a fatal inadvertence that the Canons had never been seen by the Assembly, nor so much as communicated to the ears of the Privy Council; and he also candidly admits, that it was strange that the Book of Canons should have been published a whole year before the Liturgy, when several of these were principally for the punctual compliance with a service not yet known. “The Liturgy sent down,” says Kirkton, “was indeed a great deal nearer the Roman Missal than the English Service-Book was. I have seen the principal book corrected with Bishop Laud’s own hands, where in every place which he corrected, he brings the word as near the Missal as English can be to Latin.” It ordained, that the water for baptism should be consecrated. It contained, in the first prayer after the offering, a benediction for departed saints; several pas-

sages in the consecration prayer were the very words of the mass in favour of the real bodily presence; and instead of a table there was to be an altar.

Dr. Aiton has given more at length than we have anywhere seen it the account of the proceedings at Edinburgh on the 23d of July, 1637, when the Liturgy was introduced. This is the critical event of the history. The attempt had been expected, and Presbyterians gathered in Edinburgh from every side. Henderson, it is affirmed by Episcopalians, came to the city on the part of his brethren in Fife. He there met Mr. David Dickson, who had been sent on the same errand by the clergy of the west country, and also Mr. Andrew Cant. These three waited on Lord Balmerino and Sir Thomas Hope, who approved of their plans. A meeting was afterwards held in the house of Nicholas Balfour, in the Cowgate, and the prominent persons were the three men just named. There were present among others the Earls of Rothes, Cassilis, Glencairn, and Traquair, Lords Lindsay, Loudon, and Balmerino. How far the subsequent riots were planned or favoured by these noblemen and ministers, it is perhaps impossible now to determine. Bishop Burnet says in his memoirs, that "after all inquiry was made it did not appear that any above the meaner sort were accessory to the tumult." Other accounts involve Henderson more deeply. Every Presbyterian is acquainted with the general occurrences of that Easter Sunday. The great church of St. Giles was not only filled, but surrounded. To give solemnity to the service, the two archbishops, several other bishops, the chancellor, the members of the Privy Council, the lords of Session, and the magistrates of Edinburgh, resorted, in great pomp, to the church. A mob of women occupied moveable seats at the lower end of the church. The cry was "They are going to say mass!" "Sorrow, sorrow for this doleful day!" Some of the gentlemen cried that "Baal was in the Church." For a time the fury was directed against the Dean, whose courage was failing him so far that he needed the bishop's encouragement, when an old herb-woman named Janet Geddes, with violent exclamations, threw at his head the stool on which she had been sitting. This was the signal for a volley of missiles which were hurled at the Dean. Some tried to pull him down, and many rushed out with doleful lamentations. Bishop Lindsay mounted the pulpit, in order to preach, but narrowly escaped a dangerous stroke. The authorities succeeded in turning out the chief rioters,

but they remained without, assaulting the doors and windows, and crying "A Pape! a Pape! pull him down!" The bishop and other clergymen were exposed to great personal danger in going home.

It is not known that Henderson had any favour towards this violent proceeding. The two-edged sword of the mob, Dr. Aiton well remarks, when once unsheathed, hews down not only foes and friends, but destroys the very arm that wields it. In justice to Scotland, it must be added, that although sixty thousand Covenanters were several times collected by their leaders, they seem in no instance to have gone beyond the bounds prescribed to them, and, after having quietly effected their purpose, they uniformly dispersed quietly. This outrage of the rabble was disowned by all parties. The Council went into an investigation, of which the result was that they silenced Ramsay and Rollock for not using the Service Book: and for a month there was no ringing of bells or public worship or sacred meeting in Edinburgh.

When an order came from the archbishops, enjoining on every minister to buy two copies of the Book, it was formally announced in the Presbytery of St. Andrews, upon which Henderson, Hamilton of Newburn, and Bruce of Kingsbarns, refused to comply. They declared that they would buy and read, but not publicly use the service. The gauntlet was thus thrown down, and the Bishops singled out Henderson as their victim. A messenger-at-arms accordingly charged him to buy and use the Service Book within fifteen days, under pain of being imprisoned as a rebel. Hitherto Episcopacy had been opposed chiefly by tumult, but now an able man stood forth, and in the course of a few days the cause was espoused by some of every class in the community.

Henderson and his two brethren protested against the charge in due form, and repaired to Edinburgh for further advice. Henderson and Dickson were the two leaders, and they were joined by four ministers of the greatest note—Cant, Rollock, Ramsay, and Murray. On the 23d of August, Henderson, and others, petitioned the Lords of the Privy Council to suspend the charge against them. They were unwilling to give a promise until they should have read the book. They declared the Church of Scotland to be as independent as the kingdom itself, and under the direction of her own pastors and Parliament, which, by the act

of 1567 and 1633, were esteemed the necessary guardians of its liberties; that the obtruded Service Book was warranted neither by the authority of the General Assembly, nor by that of any act of Parliament; that the ceremonies enjoined in it were far different from the form of worship and reformation of Presbyterianism, and similar, in many particulars, to the mummeries of the Church of Rome. In other supplications it was stated, that the reformed churches in Austria and Spain had been formerly shaken to their centre by similar divisions, and that the King's coronation-oath bound him not to introduce religious alterations into Scotland, unless with the consent of all concerned.

The supplication was answered by the bishop of Ross; but before the suspension came to be discussed in court, several noblemen, by letters, and many gentlemen personally, solicited the Lords of the Privy Council, "to hold the yoke of the black book from off the necks of the ministers," and declared that if this course were not adopted the people would raise a general outcry against his majesty's government. At the council board, the Earl of Southesk recommended the supplication, but was answered by the archbishop of St. Andrews, who said, that "as there were only a few ministers, and two or three Fyfe gentlemen in town, there needed be no steer anent the affair." The bishops, who thought there was no limit to their power, were mortified and astonished when the Council so interpreted the mandates as to suspend the order for reading the Liturgy till new instructions should be received from London; and that the ring-leaders in the riots should be set at liberty. Henderson, Dickson, and other supplicating ministers, expressed their gratitude in a public manner to the Council, for the fair statement of their case, which they had sent to the King. They placed their trust in the favour of God, and vowed not to relax in prayer until the Church was restored; they pointed out the causes they had for fasting, humiliation, and encouragement of their hopes; they framed plans for their after proceedings, and retained the best legal advice which the kingdom could afford; they kept Sir Thomas Hope as their secret oracle, and arranged that Balmerino and Henderson should, when occasion required, slip quietly behind the screen for instructions. And, that the brethren throughout the kingdom might concur more universally with them, Rollock, Murray, Cant, and Ramsay, were sent to different parts of the country. But Charles insisted upon ab-

solite conformity, and the consequence was that all the kingdom, to use Clarendon's words, flocked to Edinburgh, as if in a general cause which concerned their salvation. In the course of three days, upwards of twenty noblemen, many barons, a hundred ministers, provosts from seventy parishes, with many of the gentry from the principal burghs, commissioners from seventy parishes, with many of the gentry from the counties of Fife, Stirling, Lothian, Ayr, and Lanark, came to town. The citizens of Edinburgh were almost to a man opposed to Episcopacy, and they judged that if it were introduced among them, it would not stop until it had overspread the land. The magistrates presented a petition and remonstrance, which they expected to be sent to the King. But being disappointed in this, and finding the prelates more and more bent on the sternest measures, they combined in renewed opposition, and another more formidable tumult took place. At one of their meetings, Henderson, now "the bold and able leader of his party," moved, that whereas they had formerly petitioned to be freed from the Service Book, they might now complain of the bishops as underminers of religion, and crave justice to be done upon them." Some were not ready for this, but the deference which all were disposed to pay to Henderson's opinion, and the facetious and acute speeches which the earls of Rothes and Loudon made in support of it, silenced opposition. Loudon, Balmerino, Henderson, and Dickson, were appointed to make out a complaint against the bishops, as the authors of all the troubles the Service Book had occasioned, and to present it to the petitioners on the next morning. The result was a complaint which, within twenty-four hours, was signed by thirty-eight noblemen, and gentlemen without number, the signatures amounting at once to many hundreds.

It was during these troubles that those Presbyterian committees of vigilance were erected, which, from their sitting in four different rooms, or at four several tables of the Parliament House, came to be so well known by the name of the Tables. A member from each of these constituted a Table of last resort, which at length consisted in practice of Rothes, Loudon and Balmerino, and the two leading clergymen, namely Henderson and Dickson. Here most of the plans of the party were matured, and here, as Dr. Aiton observes, we bid adieu to the crowd as supplicants. It is the process of all revolutions. The submission and promptness with which the masses retired to the country indicated a

spirit more appalling than the uproar of the two riots. "Like the piston in the steam-engine, these Tables gave the command of the whole Presbyterian machinery. Through them, by the moving of their hand, a few nobles and the 'two archbishops,' while sitting at Edinburgh, could at once stop or set in motion every wheel, however huge or remote, and send their commands to the inhabitants of the most distant glen with the rapidity of a skyrocket." To refute calumnies, the supplicants published a Historical Information in defence of their acts.

When it was discovered by the Presbyterians that the Service Book was to be sanctioned by a special royal Proclamation, and when this was published amidst circumstances of the most exciting kind, (for the details of which the graphic account of our author may be recommended as greatly superior to any other) Henderson suggested, that Presbyterians of all ranks, parties, and sentiments, whether they belonged to the Church or State, should make a common concession of minor differences, agree to certain definite opinions, and adopt a National Covenant framed upon irrevocable principles.*

By this mutual compromise, all differences among churchmen were to be at an end. By this overt act, every Presbyterian in the land, old and young, east and west, became equally committed, and, above all, by this proposed bond of union, every effort of the courtiers to break up the general confederacy was defeated. Had Henderson, says Dr. Aiton, been of the same impetuous temper as Melville, the Presbyterians would have been divided into separate detachments, which the Episcopalians would have cut up in succession. Although Henderson, at this stage, was but the general of one of the brigades which in their secret councils was an antagonist force, yet the leaders of the other divisions admired his extraordinary talents and amiable dispositions so much, that his unwearied endeavours to conceal minor differences among the brethren, were uniformly triumphant.

On the 23d and 24th of February, the Presbyterians, now wonderfully increased in numbers, met at Edinburgh, in defiance of the proclamation. It was agreed, on the motion of Loudon, that none should have dealings with any of the Lords of Privy Council without the knowledge and consent

* Baillie MSS. Vol. I. p. 84, says, "The Noblemen, with Mr. Alexander Henderson, and Mr. D. D. resolve the renewing of the old Covenant for Religion. Little inkling of this is given out at first to the rest."

of the whole Church. It was recommended, with great affection, by Henderson, that all their hearts should be strongly united one to another in a bond of union and communion. He said, that as they were now declared outlaws and rebels by their Sovereign, they should join in covenant. He recommended that all, in a conjunct motion, nobility, gentry, burghesses, ministry, and people, should now renew the covenant which was subscribed by their forefathers in the year 1550, with such additions as the corruptions of the times required. The proposal not only was adopted by the meeting, but sounded like an alarm-bell throughout the whole kingdom. Henderson and Archibald Johnston of Warriston, were appointed to frame a Confession of Faith, and Rothes, Loudon and Balmerino, were requested to revise it. The people were prepared for what was to be done by public exercises of religion. The Covenant consisted of three parts: first, the old Covenant, word for word; secondly, the Acts of Parliament which were in favour of their Confession against Popery; thirdly, the special application to their present circumstances. Under this last head, they swore to continue in the profession and obedience of Presbytery, and to "resist all contrary errors, to the uttermost of their power, all the days of their lives; to defend the person and authority of the King and of one another, so that whatever should be done to the least of them, for that cause, should be taken as done to all in general, and to every one of them in particular; and not to suffer themselves to be divided or withdrawn from their union, but to make known, that it might be timeously obviated, every attempt should be made." The third part, beginning 'In obedience to the commandment of God,' was written by Henderson. In vindication of the measure, Dr. Aiton reminds us of the maxim of James VI. who was surely no democrat, namely, that *pro aris et focis et patre patriæ*, the whole body of the commonwealth might rise as a solid mass. Accordingly, Charles's Advocate for Scotland did not hesitate to give his legal opinion, that this Covenant contained nothing inconsistent with the duty of subjects to their Sovereign.

Wednesday, the 28th day of February, 1638, was memorable in the history of Henderson and of the Church. There were sixty thousand Presbyterians in Edinburgh. In the afternoon, the venerable church of the Greyfriars, and the large open space around it were filled with Presbyterians from every quarter of Scotland. At two o'clock, Rothes,

Loudon, Henderson, Dickson, and Johnston, (the great jurist of the church,) arrived, with a copy of the Covenant, ready for signature. Henderson constituted the meeting by prayer, "verrie powerfullie and pertinentie" to the purpose in hand. Loudon, then, in an impressive speech, stated the occasion of this meeting. The Covenant was next read by Johnston, "out of a fair parchment, about an elne squair." When the reading was finished, there was a silence like death. Rothes broke it by challenging objections. "Feu comes, and these feu proposed but feu doubts, which were soon resolved." About four o'clock, the venerable Earl of Sutherland came forward, and put the first name to the memorable document. Sir Andrew Murray, minister of Ebdy, in Fife, was the second. After going round the church, it was taken out to be signed by the crowd in the church-yard. Here it was spread on a flat grave-stone to be read and subscribed by as many as could get near it. Many, in addition to their names, wrote, *till death*; and some even opened a vein and subscribed with their blood. "The immense sheet in a short time became so crowded with names, within and without, that there was no room for a single additional signature. Even the margin was scrawled over; and as the document filled up, the subscribers seem to have been limited to the initial letters of their names. Zeal in the cause of Christ, and courage for the liberties of Scotland, warmed every heart. Joy was mingled with the expression of some, and the voice of shouting arose from a few. But by far the greater portion were deeply impressed with very different feelings. Most of them, of all sorts, wept bitterly for their defection from the Lord. And in testimony of his sincerity, every one confirmed his subscription by a solemn oath. With groans, and tears streaming down their faces, they all lifted up their right hands at once. When this awful appeal was made to the Searcher of Hearts, at the day of judgment, so great was the fear of again breaking the Covenant, that thousands of arms which had never trembled even when drawing the sword on the eve of battle, were now loosened at every joint. After the oath, the people were powerfully enjoined to begin their personal reformation. At the conclusion, every body seemed to feel that a great measure of the divine presence had accompanied the solemnities of the day, and with their hearts much comforted, and strengthened for every duty, the enormous crowd retired about nine o'clock at night. Well, indeed, might Henderson boast, in

his reply to the Aberdeen doctors, 'that this was the day of the Lord's power, wherein we saw his people most willingly offer themselves in multitudes like the dew-drops of the morning—this was indeed the great day of Israel, wherein the arm of the Lord was revealed—the day of the Redeemer's strength, on which the princes of the people assembled to swear allegiance to the King of kings.' ”

During the same week, the Covenant was sent to every shire, bailliery, and parish. In the country, it was every where received as a sacred oracle. Some men, says Henderson, of no small note, offered their subscription, and were refused, till time should prove that they joined from love to the cause, and not from the fear of men. “I was present,” says Livingston, “at Lanark, and several other parishes, when, on the Sabbath, after the forenoon's sermon, the Covenant was read and sworn, and I may truly say, that in all my life time, excepting at the Kirk of Shotts, I never saw such motions from the Spirit of God. All the people generally and most willingly concurred. I have seen more than a thousand persons all at once lifting up their hands, and the tears falling down from their eyes; so that through the whole land, excepting the professed Papists, and some few who adhered to the prelates, people universally entered into the Covenant of God.”

When Hamilton made his public entry into Edinburgh, the Covenanters, to the number of sixty thousand, according to Burnet, stood in ranks along the sea-side for several miles;—of women, says Baillie, there was a world. “At the eastern extremity of the links, on the side of a rising ground, as the most impressive part of the show, there stood six or seven hundred ministers with their cloaks and bands. Mr. William Livingston, minister of Lanark, the strongest in voice, and austerest in countenance, and most venerable of them all, supported by Henderson, Ramsay, and Blackall, was here appointed to make Hamilton a short address.” The object of the Covenanters in this gathering seems to have been to display their strength. On Sunday, Henderson preached; but in such a manner that he was censured for undue prudence, and he scourged the bishops in his next discourse. Rothes, Montrose, Loudon and Henderson were deputed to treat with the Commissioner, and particularly to demand the calling of a free General Assembly, and a Parliament. He “assured them that they should have a General Assembly and Parliament, providing they would not irritate his Majesty

by their carriage and behaviour in this business, and that in his Majesty's own time," and that they should have their answer in a royal proclamation. To meet this, the others engaged themselves to furnish a protest. Here Hamilton and Henderson came into warm conflict, and were scarcely appeased by the facetious intervention of Rothes. In all the conferences the Commissioner demanded the rescinding of the Covenant. Henderson published "Reasons against the rendering of our sworn Covenant and subscribed Confession of Faith," and the party stood to their ground.

In all these proceedings Hamilton carried himself with consummate art, and used every finesse to gain time, and enjoy the instructions of the King. In a letter dated 11th June, 1638, Charles declares to the marquess, that nothing but force would bring the Scots to obedience, and commands him to disband the multitude and gain the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling. "I give you leave," the King writes, "to flatter them with what hopes you please, so you engage not me against my grounds, and in particular that you consent neither to the calling of Parliament nor General Assembly till the Covenant be given up, your chief end being now to save time, that they may not commit public follies until I be ready to suppress them."

Henderson, Dickson, and Cant, not long after this, were sent with some others to Aberdeen, to gain over those who still refused to sign the Covenant. The mission was of great service to the Presbyterian cause; and the northern confederacy was greatly weakened by the loss of numbers of people, including about fifty ministers, who signed the Covenant. It is true that a paper war ensued between the Aberdeen doctors, under Forbes's guidance, and the Covenanters, who were led by Henderson. The controversy was fierce, and occupies more than a hundred pages of small print. The Episcopalians claimed the victory, and Hamilton seized the occasion, on his return from a visit southward, to make a personal attack on Henderson, Dickson and Cant, who were styled, from this mission, the three Apostles of the Covenant. Dickson and Cant indeed gave little aid in this dispute, "and for Henderson, although" says Guthrie, "it cannot be denied that he was a learned man, yet, without wronging him, it may be thought that he could not well hold against all those doctors, who, for their eminence and learning, were famous, not only at home but also throughout other countries abroad."

In the proceedings which resulted in the memorable Assembly of 1638, and of which we shall not repeat the history we gave two years ago,* Henderson was the acknowledged clerical leader. Of that Assembly he was the moderator, and pronounced the sentence of deposition and excommunication against the bishops.

Dr. Aiton has devoted a chapter to the origin of the War in Scotland. "The important question, Who began the war in Scotland? never has been, and probably never will be settled to the satisfaction of all parties. In spite of any thing which can be said on either side, it will be answered by many on both, not exactly in accordance with the facts, but in compliance with religious prepossessions. The war arose from so many remote circumstances, and these were so insensibly gradual in their progress, that it is difficult even to give a date to its origin, and, of course, far more so to make it apparent who were the aggressors. One class of Episcopalians may point with triumph to the uproar in St. Giles's Church as an incident which would justify an appeal to arms; while others, according to the moderation of their views, may date the determination to go to war, from the erection of the Tables, the meeting at Stirling, or the signing of the Covenant and levying of taxes on the part of the Covenanters. On the other hand, their opponents, approving of these bold measures, will refer it to the King's intolerance in enforcing Episcopacy on an independant church, or to his declaration that the Presbyterians were traitors, or to the whole tenor of his policy. But it is obvious that the question cannot be satisfactorily answered merely by trying to ascertain who committed the first overt act of hostility. In such cases, that is often an accidental isolated circumstance, depending in a great measure on the discretion, or the want of it, in inferior agents. The general question may have already, therefore, been answered by the reader. If not, the particular point now to be attended to is, when did the war become inevitable? In a war between a king and his own subjects, it is worthless to argue, merely when it might be justifiable to commence bloodshed. Hostilities are never excusable until it becomes utterly impossible to avoid them. Notwithstanding, then, all that has been said and done, peace might probably have been maintained up to the time that Hamilton left the Assembly. But however anxious both

* See Princeton Review for 1838, pp. 362—396.

parties may have been to avoid open hostilities, it appears obvious that they were inevitable from this period. Without pretending to vindicate the Covenanters in all their measures, the odium of beginning the war may be traced to this step, which was in effect a rash and irrevocable declaration of hostilities. Whether Hamilton or his superiors at Court deserve the reproach need not be ascertained. But if the war of words, although already tedious, had been maintained by him with more sincerity, the discharge of heavier metal in the field might have been spared. At any rate, however hopeless the task might appear, Hamilton's policy was to have remained at his post in the Glasgow Assembly; to have consented to what he saw he could not control; and in lieu of this acquiescence, to have urged his opponents to modify some of the propositions most opposed to his master's supremacy. In this way, although he could not have obtained all, he might have got something; partly to save his majesty's honour in covering the retreat. But by turning his back to the battle, he enabled the Covenanters to carry every thing in triumph. It is a remarkable feature in this case, which should be constantly kept in view in answering the great question, Who began the war in Scotland, that even up to this period, the effects of an honest policy on the part of the court, had never once been ascertained. If Hamilton even, in the Glasgow Assembly, could have made it appear that he and his master were at last to be trusted, and if, in addition, he had acted on a more liberal policy, he might, by a dexterous distribution of firmness and of conciliation, at least have brought over to his interest such a minority as would have kept his opponents more in check. The court ought to have known, that although the Covenanters were really anxious to preserve loyalty as a plant indigenous to their soil, yet they esteemed Presbyterianism as the green pasture from which alone they could procure spiritual food. As the chief earthly shepherd of the flock, and sovereign of a free and loyal people, Charles should have made a merit of necessity, by conceding at once the great point at issue, or if he felt it to be a matter of conscience to enforce Episcopacy on the Scots, it ought to have been Prelacy in its purity, and not alloyed with an Arminianism, ostentatiously decked out in the scarlet rags of Popery. From the moment the Scots conceived that the object of the court was to bring them first to yield to the Lutherans and next

to the Papists, they became determined to stand where they were at all hazards."

The Covenanters left no means of conciliation untried, even while they were arming themselves. They dispersed a printed declaration throughout England, in which they took God to witness that religion was the only subject, conscience the only motive, and reformation the aim of all their designs. Henderson, by authority, framed a remonstrance of the nobles, &c, vindicating them and their proceedings from the crimes laid to their charge in the proclamations. "So deep was their conviction as to the absolute submission to princes, that Lord Cassilis, Baillie, and even Henderson, for a time, seem almost to have felt that, if the King should play all the pranks of a Nero, they might no more resist his deeds than the poorest slave at Constantinople might oppose the tyranny of the Grand Turk." On further investigation, Henderson came to the conclusion that a defensive war was lawful, and drew up a paper in defence of the position, which, though read from many pulpits, was never printed. It may be observed that in this hesitation of Henderson and some of the leaders, the clergy in general did not share.

"Whatever difficulty," says Dr. Aiton, "there may be in answering the question, Who began the war? there can be no doubt that the Presbyterians were most anxious to bring it to a bloodless conclusion." Henderson was one of six commissioners named by the Covenanters to conclude a treaty with the King. At one meeting, when he happened to be absent, Charles missed him, and at the next declared himself much delighted with Henderson's reasoning. On another occasion, the King seemed to be in an especial degree attached to Henderson and Loudon. The result was a pacification, comprising these concessions, among others, that the Perth Articles be dispensed with—that bishops should, from time to time, be answerable to the General Assembly—that a new Assembly should be immediately held at Edinburgh, and thereafter annually—and that a Parliament should be convened to ratify whatever might be concluded in such Assembly. The matter was so managed that neither party was committed as to the Glasgow Assembly. Yet, after all, the feeling on both sides remained very much what it had been before the conference.

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh on Monday, the 12th of August. Henderson preached from Acts, ch. v., on the advice of Gamaliel, and exhorted the Lord Commis-

sioner, Traquair, and the members, to vie with one another in gratitude, zeal and moderation. Traquair, following his instructions, insisted that Henderson should again be moderator. This, in the opinion of some, savoured too much of the "constant moderator"—by which episcopacy had been lately introduced—and by none was it more opposed than by the nominee himself. Mr. Dickson was chosen moderator, and Henderson sat by his side as his coadjutor. The great measures proposed were, 1st, to condemn corruptions which had long troubled the church; 2d, To discuss the report of censures which had been inflicted on Episcopalian ministers, for errors, immoralities, and contempt of the authority of the Church; 3d, To condemn the Large Declaration, or manifesto of the King; and 4th, To renew the National Covenant. As it regards the first point, it was a delicate question how to accomplish the reform without any mention of the Glasgow Assembly, which the King had forbidden. This was effected by a recital, as if *de novo*, of all the abuses, and a re-enactment of the Glasgow Acts. They decided therefore in favour of the rejection of the liturgy, canons and High Commission—the Perth Articles—episcopal jurisdiction and civil power of clergymen;—also that the six Assemblies of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618 should be accounted void of authority—that Assemblies should be held at least once a year, and that Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods should be constituted according to the order of the Kirk. Traquair gave in his formal written consent and subscribed the premises as his Majesty's Commissioner. "These gratifying results filled every heart with joy. Henderson, and especially the old ministers, who had felt the energy of the Holy Spirit accompanying ordinances in former times, and had contrasted with it the awful defecation which afterwards ensued, could not express their sense of the present happy change under the countenance of the King, otherwise than by tears. The moderator stirred up all to be grateful to God, and affectionate to the King." This calm was interrupted however by a debate on the motion to approve the deposition of certain Episcopal delinquent ministers by the Glasgow Assembly. Though they wished to avoid any offence to the King by a formal approbation, they declared that *while they breathed* they would not pass from that Assembly. Eighteen ministers were also deposed, but it was recommended to Synods that those who were deposed merely for Episcopacy should, on evidence of submission to

the constitution of the Church, be reinstated. The National Covenant of 1550, with the bond of the last year appended, was next renewed, under the sanction of the royal authority. And the Privy Council, at the request of the Assembly, conferred on it the force of an act to oblige all his Majesty's subjects to subscribe it. This was the Assembly which passed the first Barrier Act of the Scottish Kirk, providing that no innovation causing disturbance should be proposed till the motion be first approved of at home, after due deliberation in the several Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk-sessions. After the Revolution, it is worthy of note, the Act of the Assembly was remodelled, and confined only to Presbyteries.

At the Assembly at Aberdeen, of July 1640,—just two centuries ago—Henderson was not present, being engaged in important business at Edinburgh. The great subject which occupied this court was an act against a sect which was arising similar to the English Independents. The part which Henderson took against these sectaries has been stigmatized as savouring of persecuting bigotry; and he was constrained to make a publication on the subject, which, though esteemed a healing overture by both parties, led to very unpleasant altercations, and gratified the foes of the Covenant, as a threatening of internal disruption.

In 1641, the office of Rector was revived in the University of Edinburgh, and was conferred upon Henderson, and, by the efforts of himself and other leading men, that institution was placed upon a solid basis. These men were great promoters of literature, and it should never be forgotten that to them Scotland is indebted for her admirable system of parochial schools. But the rumour of approaching war left little time for the care of letters. The English army was now advancing to the border, and in July the Scotch, to the number of twenty-two thousand foot, and three hundred horse, marched towards the Tweed. Each regiment was attended by one of the most eminent clergymen of its district. Of the number were Henderson, Blair, Livingston, Baillie, Cant, and Gillespie, and these were invested with presbyterial authority, that they might perform every part of the ministerial function. By means of pulpit addresses at Edinburgh such enthusiasm was excited, that the matrons of the city sent webs of coarse linen sufficient to make tents for almost the whole army, and the men advanced on security, 240,000 pounds Scots.

When a conference between the two parties was, soon

afterwards, agreed upon, Henderson was one of the commissioners who went to London: the others were Rothes, Loudon, Dunfermline, and Archibald Johnston. They were accompanied by Blair, Baillie, and Gillespie, as the most eminent preachers of that day. Clarendon says of Henderson's preaching in London, that the public curiosity was so great, that those who had the happiness to get into the church in the morning kept their seats till the afternoon's exercise was finished. Both Clarendon and Hume, however, ridicule the style of the performances. "Certainly," says Dr. Aiton, "Clarendon forgot the native elegance of his style, and Hume preferred sarcasm to truth, when they speak of the barbarism and ignorance of Henderson, Baillie, and Gillespie. All of them were profound scholars; and Baillie's acquaintance with the languages of modern Europe was most extensive. Besides being able to write Latin with the purity of the Augustan age, he was master of twelve or thirteen different languages."

During the few months which Henderson spent, on this occasion, at London, besides the unwearied attention which he must have given every day to the many important matters in hand—and among the great events of the period it may be remembered that the trials of Strafford and Laud were now in progress—he found time to write a treatise on Church Discipline, and to publish reasons for removing diocesan bishops out of the Church. He had several private conferences with the King, and others in company with Rothes and Loudon, in all of which he grew in favour with Charles. This favour he well nigh lost by means of a short and hasty paper vindicating the Commission from the charge of diminished zeal against prelacy and the "two incendiaries."

The General Assembly had been appointed to meet at St. Andrews, July 20th, 1641; but adjourned to Edinburgh, chiefly, Dr. Aiton declares, in hope of there meeting with Henderson. In this they were gratified, and he was again chosen moderator, notwithstanding his own earnest protestations. "Had there been nothing else to render this Assembly conspicuous in the pages of our Church History, or to secure respect for the memory of its moderator, the magnificent idea, which he here was the first to suggest, of framing our Confession of Faith, our Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and our Directory or Platform of Church Government and Worship, would have been enough to immortalize the period

in which he lived. By these Henderson has erected a monument in almost every heart in Scotland. For two hundred years, these have withstood the attacks of infidelity, and even many severe wounds from the hands of their friends; yet is the Confession of Faith, unshaken as the rock of ages, still found, on a Sabbath afternoon, in the hands of our peasantry, dear to them almost as their Bible, and the Catechism carried morning after morning, by our sons and our daughters, to the parish school, (the plan of which Henderson devised,) that their contents may enlighten the mind and spiritualize the nature of the rising generation. Next to the introduction of Christianity itself into Scotland, and the translation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, the framing of the Confession of our Faith and of the Catechisms has conferred the greatest boon on every Christian in our country. It was on Wednesday, the 28th of July, that Henderson first suggested to the Assembly the propriety of drawing up a Confession of Faith, a Catechism, and a Directory for all the parts of the public worship. His first intention seems to have been to frame the system in such a way as to make it agreeable to the worshippers on both sides of the Tweed. But there is no compromise of Presbyterianism in it from beginning to end, so as to support the Episcopalian principles of the English. On proposing the matter, he expressed himself as being anxious to escape the toil of compiling these important works; but the burden was laid on his back, with liberty to retire from his parochial duties whenever he pleased, and to call to his assistance the abilities and diligence of any of his brethren."

The Parliament of 1641 was attended by the King, who arrived at Holyrood House on Saturday evening, 14th August. On the Sabbath, he went to the Abbey Church in the forenoon, and heard Henderson preach. In the afternoon, his Majesty did not return to church, but exercised himself at the play called golf, which was the only recreation the place afforded. For this profanation of holy time he was reprimanded by Henderson, and condescended to forbear in future. He made Henderson his private chaplain, and requested him to name the preachers who should afterwards officiate. He accordingly stood behind the King in church, where Charles attended punctually forenoon and afternoon. On Tuesdays, in the morning and evening before supper, he heard his chaplain pray, read a chapter of the Bible, and sing a psalm. The King seemed anxious to join in all the

Presbyterian devotions, which were sometimes extremely protracted. On every occasion, Henderson was careful to pay his Majesty all the dignified and delicate respect which loyalty could inspire; insomuch that some, even of his old friends, suspected his motives, and thought him too lenient towards the King. It is well known that, at this Parliament, Charles ratified all the acts, including those of the Glasgow Assembly, by which Presbyterianism was established: he even swore the Covenant. He departed, as was said, a contented King from a contented people, for Presbytery seemed fully established.

The only fact connected with the Assembly of 1642, which we shall mention, is, that Henderson found himself under the necessity of vindicating himself from charges of undue moderation, and from the suspicion of playing the courtier. It should seem that he was successful in these defences. It has sometimes been asked how, since men who have deserved well of their age have so often been requited with ingratitude, there should nevertheless be in every period a constant succession of such men. "Our profession," said Henderson on another occasion, "can answer both in a word, that by a special providence, such as have deserved well come short of their rewards from men, that they may learn, in serving of men, to serve God, and by faith and hope to expect their reward from himself; and that, notwithstanding all the ingratitude of the world, the Lord giveth generous spirits to his servants, and stirreth them up, by his Spirit, (the motions whereof they neither can nor will resist,) to do valiantly in his cause."

When the Parliament of England intimated their resolution to call an Assembly of Divines to concert measures for bringing about unity of religion, and uniformity of Church government in both Kingdoms, they required some ministers from the Kirk of Scotland, to be present by the 5th of November, 1643. Notwithstanding the extreme reluctance of Henderson, who pleaded former services and frailty of constitution, he was put on the list, "on account of his great honesty, which had ever remained untainted, and his unparalleled abilities to serve the Church and State." The commissioners were Henderson, Douglas, Gillespie, Rutherford and Baillie, ministers, and Cassilis, Maitland, and Johnston of Warriston, elders.

By this time the bloody war between Charles and the Parliament was in full progress. One of the principal events

in the life of Henderson was his embassy, in company with Loudon, to the King at Oxford, their object being to procure the calling of Parliament and the establishment of a lasting peace. For a time, the King refused them an audience; then he wished to see their instructions, and next he questioned their power to treat. Henderson was allowed no private conferences as on former occasions. Although the King tried to protect his person from affronts, yet when he walked the streets he was reviled from the windows, and some of his friends hinted to him that he was in danger of being stabbed or poisoned. The doctors of the university treated him with consideration, and invited him to compare notes with them on the subject of episcopacy. This he declined; and Clarendon adds, insolently; if so, certainly belying his natural disposition, and uniform conduct to his opponents. The discussions with the King were long, and sometimes angry: they ended without satisfaction to either party. While the Covenanters were awaiting the Convention of Estates in Edinburgh, Henderson was despatched to treat with the tender conscience of Montrose, who for a period of two or three years had been blowing hot and cold in regard to the Scottish cause. The result was as little successful as the preceding one: indeed it seems to have precipitated his flight into the King's arms. From this time till he laid his head on the block, the history of Montrose, says Dr. Aiton, gives us a detail of efforts in behalf of his royal master more brilliant and romantic, perhaps, than any in the pages of Plutarch.

Henderson was again moderator of the Assembly, when it met August 2d, 1643, at Edinburgh. It was remarkable for the visit of commissioners from England, namely, Sir Harry Vane the younger, one of the gravest and ablest of their nation, Stephen Marshall, a Presbyterian, and Philip Nye, an Independent, from the Assembly of Divines. The declarations from both houses of Parliament, and a letter from the English Assembly by Dr. Twisse, and a third signed by about seventy divines, were all read openly in the Assembly. Henderson, after a long speech, asked the opinion of the leading members of the house by name, whether the general answer was that the business should be committed to him and his assessors. At this critical moment, Guthry was the only man amongst them who saw the matter in its true light. He said "that the Assembly of Divines in their letter, and the Parliament in their declaration, were

both clear and particular concerning the privative part, namely, that they should extirpate Episcopacy root and branch. But as to the positive part, what they meant to bring in, they huddled it up in many ambiguous general terms. So that whether it would be Presbytery, or Independency, or any thing else, God only knew, and no man could pronounce infallibly. Therefore, that so long as the English stood, and would come no farther, he saw not how this Church, which held Presbyterian government to be *juris divini*, could take them by the hand." He made a motion in accordance with this speech, but, strange to say, no one seconded it, and the matter fell into the hands of Henderson and his assessors. The committees, after anxious consultation with the principal nobility, concluded that it was the duty of the Scots to enter into a confederacy with the Parliament. In the conferences, the English argued for a civil League, and the Scots for a religious Covenant. The English tried to keep a door open for Independency, while the Scots were equally eager to keep it shut. At length Henderson was appointed to frame a draught of the well-known Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms. This document was passed both by the Assembly and the Convention of Estates, on the 17th of August, 1643. It bound all who subscribed it, to preserve the reformed religion of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, and also the reformation of religion in England and Ireland, *according to the word of God, and the example of the best reformed churches*; to abolish Popery and Prelacy; to defend the King's person, and to preserve the rights of Parliament and the liberties of the kingdom.

As the Covenanters could not march their army till the Covenant was ratified on the part of the English, the English commissioners, with Maitland, Henderson, and Gillespie, embarked for London on the 30th of August. "On their arrival at the metropolis, there was great joy on all hands, and a hearty welcome, in the Westminster Assembly, from Twisse, Case, and Hoile, who all made set speeches on the occasion. The Commissioners found that an express had arrived in London from Edinburgh, with the Covenant, which had already undergone some slight modification. Henderson disapproved of any alterations, however trivial, having been made before he was heard in defence of his own measure. On this account, a conference was held in Pym's house, when the Scottish Commissioners were convinced

that the alterations were for the better. Some of the English divines stated, that, as they had sworn to obey the bishops in all things lawful, they durst not abjure Episcopacy absolute; they, therefore, proposed to qualify the expression by inserting the words, 'all anti-christian, tyrannical, or independent Prelacy;' but it was carried against Dr. Featly's motion. Many declared for primitive Episcopacy, or for one stated President, with his Presbyters to govern every church, and the abjuration of archbishops, bishops, deans, chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending upon them. When Calman read the Covenant before the House of Lords, he declared that by Prelacy all sorts of Episcopacy was not intended, but only the forms therein described. The term League was added in the title by Vane, who was the Talleyrand of Cromwell. On the 25th of September, both Houses of Parliament, with the Assembly of Divines and Scottish Commissioners, met in St. Margaret's Church. First, Mr. White, one of the Assembly, prayed for an hour, to prepare them for taking the Covenant; then, Mr. Nye, in a longer sermon, stated, that the Covenant was warranted by Scripture precedents and examples since the creation, and that it would be of benefit to the church. Henderson made a long speech, which was published at the time, stating what the Scots had done, and the good they had received by such covenants; and then he showed the prevalence of evil counsels about the King, and the resolutions of the States of Scotland to assist the Parliament of England. Then the Covenant was read, article by article, in the pulpit, from a parchment roll, all persons present standing uncovered, with their right hand lifted up in worship, and the solemnity of an oath. After this, two hundred and twenty-two members of Parliament signed, as did also the divines of the Assembly and the Scottish Commissioners. Dr. Gauge concluded the whole by a prayer for a blessing upon the Covenant. In the same way, it was tendered next Lord's day to all the congregations within the bills of mortality and throughout the kingdom, to the Elector Palatine and English abroad, and also to the army of the Parliament at home."

On the 20th of November, Henderson and the other commissioners, petitioned both houses of Parliament, that a warrant might be granted them for admission to the Westminster Assembly. This warrant was sent to Dr. Twisse, while Henderson and his brethren waited at the door for an answer. Three of the members came out to introduce them.

Dr. Twisse, in a long speech, gave them a hearty welcome, and assigned them a seat at his right hand, in the front of the members of Parliament deputed to attend. Henderson and the rest were struck, as well they might be, with the solemnity of the scene, the like of which, Baillie says, they had never beheld. When the united learning, ability, and piety, of this Assembly is considered, and when the caution with which every point was discussed is considered, we cease to wonder at the excellence of our formularies. In this great work the Scottish commissioners bore an active part. The experience which Henderson had gained at the helm of public affairs, and which all had obtained in the popular Assemblies of the Church, gave them great advantages. So much deference was paid to their judgment that Henderson made the first draught of the Directory for Worship, and of the other pieces: and "in the whole Assembly, no one supported them to better purpose, nor with better acceptance of all the hearers than the young, but learned, acute, and distinguished ornament of our Church, Gillespie."

As commissioners to consult for uniformity, Henderson and his brethren refused to treat, except through a regularly constituted committee of Lords, Commons, and Divines. On the questions at issue between the Independents and the Presbyterians, the Scottish divines had to fight their way against a great array of talent. On the question of ruling elders, they disputed for ten days. All were willing to admit elders as a matter of prudence, but the Presbyterians did not rest until it was agreed that besides ministers of the word there should be, according to the Scriptures, ordained elders and perpetual deacons.

In regard to the Directory for Worship, the two parties entered into a tacit compromise, and as the Independents were permitted to qualify some things in the preface, it passed with great unanimity. The next summer, Parliament called in all Common Prayer Books, forbidding their use even in private families, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, and ordered all ministers to read the Book of Directory openly, in their respective churches before morning service. Thus the Church of England was rendered, by public authority, Presbyterian.

At the memorable Uxbridge Treaty, Henderson was the champion for the Covenant. He was ably opposed by Dr. Stewart, clerk of the King's closet, who had been appointed to defend the hierarchy. The result was that Charles refused

to abolish Episcopacy, establish the Directory, confirm the Assembly of Divines, or take the Covenant: while he offered to suspend penalties, take off the yoke of compulsory rites, limit the power of bishops, enforce residence, and even call a national Synod. Both parties kept their ground and separated with mutual crimination.

To return to the Assembly of Divines, the question of church courts in regular subordination was decided in favour of the Presbyterians by a vast majority. But though the Independents were defeated, the Erastian party took an appeal to the Parliament. Here, to the inexpressible mortification of Henderson and his friends, it was carried in the negative; and the modified proposition of the Erastians, that Presbytery was merely lawful, and agreeable to the word of God, was substituted for the decision of the Assembly, which declared it to be *jure divino*. The Scottish Commissioners then called up the citizens of London to petition the Parliament that the Presbyterian Discipline might be established as that of Jesus Christ. But Cromwell was well aware that the time was now come for an open rupture, and the petition was dismissed with contempt. Their subsequent efforts were equally unsuccessful. The triumphant advances of the parliamentary army, and the misery of the Scots, emboldened Cromwell to produce, in the Committee of both kingdoms letters from unknown hands, calumniating the Covenanters and their Commissioners in London.

As the Independents gained power, the discussions became fiercer between the Parliament and the Assembly. When the question as to "the power of the Keys," came to be discussed, the Presbyterians claimed, of divine right, the power to retain or remit sin, and to proceed by admonition, suspension, and excommunication. The Independents claimed the same power for the brotherhood of every particular congregation; and the Erastians were for laying the communion open, and referring all ecclesiastical offenders to the civil magistrate. The Presbyterians carried the question in the Assembly, but they were thwarted in Parliament, for all ecclesiastical determinations were subjected to the civil power. This was the occasion of great offence to the Scottish Commissioners. Yet with this exception all the fundamental observances of Presbyterianism were established in England. The measure however pleased no party; for even the Scots were dissatisfied that Presbyteries were deprived of power over their communicants.

The English Presbyterians identified themselves with the Scottish Commissioners, and refused to give effect to the ordinance. Here arose a most disagreeable series of altercations between the Assembly and the Parliament, touching Toleration and the allied points; into the history of this we cannot for a moment think of going. Henderson and his brethren are found ranged upon the side of intolerance. They prevailed on the Scots Parliament to demand of the English Houses their civil sanction to the establishment recommended by the Assembly of Divines, and not to admit the toleration of sects, as being contrary to the solemn League and Covenant. Clarendon and Whitelock both state that the King tried to turn these divisions to his own advantage, and made great offers of compensation to two leading Independent ministers if they would oppose the Covenant uniformity intended to be imposed on England by the Scots.

During Henderson's absence from Scotland, matters were badly managed. In the Scottish Assemblies and Parliament, there were so much murmuring and jealousy as to what was going on in London, that it was actually proposed to supersede the commissioners there. The latter sent regular accounts of their proceedings, but seldom heard from home either on public or private affairs. At last they resolved to return to Scotland in October 1645, but the ministers of London sent twenty of their number to entreat that Henderson might remain, which was granted.

It will be remembered by the student of history, that after the fatal campaign of 1645, when Charles had fled to the Scottish camp, there were hopes entertained by this misguided monarch that the Covenanters would mediate between him and the Parliament; and that persons were sent to treat with him, in order to bring him over to Presbyterianism. "As Charles had more confidence in Henderson than in any one of the party, and as Henderson's qualifications were exactly fitted to the delicate work in hand, an express command was laid upon him, unanimously by Church and State, to resort to the Scottish camp for this purpose." He arrived at Newcastle on the 15th of May, 1646, and the conference proceeded. The papers which passed between the King and Henderson are given at length by Dr. Aiton. But unfortunately for Charles, Henderson's constitution gave way at this critical point, under the crushing mental anxiety and bodily fatigue which he had for years endured in the public service. If he had lived, says our biographer, the Covenanters would

have kept by their first mild declaration, that they neither would nor could compel the King to return to the parliament. About the middle of June, 1645, he had been confined several days with a calculous attack. He and Rutherford went down to the Epsom waters, but so long as any thing was to be done in London his presence was indispensable. Anxiety of mind, while with the King at Newcastle, greatly added to his bodily infirmities. "We know well," Baillie writes to him, "the weight that lies on your heart. I fear this be the fountain of your disease." On the 7th, the same writer says to Spang, that "Mr. Henderson is dying most of heartbreak at Newcastle." The rapid progress of his complicated diseases forced him to break off all controversy with the King, as well as all contention with Cromwell. He went to Leith by sea, in a still more languishing condition, and thence proceeded to Edinburgh, where he soon afterwards breathed his last, on the 19th of August, 1646, being about sixty-three years of age.

It has been pretended that Henderson died of remorse for the part he had taken in revolutionary measures,—that he became reconciled to the royal party,—that he uttered a death-bed recantation; and these impostures have become part of history. It is enough to say, that after careful investigation, the whole Church, on the 7th of August, 1648, condemned the pretended recantation as being forged, scandalous, and false.

We have traced the life of Henderson from its early seclusion to its close amidst the troubles of an eminently turbulent period. His own reflections on it are striking. "When" says he, "from my sense of myself and my own thoughts and ways, I begin to remember how men who love to live obscurely and in the shadow, are brought forth to light, to the view and talking of the world; how men that love quietness are made to stir and to have a hand in public business; how men that love soliloquies and contemplations are brought upon debates and controversies; and generally, how men are brought to act the things which they never determined nor so much as dreamed of before: the words of the Prophet Jeremiah come to my remembrance, 'O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.' Let no man think himself master of his own actions or ways:—'When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldst; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and

another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldst not.' ”

“Henderson,” says his biographer, “never was married. By his testament, registered in the Edinburgh Commissary Court, and confirmed 9th November, 1646, he appears to have died in the possession of considerable wealth. He appointed George Henderson, a brother’s son, who had attended him during the latter years of his life, as his principal executor and heir. He also mortified a house, garden, and croft, and two acres of light land, about half a mile north-west of the village of Leuchars, and four pounds ten shillings and sixpence sterling, to those holding the office of school-master. He also bequeathed the sum of two thousand merks for the maintenance of a school in the town of Lithrie, in the parish of Creich. He left legacies to several brothers and sisters and their families.

“Henderson, by his latter will, ordained his executor ‘to deliver to his dear acquaintance, Mr. John Duncan, at Culross, and Mr. William Dalgleische, minister at Cramond, all the manuscripts and papers quhilk are in my study, and that belong to me any where else; and efter they have received them, to destroy or preserve and keep them as they shall judge convenient for their awine privat or the public good.’ Excepting a host of fugitive pamphlets, printed speeches, and sermons, hastily composed amidst a multiplicity of public avocations, which in the bulk have ceased to be interesting, Henderson has left no written works to testify his talents and worth to posterity. But so long as the purity of our Presbyterian establishment remains—as often as the General Assembly of our church is permitted to convene—while the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, larger and shorter, hold a place, in our estimation, second to the Scriptures alone—and till the history of the revolution during the reign of Charles I. is forgotten,—the memory of ALEXANDER HENDERSON will be respected, and every Presbyterian patriot in Scotland will continue grateful for the SECOND REFORMATION of our Church, which Henderson was so instrumental in effecting.”

We have read the copious narrative of Dr. Aiton with unusual interest, and are indebted to it not only for the facts, but, whenever it suited our purpose, for the language. To any but a Presbyterian the book would seem prolix: to ourselves it is only too short. We abstain from comment, and leave this fragment of our annals to the meditations of the pious reader.