

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 2.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

Commentar ueber die Genesis von FRANZ DELITZSCH. Dritte durchaus umgearbeitete Ausgabe. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke. 1860; pp. 648, 8vo.

Silent leges inter arma. In a sense quite different is this true, from that in which the words were pronounced by the Roman orator in his defence of Milo. He affirmed it of the observance of laws, and not of the principles which are their basis. Literature and science, the quiet studies of the scholar, and the profound researches of the philosopher and jurist, are unheeded amid the din of war. When the halcyon days of peace return, it may again be said, *Cedunt arma togæ*, and the sword will be beaten into the plough-share once more, and the spear into the pruning-hook. But when there is on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the waves and the sea roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth, it requires an absorption in study, like that of Archimedes at the capture of Syracuse, to enable one to hold on his way in the ordinary pursuits of the scholar. Halls of learning are deserted of

VOL. XV., NO. II.—21

ARTICLE IV.

The Puritans: or The Church, Court, and Parliament of England, during the reigns of Edward the Sixth and Queen Elizabeth. By SAMUEL HOPKINS. In three volumes. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1859.

Since its first appearance, Neal's History of the Puritans has been accepted as the standard work on that subject; nor is it likely to be very soon superseded. The author seems to have been peculiarly qualified for the task to which, with filial piety akin to that of Old Mortality, he devoted the best energies of his nature and the best years of his life. An Independent minister, of unfeigned piety, of orthodox sentiments, of highly respectable talents and attainments, with a profound veneration for Puritan institutions, ideas, and character, with some peculiar personal facilities in the possession of important papers relating to the men and times to be treated of, and in perfect sympathy with the freedom and glory of his country, he was unquestionably well fitted for his important undertaking. His style is uniformly clear, unaffected, and manly. It can not, of course, be compared, for a moment, with the style of our great classic historians; in vigor, in vivacity, in pungency, or in narrative tact, with that of Hume; in variety, in grace, in pictorial art, and in graphic force, with that of Macaulay; in pomp and magnificence with that of Gibbon, the procession of whose stately sentences is measured and majestic as was that of those Roman legions he so delighted to honor; but it is a style, nevertheless, which we can always read with satisfaction.

Of the author of the portly and ponderous volumes before us, we know absolutely nothing, save what may be easily inferred from the work itself. We were, therefore, wholly unprejudiced, of course, and we took up the work

with high hope; but we laid it down with disgust, not unmixed with indignation. It may be proper to say that only two of the three volumes announced have reached us. What could possibly have induced the author to write so long and laborious a work on such a subject, we can not divine. He evidently has no proper understanding of the Puritan character; and, of course, no intelligent sympathy with it. Judging from the materials before us, we should take him to be an unworthy scion of the old Puritan stock, ambitious and wrong-headed, without refinement of literary taste or thoroughness of literary culture, determined to do for himself what a good man, in the extremity of his anguish, imprecated on his enemy, as the sum and climax of every earthly evil—*write a book!* With this foregone conclusion arrived at, “in spite of nature and his stars,” he cast about for a subject, and, as John Bunyan says of himself, “as he walked through the wilderness of this world, lighted” on the unhappy Puritans.

The style of the work is peculiar and provoking, if not piquant or picturesque. The first volume opens like one of James’s novels—any one taken a trandom—but, instead of the inevitable “solitary horseman,” lo! we have a couple of horsemen, who turn out to be Edward the Sixth and the Lord Protector, Somerset. Then follows an “imaginary conversation,” not exactly in the style of the best of Walter Savage Landor’s.

Now, we protest, *in limine*, against writing history after this fashion. A novel may be a good thing in its place, and after its kind. If a man can and will write a novel, such as has been written, and probably will be written again, which shall “hold the mirror up to nature;” shall abound with pure sentiment, with elegant and exact description, with delicate touches of human nature; which shall cause the purest and profoundest waters of the fountain within us to gush forth, as if at “the touch of the enchanter’s wand;” the affections of this human heart, “by which

we live," to flow forth in streams of tenderness, of admiration, and of delight; if, in a word, he can and will give us a new Vicar of Wakefield, or a new Heart of Midlothian—we, for one, at least, shall be sincerely thankful. All we contend for is, that a novel is one thing, and a history is another; and that when a man professes to write a history, he should not so far confound things that differ as to give us a novel under the title of a history; or, as this unscrupulous writer has done, for bread give us a stone, and for a fish, a serpent. A woman may be a very good woman, and a man may be a very good man, still we do not like to see them resemble each other too closely in dress and demeanor; and must confess that we have always felt some sympathy with the honest Welshman, when he exclaimed, "I like not when a 'oman has a great peard: I spy a great peard under her muffler."

Never before, in the annals of literature, was there so little harmony between subject and style; the downright, determined, straight-forward, and energetic character of the men to be portrayed, and the tricky, gaudy, jaunty, affectedly picturesque and really burlesque manner in which they are presented. Even their worst enemies must admit of the Puritans that, whatever their faults, whatever their short-comings, whatever their errors of taste, of opinion, of principle, or of policy, they were not light, trifling, finical, but plain, serious, resolute, earnest, and able men.

The spirit of the book we hesitate not to characterize as grossly and offensively irreligious. What would those grave and godly divines, Cartwright and Travers, Baxter and Owen, have thought of a writer who could so lightly profane the awful name of the Most High, as does this irreverent scribbler on the 267th page of volume 1: "Good God! what a question;" or, on only the third page after, 269th, "By Jesu! sith thou dost provoke me;" and, "Jesu! saith she," etc., page 297; "Odds! my life, sir!" page 37, volume 1; etc., etc.

We have transcribed these profane expressions with ineffable disgust, and only because we supposed that without the exhibition of some specimens, at least, the grave charges alleged might be deemed undeserved or exaggerated. It must be perfectly evident that, whatever else he may be able to do, or fit to do, such a man is morally and intellectually incapable of writing the history of the Puritans.

The matter is not a whit better than the style and spirit of the work. It is astonishing how little these two large volumes tell us, not that was previously unknown, not that could not be readily found in a score of printed and by no means rare works—in Neal's History of the Puritans, in Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, in Jeremy Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, in the Zurich Letters, in Mather's Magnalia, in McCrie's Life of Knox, in the Life and Writings of Thomas Cartwright, taken in connexion with the Life and Writings of Richard Hooker—but that they tell us so little that was worth knowing at all, not to say that even this little might there be obtained upon much more moderate terms than wading through the deep morass of this "perilous stuff."

The ancient historians, Greek and Latin—Herodotus and Thucydides, Livy and Sallust—were comparatively disdainful of minute accuracy. They rarely condescend to refer to dates and authorities. *Ὡς λέγουσι*, seems to have been regarded by the father of history as a sufficient voucher for his most marvellous statements. The design of these writers was not so much to convey exact information, as to amuse or amaze the reader. They were more solicitous, therefore, to make a vivid and deep, than a just and adequate impression. Truth, indeed, they sought, they attained, they announced; but it was not so much literal historic verity, as ethical or dramatic truth, such truth as we find in Hamlet or in the Iliad. It was rather the truth of nature than the truth of history that they aimed at. A critical and philosophical history, like Grote's History of

Greece, or like Niebuhr's History of Rome, was unknown to the literature of classical antiquity. Hence it is a capital rule with the ancient historians, never to spoil a good story by fanatical scruples or ill-timed scepticism. Hence, they have not the slightest hesitation in putting speeches into the mouths of their historical characters, such as they deemed appropriate to the occasion. Still, Herodotus and Thucydides never ventured on the dramatic liberties in the formation and structure of their narratives, which the writer before us so boldly and blindly assumes.

We now take leave of Mr. Samuel Hopkins, not altogether pleased, it may be, but "more in sorrow than in anger;" a sorrow occasioned by the terrible remembrance of two mighty and mortal volumes, not to speak of the appalling announcement of a third of equal diameter and dulness, from which, thus far, we have been mercifully preserved by a benevolent blockade. No intelligent person can fail to have perceived, no evangelical believer can fail to have deplored, the indiscriminating censure and scorn with which the Puritans have been stigmatized of late, and in which every party, in any way or on any ground associated with them, justly or unjustly, intelligently or ignorantly, has been compelled to bear a part. It is to be feared that, under the hated name of Puritan, not only will good men be unjustly aspersed, but great principles fall into temporary discredit. So easy is it for those who dislike the polity and principles of the Presbyterian church, under cover of an assault on the Puritans, to assail the principles and disparage the men we hold most dear, that we think it not merely a service to the cause of historic truth, but a necessary act of self-defence, to enter on the inquiry, how far the Puritans are liable to the charge of being pragmatic disturbers of the peace of society, and fanatical despisers of the decency of divine worship; and what relation they rightfully bear to us, even if the charges brought against them be sustained and admitted.

In regard to this latter point, we wish it distinctly understood in the outset that we acknowledge no responsibility for the acts and principles of the Puritans, save so far as we were historically united in a common and heroic resistance to civil and ecclesiastical oppression under Queen Elizabeth and the Stuarts, and received in common certain great principles of divine revelation and canons of Scripture interpretation. That there is not merely misapprehension, but malice, in the tone now adopted when speaking of the Puritans, is evident from the fact that, in its bitterness and boldness, at least, it is quite recent. Even David Hume, sceptic and tory as he was, the champion of abuses and the apologist of tyranny, admits "that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect, whose principles appear so frivolous, and habits so ridiculous, that the English owe the whole freedom of their Constitution."* The testimony of the historian of the United States to the same point, is uniform and emphatic: "The Commons of England resolutely favored the sect which was their natural ally in the struggle against despotism."† From the time of the appearance of Macaulay's *Essay on Milton*, in the forty-fourth volume of the *Edinburgh Review*, to the appearance of Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, we had imagined that a change, favorable to the estimate of the Puritan cause and character, had been going on in the public mind of Europe and America.

Since the commencement of the revolution through which our country is now passing, however, we have been pained to see a disposition on the part of many conductors of the public press and leaders of public sentiment in the South, to identify the insane and inhuman crusade now instituted against the people of the Confederate States

* Hume's *History*, Vol. IV., p. 141, Harper's edition.

† Bancroft's *History of the United States*, Vol. I., p. 298, and throughout the work.

with the creed and character of the Puritans; and to represent the shameless atrocities of the present war as the legitimate fruits of their teaching and example: not remembering that we are contending this day for the very truths and doctrines, in the political sphere, at least, for which the Puritans contended in Great Britain, and for which they were content to suffer the forfeiture of their estates, the mutilation of their limbs, imprisonment, exile, and death; that the war now carried on against us is the act, not of a sect, or of a portion, but of a "*united North*;" that if a Spring, a Breckinridge, and a Hodge, are to be found among its Presbyterian abettors, a Cheever and a Beecher among the Independents; Doctor Tyng, Bishop Clarke, Bishop McIlvaine, Bishop Whittingham, and Bishop Smith, are found as representing the Prelatic element of Northern society, and Archbishop Hughes and his satellites the Romish; that while, as Sallust tells us, worthy ancestors are a reproach to degenerate descendants, no one has ever been so wild as to imagine that the unworthiness of a remote posterity was just ground of reproach to a noble ancestry; that the most excellent things are the basest and most pernicious, when they grow degenerate and corrupt. The prince of darkness was once the son of the Morning, and Adam, who, by his transgression, "brought death into the world, and all our woe," was, in his creation, the son of God. The choice seed which Jehovah planted in Canaan, the noble vine was not more unlike the degenerate plant of a strange vine, which it afterward became; the godly generation which took possession of the promised land, under the leadership of the heroic Joshua, was not more unlike succeeding generations, who offered incense to the queen of heaven, and bowed down to Baal and to Ashtaroth, than were the original settlers of New England, the followers of Bradford, of Winslow, of Winthrop, and of Endicott, to their corrupt and degenerate descendants of the present day.

Certain it is, that no body of men in the South have sustained the cause of Southern independence with more unanimity, intelligence, zeal, and efficiency, than the ministers and members of the Presbyterian church. In the war inaugurated against the rights, the interests, the institutions, and the very existence of Southern society, in defiance not merely of the dictates of humanity, but in violation of solemn constitutional compacts and the most sacred pledges of public faith, it is known that several of our best ministers have been in the fore-front of the hottest battle; that no more precious life-blood has bedewed the altar of our country's freedom than that which has streamed from the brave hearts of Presbyterian ministers on Southern soil. And while our church or our country shall survive; while freedom, or religion, or learning, the noblest gifts of nature, or the brightest instincts of personal or hereditary worth, shall be treasured among men, never will the name and the memory of the Rev. Dabney Carr Harrison be forgotten—a gentleman, a scholar, a Christian, a minister, a martyr to his conscientious conviction of public duty and uncalculating devotion to his country. Among the illustrious worthies of ancient story, among the deified heroes of ancient song, in the golden records of Grecian fame, in the glowing chronicles of mediæval knighthood, in the ranks of war, in the halls of learning, in the temples of religion, a nobler name is not registered than his, nor a nobler spirit mourned. And among the glorious leaders whom God has raised up for our country, in this the hour of her deadly peril, none can be found whose names shine with a purer lustre than those of Daniel H. Hill and Stonewall Jackson, who yet esteem it their brightest glory, not that they have received the grateful plaudits of their admiring countrymen, not that they have received the respectful recognition of the friends of freedom throughout the world; but that they have been counted

worthy to be members and officers of the Presbyterian church.

It is, however, a gross historical anachronism to identify or confound the Presbyterian church with the Puritans. Puritanism arose in the Church of England. That church, and that church alone, is responsible for its existence. Puritanism was the protest of the Christian conscience of the more evangelical portion of the Established Church, against the errors and abuses of popery, to which not the superior clergy of that church alone, but the princes as well, from Elizabeth to James the Second, clung with such perverse and pernicious tenacity. The Presbyterian church was in existence, not in decrepitude, not in decay, but in unimpaired vigor, in uncorrupted integrity, before Henry the Eighth had renounced the supremacy of the pope; before Calvin had given his matchless Institutes to the world, or Luther had translated the word of God into the German tongue; before the southern provinces of France had been stained with the blood of the martyred Albigeois; before the morning star of the Reformation had arisen on England; before Charlemagne had restored the empire of the West; before Constantine had enthroned and enslaved the Christian Church. In the times and writings of the apostles of our Lord, not merely were the inspired articles of our belief and teaching set forth, not merely were the great foundation stones laid, on which the grand and beautiful temple of our harmonious system reposes, but not less the principles on which her ecclesiastical government is constituted and administered.

How grateful should we be to the great benefactors of our race; the men who have rescued from contempt or forgetfulness noble and needful truths; have taught them, with courage and constancy, in spite of opposition, obloquy, and loss; those high and gifted souls who have thrown out, as from a sunny fountain, imperishable streams of truth and rays of light; who have bravely fought the grand in-

tellektual and spirital battles of our race; battles for freedom, civil and religious; for intellektual enfranchisement and the sacred heritage of a divinely inspired revelation; the Apostles, the Reformers, the Puritans! The fundamental principle of the Reformation, common and dear alike to Luther, to Calvin, to Zwingli, and to Knox, was the supreme authority of the word of the living God, in opposition to all the figments of the human imagination, and all the decrees of earthly councils. The earliest and purest of the Reformers of the Church of England, as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Jewel, adopted the same great principle; although, from the peculiar circumstances of the kingdom, they were not able to carry it out with perfect consistency to its legitimate results. That they considered the Reformation in England incomplete and unsatisfactory on this ground, and for this reason, we have their own recorded testimony.* Adopting this simple and fruitful principle of the paramount authority of the Scriptures, together with the related principle of the personal responsibility of each individual to God for his belief and practice, the Puritans were not merely in sympathy and correspondence with the continental Reformers, but were the heirs and expositors of their doctrinal system, and of their views in regard to the constitution and government of the Church, considered as a visible and organized body. With this grand and generative principle of the supreme authority of the word of God in the entire sphere of conscience and duty, their subordinate principles were logically inevitable, and collision with the government of their country a fatal necessity. The inquiry of the apostles, whether we should obey God rather than man, is at once a clue to their perplexities and a key to their extrication. In the time and person of Henry the Eighth, the supremacy of the pope was merely transferred to the sovereign. The great body of popish errors,

* See authorities cited in Note R, p. 78, of McCrie's *Life of Knox*.

of popish abuses, and of popish corruptions, was retained by the bloated and beastly wretch who rejoiced in the title of Defender of the Faith, and who illustrated his claim to the title by passing sentence of death on the Romanist who denied his supremacy, and the Protestant who denied transubstantiation. In the time of Edward the Sixth, the Reformation in England made wonderful progress in a short period; when, for the sins of the people, it was arrested by the premature death of their wise and saintly king. In the time of Mary, the best of the English clergy were compelled to take refuge in Germany and Switzerland, to avoid the wrath of a bloody woman, hounded on by a bigoted priesthood. It was in her reign, and at Frankfort, that the Puritans, as a party and under that name, first appear in history.* The great Puritan controversy, however, first raged in England under the imperious and intractable Elizabeth. Her own personal tastes and religious convictions were with the Church of Rome, but her interests attached her to the cause of the Reformation. Had she professed herself a Romanist, she must have proclaimed herself illegitimate, and forfeited her title to the throne. She was, then, a Protestant, not by conviction, but, as the grammarians say, *by position*. But toward every thing distinctive of Protestantism, toward every thing characteristic of Protestantism, she was inveterately averse. She did not believe in the marriage of the clergy. She did not favor the general preaching of the Gospel. She kept a crucifix, with wax candles burning before it, in her private chapel. She gloried in a gorgeous ceremonial, and abhorred a simple and scriptural worship. The same absurd taste for finery which induced her to bedizen her plain person in gaudy clothing and splendid jewelry, inclined her to the purple pomp of the Romish religion. Her antipathy to the Puritans was far more intense and vindictive than her dislike to the papists. The papists

* Neal's History, Vol. I., p. 68.

were incessantly plotting against her throne and her life. The Puritans acknowledged her title, and were loyal to her person. Poor Stubbs, brother-in-law of Cartwright, after his right hand had been cut off by order of the Queen, pulled off his hat with his left and cried out, "God save the Queen."* But she hated them for their religion, and for those principles of civil liberty with which it was identified. "They fasted and prayed for the Queen and the Church, though they were rebuked for it, and punished by civil and ecclesiastical officers. They were suspended and deprived of their ministry, and their livings sequestered to others; and many of them were committed to prison, where some were chained with *irons*, and continued in durance a long time. The bishops tendered to suspected persons the oath, *ex officio*, to answer all interrogatories put to them, though it were to accuse themselves, and when they obtained a confession, they proceeded upon it to punish them with all rigor, contrary to the laws of God and the land. The grounds of these troubles were not impiety, immorality, or want of learning, or diligence in their ministry; but their not being satisfied in the use of certain ceremonies and orders derived from the Church of Rome, and not being able to declare 'that every thing in the Book of Common Prayer was according to the word of God.'"[†]

It is an affecting illustration of the divine wisdom and love, that God should have so bound together His best gifts and the highest interests and treasures of the soul, that we can not part with one without imperilling all. We can not

* Memoir of Cartwright, p. 95.

† Memoir of Thomas Cartwright, pp. 329, 330. See Swift's account of brother Martin's method of dealing with the fringe on his coat, in the incomparable Tale of a Tub. "But when he had gone thus far, he demurred a while; he knew very well there yet remained a great deal more to be done; however, the first heat being over, he began to cool, and he resolved to proceed more moderately in the rest of the work." Brother Martin represents the Lutheran and English churches, as Peter the Romish, and Jack the Reformed.

contend for one without gaining the others also. Thus, while battling primarily for religious freedom, the Puritans secured civil and intellectual as well. In like manner, the champions of intellectual freedom, as Erasmus, undesignedly overthrew or undermined the towers and ramparts, not only of intellectual, but of religious despotism.

What the natural sun is to the material universe, the Scriptures are to the intellectual and spiritual. In contending for the rightful supremacy of the word of God, in opposition to the mandates of kings and the decrees of councils, the Puritans conferred a priceless boon on the human race. They affirmed a principle, they established a right, which, in its power and compass, is alike immeasurable and inestimable. It gives to God what properly belongs to Him, and thereby secures to Cæsar what rightfully pertains to him, by a higher than a human tenure, even a divine obligation. Thus the doctrine of civil obedience, within the appropriate sphere of the civil magistrate, is not, as rulers are apt to imagine, enfeebled by the prevalence of evangelical principles, but entrenched and fortified, making our obedience to government a part of our obedience to God. His Bible is the weapon of Heaven, which strikes with resistless force against every speculative error and every practical evil. It is not less the storehouse of Heaven, which contains and confers every good and every perfect gift.

The apostolic history, as recorded in the Acts, is the type of the history of the Church in post-apostolic times and in all after ages. It is commonly said that history repeats itself; but here there is not an occasional, an apparent, or a fortuitous repetition, or partial resemblance, but a prophetic rehearsal—an inspired *resumé*—on a small scale and narrow theatre, of what should afterwards be enacted through all the circling ages, and over all the boundless globe. The dispersion of the Church in the first great per-

secution,* by which the seeds of eternal life were sown broadcast throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, may be regarded as a typical illustration of the method by which, bringing good out of evil, and making the wrath of man to praise Him, God propagates the Gospel over countries and continents which otherwise it would never have reached, or only after a long lapse of years. It may, especially, be taken as an illustration of His adorable providence, in making the persecution of the Puritans in England the occasion of evangelizing other lands. It may seem a reverse, and not less marvellous process, for the attainment of the same general end, that the Marian persecution should have driven so many Protestants from England to the Continent, to receive more perfect instruction in the faith, with gracious reference to the needs of their own countrymen; as Apollos, though an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, was thankful to Aquila and Priscilla for expounding to him the way of God more perfectly.† Thus, in the case of the Puritan refugees, we see how divine providence prepared the way for the diffusion of the true religion in England and Scotland in its utmost purity. He who, by a simultaneous, or nearly simultaneous operation on the mind of the Roman centurion and the Hebrew apostle,‡ so wrought that the error of the one should be corrected, and the other be instructed in righteousness and have the seal of baptism, caused the English and Scottish Reformers to enjoy the tuition of Calvin and other wise and godly men, so that they might be qualified in their turn to teach others also.

Among the early English Reformers there was no diversity of sentiment in regard to doctrinal theology. Whitgift, "the Pope of Lambeth," and persecutor of Cartwright, was quite as Calvinistic as Calvin himself, as is manifest from the Lambeth Articles, drawn up under his super-

* Acts, 8 : 1.

† *Ibid.*, 18 : 25, 26.

‡ *Ib.*, ch. 10.

vision, and issued under his sanction. Until the time of Sancroft, the Calvinistic theology was universally embraced and acknowledged in England as the doctrine of the Established Church. The great practical point of divergence and controversy between the Puritans and their opponents, turned upon the power of the civil ruler—not to impose articles of belief, but to decree rites and ceremonies, to determine the government of the church, to evacuate its discipline, and to dictate its worship. This was what the Crown claimed, what the court-party conceded, and what the Puritans contended against. All the particular points of difference—as, that no one ought to be admitted to the ministry who was unable to preach; that those only who ministered the word ought to pray publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments; that popish ordinations were not valid; that only canonical Scripture ought to be read publicly in the church; that the public liturgy ought to be so framed that there might be no private praying or reading in the church, but that all the people should attend to the prayer of the ministers; that equal reverence was due to all canonical Scripture, and to all the names of God; that it was as lawful to sit at the Lord's table as to kneel or stand; that the sign of the cross in baptism was superstitious; that it was reasonable and proper that the parent should offer his own child to baptism, making confession of that faith in which he intended to educate it, without being obliged to answer in the child's name, "I will," "I believe," etc.; nor ought women or persons under age to be sponsors, etc.*—the determination of these and the like subordinate questions, depends ultimately on the great principle contended for by the Puritans, and before them by the primitive Reformers

* Memoir of Rev. Thomas Cartwright, by Rev. R. B. Brook. London: John Snow, 35 Paternoster Row. The propositions signalized above are, of course, alleged as specimens, not as an exhaustive summary of the points in dispute.

of the Continent and Great Britain, that in reforming the Church it was necessary to reduce all things to the apostolic institution. Travers, Cartwright, and after them Milton, adhered to this principle with not less tenacity, and enforced it with not less eloquence, than Calvin. "But I trust they for whom God hath reserved the honor of reforming His Church will easily perceive their adversaries' drift in thus calling for antiquity; they fear the plain field of the Scriptures, the chase is too hot; they seek the dark, the bushy, the tangled forest, they would imbosk; they feel themselves strook in the transparent streams of divine truth; they would plunge, and tumble, and think to lie hid in the foul weeds and muddy waters, where no plummet can reach the bottom."* This was the great principle, in the reception and affirmance of which all the various parties among the Puritans and Presbyterians agreed; and in the rejection and denial of which, all who were opposed to the Puritans were not less unanimous. To the discussion of this principle, we shall now briefly address ourselves.

In such a posture of parties it is a presumptive argument that those who contended for the authority of the Scriptures, conceived that their peculiar views were sustained by the sacred umpire whose decision they invoked. They would hardly have appealed so confidently to the Scriptures, if they had not felt assured that they could make that appeal with safety. Their opponents, on the other hand, not merely declined the authoritative arbitrament of the Scriptures in regard to the leading questions at issue, but expressly referred them to a different and inferior court of judicature. They advocated their adoption, on the ground of conformity to the will of the sovereign and the laws of the realm; on the ground of decency, propriety, and good taste; and grounded their use, so far

* Milton's noble treatise of Reformation in England.

as related to divine authority, not on the positive prescription, but simply on the silence of the Scriptures—a most “expressive” silence, surely, if it authorized the English hierarchy, culminating in the Archbishop of Canterbury and the headship of the reigning prince; the portentous additions to the public worship of God, wholly unknown to the New Testament; and the retention of rites and ceremonies which, if not in themselves idolatrous, were associated with idolatry; and confessedly retained, not in spite of such association, *but because of it*, and in order to propitiate and attract the adherents of Rome. That the opponents and oppressors of the Puritans did not pretend to rest their cause upon the positive authority of the word of God, express or implied, is evident, from the fact that they denied the necessity for such authority, and is conceded by their own apologists. Professor Keble, in his elaborate introduction to his edition of Hooker’s works, endeavors to account for the fact that the great writer, whose works he was about to offer to the public, had assumed ground so low, for claims and conclusions so grave and high. His special difficulty is not that Hooker made so little of the Bible argument, but that he made so little of what is denominated Church principles. He attributes the particular line of argument pursued by Hooker to the circumstance of his early education among the Puritans; to his unwillingness to insist upon claims offensive to the foreign Protestants; and to a desire to sustain the authority of the Queen’s government, and the consequent temptation to rest his plea on the obedience due to the appointment of the sovereign. The third book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* is taken up in controverting the proposition maintained by the Puritans, “that in Scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in no wise be altered.”

The doctrine held by Cranmer, by Whitgift, and by Hooker—a man incomparably superior to either in grasp

of mind, and in learning deep and various—was a modified Erastianism. It is, indeed, the only ground on which the church, of which he was the boast and bulwark, can be maintained; with the historical claims of popery on the one side, resting exclusively on prescription, on authority, and on tradition; and the Presbyterian church on the other, resting primarily on the eternal rock of the divine word, and sustained by the authentic testimony of the noblest confessors and witnesses for the truth of the divine word, from the apostolic age to the present day.

The Presbyterian church has ever held, in common with the Puritans of England, that ecclesiastical authority is not lordly, but ministerial; that nothing can be lawfully imposed upon the conscience for which the authority of God can not be alleged; that the draught of the constitution of the Church is given us in the Scriptures, not left to our own conjecture or choice; and that, therefore, it should be sought, not in the writings or practice of the Fathers, but in the infallible records of divine inspiration. And this draught they have held to be plainly, pointedly, and perfectly Presbyterian; the distinctive ecclesiastical offices and functions recognized in the Presbyterian church to be, not merely agreeable to the word of God, but ordained therein; to have not merely the divine permission, but the divine precept; that the principles which control our ecclesiastical organization and action are not merely “regulative, but constitutive,” to employ a distinction so clearly drawn and so impregably established in the pages of this journal;* and that the constitution of the Church should not positively

* See Article x., January, 1861, in which the lamented author, Dr. Thornwell, replies to the Princeton Review, Article vi., July, 1860. The death of this renowned and admirable man, just at this crisis, and in the fulness of his powers, his usefulness, and his fame, can be regarded in no other light than that of a national affliction, a disaster to every cause of God and every interest of man; but the blow falls with peculiar severity on our own branch of the Church, of which he was so distinguished an ornament and pillar.

contravene the scriptural order is not enough; but that not going beyond the Scripture or adding to it must be rigidly conformed and confined to it.

That this is not a novel interpretation or peculiar theory, as affirmed, but the true ancient and accepted doctrine of the Presbyterian church, inwrought into her standards, proclaimed by her most honored and trusted leaders, and familiar to her most intelligent and zealous members, a single citation, not from a Presbyterian, but from a Prelatist and a High Churchman, may suffice to show. "Whatever is not against the word of God is for it, thought the founders of the Church of England. Whatever is not in the word of God is a word of man, thought the founders of the Church of Scotland and Geneva. The one proposed to themselves to be reformers of the Latin church, that is, to bring it back to the form which it had during the first four centuries; the latter, to be the renovators of the Christian religion, as it was preached and instituted by the apostles and immediate followers of Christ, thereunto specially inspired. Where the premises are so different, who can wonder at the difference in the conclusions."*

It was contended by the Puritans that, in refusing subjection to the decrees enforced upon them, they were not resisting the authority of the Church, for that they were not imposed by any ecclesiastical or religious authority. They did not, indeed, recognize the authority of the Church itself, when clearly expressed, to bind any thing on the conscience which the Bible had not made binding; but they conceived that the things sought to be imposed on them could, by no definition of what constitutes a church, and by no construction of church authority, be reckoned ecclesiastical. It was, on their part, simply a resistance to civil tyranny seeking to obtrude itself within the ecclesiastical sphere. During several reigns the religion of England was made dependent

* Coleridge's Works, Vol. V., p. 149, Prof. Shedd's edition.

on the personal sentiments of the sovereign, and was actually conformed to them, so far as legal enactments and apparent acquiescence on the part of a majority of the English people might be regarded as constituting such conformity. Thus the noted Vicar of Bray was, during several reigns, a representative character. During the reigns of Henry the Eighth, of Edward the Sixth, of the bloody Mary, and of Elizabeth, it was held to be the duty of the people to conform to the religion of the crown. If this view of the duty of the subject to the sovereign, and the relation of religion to the state, were correct, religion itself, instead of being the worship of the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning—instead of being the loyal and loving subjection of the soul to Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—would be of all things the most variable, both in its essence and in its manifestations; in the doctrine which it affirmed; in the duties which it inculcated; and in the worship which it prescribed. The headship of the pope of Rome, unscriptural, absurd, injurious, and hateful though it be, is still less offensive to the conscience than the relation which the monarch of England seems, at this period, to have sustained to the religion of his country; for the successive popes might be expected to adhere to the same general system of religion; the supremacy of the pope would be willingly recognized by every sincere papist. But the worship of the king of England, during this period of national and religious change, was the headship of one who, whatever his creed, must enforce what was offensive to a large number of his subjects. If he were a papist, he must, in the name of the pope, persecute his Protestant subjects for non-conformity to papal edicts, and opposition to papal interests. If he were a Protestant, he must persecute the papists for the denial of his ecclesiastical authority, and the neglect of his religious requirements. So that the death of one king, and the succession of another, would be the signal for the revolution

of the faith and worship of a kingdom. So far as the constitution of the realm was concerned, Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, were equally heads of the Church, and defenders of the faith. One thing is unquestionable, that they were not heads of the same church, nor defenders of the same faith. The church which Edward loved, Mary detested. The faith which Edward defended, Mary destroyed. What more monstrous; what more unnatural among ancient fables—the mermaid, half woman and half fish; the centaur, half man and half horse—than to set up one who might be a papist, like Mary; or a Protestant, like Edward; or half infidel and half papist, like Charles the Second, but altogether profane and licentious; as head of the Church, supposed to be a congregation of faithful men? The atrocious crime of repudiating and resisting the authority of the sovereign, therefore, in matters pertaining to religion, is not peculiar to the Puritans, but common to them and to every other body of men in England, whoever might be the reigning sovereign, and whatever the religion of the state. To persecute men for refusing subjection to what is confessedly not of divine obligation, but of human appointment, and which the objects of persecution reject, not in defiance or contempt of human authority, but in supposed obedience to the will of God—what appalling wickedness! And for brethren to persecute brethren for such a consideration—how unspeakably offensive to God and discreditable to the Christian religion! Any one who will study the Acts of the Apostles, with the Puritan controversy in his mind, will be surprised to see what correspondence there is in the spirit, the tone, and even the terms, in which the blinded Jews reviled the apostles and primitive believers, and the prelatial charges, and the spirit which dictated them, against Cartwright, Snape, Proudlowe, and Travers. Our sense of the peculiar injustice of the bitter persecution to which these excellent men were subjected, is heightened when we reflect that the very doctrines for which they

suffered were the doctrines of the primitive English Reformers; of Cranmer, of Jewel, and of King Edward himself. They all believed that the reformation of religion in England had not gone far enough.

We are, of course, aware that it is possible to attribute a disproportionate importance to a particular structure of church government, as compared with the doctrinal system revealed in the Bible; and that the hierarchical excesses of prelacy are due, in no small measure, to this very error. But this is an extreme not more perilous than the opposite, of an Erastian indifference to all forms; and it is an extreme to which the Presbyterian church in this country seems by no means prone. There is, undoubtedly, an intimate connexion, historical and moral, between systems of doctrine and forms of government. Unless, therefore, doctrine itself be a thing which may change and bend with times and with the humors of men, we see not how church government can be safely regarded as a matter of slight importance. The mind is a unit, and a loose and latitudinarian habit will infect all its exercises, and can no more be confined to one department of speculation, especially in the sphere of commanded duties, than we can say to the unchartered winds that they shall blow only in one direction, or with a certain degree of violence.

“Uná Eurusque Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis
Africus, et vastos volvunt ad litora fluctus.”

As a matter of fact, we know, assuredly, that certain types of doctrine have been historically associated with certain principles of ecclesiastical regimen. The type of doctrine prevalent in the Romish obedience, as Palmer happily terms that corrupt communion, is as definite as notorious, and as characteristic as her hierarchical system. At certain times, but wholly without success, or with only very partial success, the attempt has been made to engraft an evangelical theology on the hierarchical system. But they

have been felt to be incongruous elements, and have refused to coalesce, like oil and water. The doctrine of Augustine, who has been honored as a saint, has always been felt to be alien to the spirit of popery, and allied to that of Protestantism. Of all the Fathers, he is known to have been the favorite of the Reformers, as he is of Protestant theologians now, on account of his vigorous assertion of the prerogatives of God and the doctrines of grace. In like manner, the Jansenists, who embraced and inculcated his system, have always been regarded as tintured with heresy. Pascal, Nicole, Arnauld, eminent for genius and piety, and withal devoted adherents of the Romish body, could not escape the ecclesiastical ban, because of the earnest sympathy and eloquent support which they gave the hated doctrines of Augustine. So in the Church of England, from the days of Archbishop Laud to the days of Dr. Pusey, that party which has receded farthest from the spirit and doctrine of the Reformation, and approached nearest to the Romish communion in its views concerning the constitution and authority of the Church, has evinced most sympathy with the doctrinal tenets of that apostate tyranny. The vessel is naturally, we may say divinely, adapted, in material and make, to the liquid which it is to contain. We may expect, therefore, that the golden cup of sorcery, which is to intoxicate the nations, shall be unlike to the cup of blessing, which shall present a healing draught from the pure river of the water of life. Our Lord himself has warned us against putting old wine in new bottles; how, then, can we safely commit the old wine of Gospel truth to new bottles of popish or prelatiçal device? We can not but look upon any departure from the scheme of government sketched in the Scriptures, therefore, or any unauthorized addition to it, with only less grief and dread than we should feel in a voluntary renunciation of the faith once delivered to the saints.

The plea on which papists and prelatists have rested their gratuitous additions to the offices and worship prescribed by the apostles, and prevalent in the churches which they planted, is a profane reflection on the wisdom and goodness of the Church's glorious Head. Forgetting that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God stronger than men, they would engraft their imaginary improvements on a pattern divinely given, and dishonor the chaste bride of Christ with the gaudy robes of the Babylonish harlot. The hands of man were never given to make a Church. The Sovereign Architect of heaven needs not the help of human builders, nor will He accept their unsolicited additions to His glorious work. As well might man seek by his gaudy fire-works to out-shine the lustre of the stars of heaven, or the beauty of the beaded grass, or to rear a temple which shall compete with "this majestic roof, fretted with golden fire," as by the devices of his fleshly mind to add to the efficiency of the ecclesiastical regimen revealed in the New Testament, or to the spiritual beauty of the worship it prescribes.

"Compared with this, how poor religion's pride,
 In all the pomp of method and of art.
 When men display to congregations wide
 Devotion's every grace except the heart!
 The power incensed, the pageant will desert,
 The pompous strain, the sacerdotal stole;
 But haply, in some cottage far apart
 May hear, well pleased, the language of the soul,
 And in His book of Life the inmates poor enroll."

If it had been our design to enter upon an extended vindication of the Puritans, it would have been proper to inquire why they should have been for so long a time the objects alike of courtly disdain and of popular odium; why the gay jesters, from the author of *Hudibras* to the author of *Pickwick*; why the grave historians, from *Clarendon* to *Hume*; should have made them the subjects of their scurrilous merriment and malignant sarcasm. We

should have brought, at least, into rapid review their majestic and precious contributions to scientific freedom and practical religion. We should have referred to that goodly and magnificent procession of divines and preachers who, teaching the apostolic doctrine in the apostolic spirit, are the genuine successors of the apostles, and the glory of the Christian Church—the elegant Bates, the heart-searching Flavel, the learned Owen, the penetrating Charnock, the philosophic Howe, and the saintly Baxter. We should not have forgotten their sympathy with the great cause of common school education in Europe and America. We should have spoken of the heroic fortitude with which they endured the utmost violence of persecuting rage, and the heroic energy with which they discharged the most perilous duties of pastors to the forsaken victims of a devouring pestilence. We should have pointed to the proud and peerless majesty of England, under the Puritan sway of Cromwell, when her force was felt, and her wrath was feared, throughout all Christendom. And we should have compared her then with the feebleness and degradation to which she so soon descended, under his most sacred Majesty, Charles the Second. We should have gratefully and reverently pointed to Cromwell's Latin secretary, the poet of Puritanism,

“Whose soul was like a star, and dwelt apart;”

a Puritan in training, a Puritan in temper, of Puritan associations, and of Puritan sympathies; the man who embodied in himself every thing pure, and serious, and high, and noble, in the traits of the Puritan nature, and the tendencies of the Puritan time. Let it never be forgotten, when wittlings and foplings sneer at Puritanism and the Puritans, that the greatest statesman who ever wielded the sceptre of empire in England was a Puritan leader; and that the purest and most sublime poet who has ever written in “the tome of our land's tongue,” was of Puritan growth, with soul deep and harmonious as those organ-tones he loved so well,

clear and capacious as the cloudless sky ; that this grandest of uninspired bards, this most Hebrew in spirit and in genius of all the sons of Gentile birth, was essentially and historically a Puritan.

“But we can now no more ; the parting sun
Beyond the earth’s green cape and verdant isles
Hesperian sets ; our signal to depart.”

ARTICLE V.

LIFE, CHARACTER, AND GENIUS OF THE LATE
REV. JAMES H. THORNWELL, D. D., LL. D.*

“We all of us reverence, and must ever reverence, great men :” for, adds Mr. Carlyle, in his terse, epigrammatic way, “the history of what man has accomplished in this world is at bottom the history of the great men who have worked here ;” “in every epoch, the great event, parent of all others, is it not the arrival of a thinker who teaches other men *his* way of thought, and spreads the shadow of his own likeness over sections of the history of the world ?” What remains have we of the hoary past, save a few monumental works, and a few names linked to those in eternal memory ? All beside is buried in the forgetfulness of history, from which there is no resurrection. And when this busy time of ours shall retreat before the coming age that crowds it back, how few that now write, and plot, and work, will flit

* The following article is a Discourse commemorating the life and labors of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, delivered in the Presbyterian church, Columbia, South Carolina, on the evening of September 17, 1862, at the request of the officers of the church, and in the presence of members of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary.