

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 4.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXII.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1872.

#### ORGANISATION.

This body held its sessions in Richmond, Va., beginning May 16th, at 11 a. m. Forty-eight ministers and fifty-four ruling elders were in attendance. Two more ministers and six more ruling elders would have made the Assembly completely full. The absentees were nearly all from very remote Presbyteries—one of these Presbyteries being in Brazil. Grace Street church, where the Assembly met, is a spacious and beautiful edifice, and was often filled with attentive and interested crowds of people gathered to witness the proceedings. Old Virginia hospitality was still itself, and was enjoyed as freely as afforded. The Moderator, Dr. Plumer, was assisted in the introductory services by Dr. Van Zandt, of the Reformed Church, a delegate; and by Dr. Porter, of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, not a delegate, but simply a casual visitor. The text of the opening discourse was from Isaiah liii. 11: "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." Dr. Armstrong nominated Dr. Welch, of Arkansas, for Moderator; Dr. Hendricks nominated Dr. Samuel R. Wilson; and Dr. Jacobs nominated Dr. Adger, but

VOL. XXIII., NO. 4.—1.

named, whose authority, if authority were admissible, would be equal to that of any who might be cited against them. The *scientism* of our day is a puny antagonist in comparison. An immense majority of the greatest of modern thinkers and observers have, in one way or another, conceded the validity of the law of causation, upon which the argument for Deity is founded. Those who question it, simply attempt to invalidate the principle of *all* investigation. For every deduction in science is *caused* by a perception of the relation of facts or premises. Why does science accumulate facts? Is it not with a view to produce conviction in the mind? And does not the unbeliever hope to see faith conquered by the force of facts? In all this the efficiency of causes is acknowledged. And the validity of this law being admitted on both sides of the controversy between truth and error, the defenders of the faith possess an advantage of incalculable power. Religion has no cause to tremble for its own safety, so long as the principles of all scientific truth are identical with those upon which her rational defence depends.



## ARTICLE V.

## ANNALS OF ENGLISH PRESBYTERY.

*Annals of English Presbytery, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* By THOMAS M'CRIE, D. D., LL.D., Emer. Professor of the English Presbyterian Church, London. Author of "Sketches of Scottish Church History," etc. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berner's Street. May, 1872.

Dr. M'Crie—*clarum et venerabile nomen*,—the honored son of an honored sire,—has made the Christian world his debtor by the timely publication of these interesting Annals. Though disclaiming any higher character for his work than that of popular sketches, the amount of valuable matter contained therein will secure for it a permanent place in ecclesiastical literature.

Without indulging in critical remarks upon the connection of England's glory and England's shame, with the honor and the dishonor done to Presbyterianism at different periods of her history, we shall, on this occasion, simply present copious extracts from this interesting volume for the entertainment of our readers.

*English Presbytery in the Primitive Church, A. D. 286-1000.*

“Few periods of our history are more obscure than that of the introduction of Christianity into Britain. . . . The theory that would ascribe to St. Paul the honor of being the pioneer of the gospel in Britain, though the most plausible, rests on no better historical grounds than the traditions which would assign it to Joseph of Arimathea, or to Pudens and Claudia mentioned in the Pauline Epistle. The story of King Lucius, who is said to have set up bishops and archbishops in place of the old Roman flamens and archflamens, is now generally abandoned as apocryphal. . . . We may fairly conclude that the knowledge of the Christian religion had reached England before the close of the second century; that it came, not from the Roman, but the Eastern Church, and probably through the medium of the disciples of St. John; and that the British Church sprung, not from a Latin, but from a Celtic origin. . . . A few glimpses of the ancient British Church shine feebly through the haze of legendary story; and, as usual, its first pages are marked by the blood of martyrdom. Of these early martyrs, the names of four have been preserved—Alban, a native of Verulam; Amphibalus, who suffered at Redburn, near St. Albans; and Aaron and Julius, natives of Caerleon, on the Usk, in Monmouthshire. . . . Some years later, we have evidence of the formation of a Christian Church, in the fact of three British bishops having attended the Council of Arles, summoned by Constantine in the year 314, viz., Eboreus, from the city of York; Restitutus, from the city of London; and Adelfius, from Caerleon, the latter being accompanied by a deacon. What kind of bishops these were, and how they were deputed to this Council, does not appear, and may be variously conjectured. . . . Certain it is that, at this period, the

power of the Pope was unknown; that the Council governed by the 'common consent' of its members; and that one of its canons enacts, that 'no person is to ordain bishops *alone*, but always with the concurrence of seven other bishops, or where that is impossible, of not fewer than three'—a rule less in accordance, it must be owned, with prelatie than it is with presbyterial usage, which requires the presence of three of its bishops, at least, as essential to the validity of its ordinations. . . . With regret, it must be owned that, among all the ecclesiastics of the ancient Britons, the only name which has descended to posterity is associated with heresy—that of Pelagius, the well known opponent of St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo. There is too strong evidence for believing that he was a Briton and a Welch monk. Pelagius appears to have been a good man, of amiable disposition, and a diligent, if not devout, student of Scripture. But he was misled, partly by a reaction from the Antinomian spirit of the age, and partly by an overweening love to metaphysics, into a denial of the original corruption of man's nature, and into assertions of the powers of the human will, which seemed to set aside the necessity of supernatural conversion. . . . Long before his advent, or that of Augustine, the Roman monk sent to convert the Saxons, Christianity had already become known, and loved, and practised in Ireland and Scotland. In point of fact, before the Saxons or any German tribes were heard of, or appeared on the stage of our history, Europe was mainly peopled by the Celtic race: though at the commencement of the Christian era they existed as distinct nationalities only in Ireland, in Scotland, and in Britain. The inhabitants of these three countries were of the same race, spoke essentially the same language, and held mutual intercourse. Their religion, too, partook of the same Celtic development, as appears in its freedom from Romanic elements down to the seventh century. To form a true idea, therefore, of the early British Church, it becomes necessary to advert to the Celtic Church, of which St. Patrick and St. Columba were the leading ornaments. The history of St. Patrick is wrapt in mystery. Doubts have even been thrown on the existence of such a person. He has been

confounded with a senior Patrick, and even with Palladius. But without entering into such discussions, and assuming that he is the person known by the 'Confession of St. Patrick,' which has been preserved, we learn that he was a native of Britain, and that his father was a deacon named Calpurnius, who again was the son of a presbyter. . . . Here also is proof that, at this early period, the celibacy of the clergy was unknown. From the same 'Confession' we learn that Patrick, when in the sixteenth year of his age, was carried off by pirates to Ireland, where he remained for six years in a state of servitude. The solitude of woods and mountains encouraged a naturally serious and meditative spirit, and he piously says: 'The Lord opened my unbelieving heart to a tardy remembrance of my transgressions, and to turn with my whole soul unto the Lord my God, who regarded my low estate, and pitied the ignorance of my youth.' Relieved from captivity, he appears to have visited France, and there been ordained to the office of a presbyter; after which, along with some companions, he returned to Ireland, burning with a holy zeal for the conversion of the natives, whom he had left in a state of the grossest ignorance and barbarism. There is not the slightest historical foundation for supposing that he ever visited Rome, or that he had any commission from the Pope. From the most authentic accounts, he must have obtained his religious education and his orders from a Gallic or Celtic origin. The simple and warm-hearted presbyter met with a success in his missionary labors, far more wonderful than all the ridiculous miracles that have been ascribed to him in legendary tales. He is said to have ordained no fewer than four hundred bishops or Christian teachers. He had found the country a moral desert, and he died in 465, leaving it filled with churches and monasteries. His Celtic converts, being kept far aloof from Romish influences by distance, lineage, and language, retained for many ages the simple rites and scriptural faith in which they had been instructed; and, unlike the great body of our modern Irish, would have doubtless held it foul scorn to trace their religion to a Latin or an Anglo Saxon pedigree. . . . Strangely enough, the dimness of these old annals begins to disperse when

we turn to the north of Scotland, and come in sight of St. Columba. This genuine saint was born, about the year 520, in Ireland, in the County of Donegal. His father was related by blood with the royal family of Ireland. His name was originally Crimthan, but was afterwards changed to Columba, or Columkill, 'the dove of the cell, or church.' If in early life he was addicted to war and feuds, the change of his name may indicate the entire transformation that must have passed over his nature; for in after life few had more of the gentle peacefulness of the dove. In personal appearance, Columba is said to have excelled in manly beauty and majestic stature; to have possessed a sweet and sonorous voice, with a cordial manner, and grave dignity of deportment. . . . It would be a great mistake to suppose that the institution at Iona resembled a Romish convent. It was rather a large Christian family, or school of the prophets. Though the members of the fraternity divided their time into certain portions, allotted to prayer, vigils, fasting, reading, transcribing, and manual labor, they had no monastic vows of poverty, celibacy, or obedience. Columba did not recommend lengthened fasts, any more than long faces, but would have the brethren to 'eat every day, that they might be able to do work and pray every day.' Under his superintendence the barren island was converted into a fruitful field, and a smiling orchard. Every hand was busy at work, every hour profitably spent. There was nothing morbid in his asceticism, no treating of the body as if it were in itself an evil, no merit or importance attached to bodily maceration. On the contrary, to preserve a healthy frame as the best vehicle of a sound mind, seems to have been his perpetual study; 'and whilst all his biographers conspire to attest the uniform hilarity that beamed upon his countenance, one of them tells us that from the grace of his person, the neatness of his dress, and the ruddiness of his cheeks, he always looked like a man nourished amid delicacies.' Being a collegiate establishment, intended to train men for the work of the ministry, the monastery of Iona does not seem to have admitted females; but that no vow of celibacy was imposed, is apparent from the undeniable fact, that many of those who issued from its walls entered the married

state. Equally mistaken would be the conclusion, that because Columba was a presbyter, the discipline of his house would resemble that of a Church constituted after the Presbyterian model. This would be to forget that the brethren at Iona were not ministers of an organised Church, but missionaries, whose object was to preach the gospel, and to plant the Church in an almost pagan land. On the other hand, those who are bent on making out an uninterrupted chain of prelatial orders, are greatly at a loss how to explain the undoubted fact that Columba, himself a presbyter, or perhaps only a deacon, ordained and presided over whole provinces of bishops. . . . The Culdees, as the disciples of Columba were called, though bound by no rule, like that of St. Benedict, continued for centuries after his death to inherit his life and spirit, and to maintain a pure gospel in the communities which they gathered around them both at home and abroad. It is only of late that traces of their labors have been discovered on the continent of Europe, where few expected to find them. In regard to ordination, indeed, the Romish Church held them to be very uncanonical. 'Kentigern, of Glasgow, was ordained,' says his biographer, 'after the ancient manner of the Britons and Scots, merely by anointing his head, with invocation of the Holy Spirit, the benediction, and the imposition of hands; for these islanders, living apart from the rest of the Christian world, were ignorant of the canons.' 'When the Apostolic See sent us to Britain,' says Laurentius, the successor of Augustine, 'we held both the Britons and the Scots, before we knew them, in great esteem for their sanctity, supposing that they lived according to the customs of the Church (of Rome); but after we became acquainted with them, we found the Scots no better than the Britons; for one of their bishops, Daganus, on coming to us, not only refused to communicate with us, but would not eat his victuals under the same roof in which we were entertained.' "

*English Presbytery in the Mediæval Church, 1000-1500.—John Wycliffe—The Lollards of England—Sir John Oldcastle.*—"Though less a theologian than a preacher, and aiming

chiefly at the reigning vices of the period, Wycliffe may be regarded as the John Baptist of the Reformation. Three hundred of his sermons have been preserved, from which it is easy to judge of his religious sentiments. These, considering the age in which he lived, are remarkably pure and scriptural. He protests against the popular superstitions of his time—image and saint worship, pilgrimages, penances, relics, and holy water. On the subject of purgatory he seems to have held something like an intermediate state, though opposed to all masses for the dead. On the eucharist, he is supposed by some to have leant towards the theory of Radbert, in the ninth century; but if we may judge from various expressions, he appears to have been in advance of Luther, teaching that ‘what we see on the altar is neither Christ nor any part of him, but only an effective sign of him.’ . . . The hierarchy of Rome, he held to be anti-Christian. And in regard to Church government, we learn that he maintained, that ‘in the time of the Apostle Paul, two orders of clergy were held sufficient for the Church, priests, and deacons; nor were there in the days of the Apostle any such distinctions as pope, patriarchs, and bishops.’ But the material service which Wycliffe rendered to the cause of truth, and that which entitles him to be regarded as ‘The Morning Star of the Reformation,’ was his English version of the Scriptures. Though taken from the Vulgate, this translation is remarkably true to the original, and in its antique Saxon most expressive. Transcribed in copies without number, the version had a wide circulation, and became an engine of amazing power. . . . The followers of Wycliffe were generally called Lollards—a term of doubtful origin, given them in contempt, and never assumed by themselves. . . . At this period when stage-plays were enacted, in which the most sacred scenes and persons were introduced in ridiculous costumes, the churchmen could stand almost any amount of literary burlesque. But the Lollards were men of solemn mien and serious conversation. They kept themselves aloof from the frivolities, and even from the ordinary traffic of society. They spent their time in prayer and in the reading of Holy Scripture. They claimed the right of judging for them-



selves, and would only obey the Church 'in as far as the Church was obedient, in work and word, to God and his law.' They went a step farther than this; for Rome they regarded as the 'antichrist' of Scripture, and they plainly condemned the sacrifice of the mass as idolatry. These poor people were not to be tolerated; and though at this time, without any Church organisation, and seldom meeting in great numbers, they became the victims of a systematic and bloody persecution. . . . From Henry IV., who, having usurped the crown, placed much dependence on the clergy for upholding his authority, they obtained, without the consent of Parliament, the bloody edict that 'the heretic, if he refused to abjure, or relapsed, *should be burned alive*, in a conspicuous place, for the terror of others.' This statute was immediately carried into effect; for the same year William Sawtre, priest of St. Osyth's, in London, was accused of heresy, for having denied the dogma of transubstantiation, and refusing to worship the cross; and he died in the flames at Smithfield, February 12, 1401, having thus the honor to be the first of the noble army of English martyrs. . . . Under the reign of Henry IV., and of his son Henry V., there lived a brave old knight, named Sir John Oldcastle, or as he was sometimes called, from his marriage, Lord Cobham. In early life, by his own confession, he had led a gay and careless life, like his companions, addicted to courtly pleasures and to deeds of blood. But the perusal of the Scriptures, and the writings of Wycliffe, had produced an entire change on his character; 'the valiant captain and hardy gentleman' of former days became a decided Christian. He still retained, however, in his new career, all the native qualities which marked the stalwart English knight of the fifteenth century. He made no secret of his sentiments, and in his place in Parliament openly avowed that 'there would be no peace in England till the authority of the Pope was sent over the sea,' and that the ill-gotten wealth of the Church should be confiscated to the use of the crown. At the same time, his castle of Cowling, near Rochester, afforded a ready asylum to the persecuted Lollards; and when any of their ministers officiated in the open air, Sir John would stand at their side, sword

in hand, to protect them against the insults of the friars. Thus, stung in two of their tenderest parts, their avarice and their superstition, the clergy never ceased to seek his ruin and disgrace. . . . On being brought before an assembly of bishops in the chapter-house of St. Paul's, Cobham produced a written confession of his faith. . . . When taunted with being a disciple of Wycliffe: 'As for that virtuous man,' he said, 'I shall only say, before God and man, that before I knew that despised doctrine of his, I never abstained from sin; but since that, it hath been otherwise, I trust, with me.' 'What say ye of the Pope?' asked one of his judges. 'As I said before,' returned Sir John, 'he and you together make up the great antichrist; he the head, you the body, and the friars the tail.' . . . The trial lasted two days, and the result was that Sir John Oldcastle—Lord Cobham—was condemned for 'a most pernicious and detestable heretic, committing him henceforth to the secular jurisdiction *to do him thereupon to death.*' . . . Either through his friends or the connivance of the governor, he succeeded in escaping from prison. . . . The Parliament which met at Leicester, April 1414, had encouraged the king to venture on the Church lands; but the churchmen, by a piece of exquisite policy, managed to procure an enactment by which, on pretence of condemning the Lollards for aiming at the alienation of Church property, it was ordained that all such offenders 'should first be hanged for treason against the king, and next burned for heresy against God.' By inadvertently passing this statute, Parliament at once tied up its own hand, and placed unlimited power into those of the clergy; and by this clever trick the Reformation may be said to have been retarded for a hundred and twenty years. The eventful history of Sir John Oldcastle now draws to a close. His unrelenting enemies succeeded in exempting him from the indemnity granted to the Lollards; and, in the year 1418, after wandering for four years among the mountains of Wales, the reward of a thousand merks set upon his head proved too strong for the avarice of Lord Powis, who discovered his retreat, and betrayed him to his pursuers. . . . No time was lost in carrying the iniquitous sentence into execution. He was drawn in a hurdle to St. Giles in

the Fields, where the farce of the insurrection was to have taken place, 'with his hands bound, but with a very cheerful countenance.' His sentence was, that he should be hung in chains, and consumed in the fire. From several authentic sources we learn that he behaved himself in a way becoming a brave knight and Christian martyr. He prayed for the forgiveness of his enemies; he exhorted the people to follow the laws of God written in the Scriptures, taking heed of those who were contrary to Christ in their life and conversation. Hung up by the middle in iron chains, the martyr of Christ may be said to have been literally broiled alive; and yet, in the midst of this barbaric torture, while the priests, who witnessed it with ill-concealed satisfaction, forbade the people to pray for him, the sufferer never lost his composure, but 'died praising the name of God while life lasted.' 'And thus,' says Bale, 'rested this valiant knight, Sir John Oldcastle, under the altar of God, which is Jesus Christ, among that godly company who, in the kingdom of patience, suffered great tribulation, he abiding with them, fulfilling the number of his elect. Amen.' . . . History has its compensations as well as its retributions. A special providence seems to watch over the names of those who have suffered in the cause of Christ and his truth. Their memory may lie under a cloud of calumny and reproach for ages; but when men least expect it, and sometimes from the most unexpected quarters, the cloud may be dispelled, and tardy justice is done to their real worth. So has it happened in regard to the memory of Sir John Oldcastle. Fuller informs us that his name was the make-sport in old plays. But even Fuller leaves him at last in the shade. Strangely enough, a witness was raised up to bear testimony in favor of the outraged memory of the martyr, in the person of one whom few will venture to suspect of partiality or partisanship—no less than our poet Shakspeare! At first, the dramatist had represented Sir John in the odious light of the old plays, as a braggart, a debauchee, and a poltroon. But having satisfied himself as to the real character of the true Sir John, he not only substituted for his name that of Sir John Falstaff, but in a play entitled 'The History of Good Lord

Cobham, he, or another under his eye, made an ample apology for his former mistake, pronouncing him 'A VALIANT MARTYR AND A VIRTUOUS PEER.'

*The Martyr-Bishops of England, 1500-1558.*—"Our claim to regard the martyr-bishops of England as our brethren, will not be disputed by those admirers of mediævalism who will hardly acknowledge them as representatives of the Church of England. But it is not upon minor points of Church order that we advance the claim, as it was not for such points that they died. We regard them as bearing witness to the saving truths of the Christian faith, and as shedding their blood in the same cause with the Huguenots of France under the Guises, and the Presbyterians of the Netherlands under the atrocious Philip.

"Hast thou admitted, with a blind fond trust,  
The lie that burned thy father's bones to dust,  
That first adjudged them heretics, then sent  
Their souls to heaven, and cursed them as they went ?

Shame on the candor and the gracious smile  
Bestowed on them that light the martyr's pile ;  
While insolent disdain, in frowns exprest,  
Attends the tenets that endured the test !

*Cowper's Expostulation, 1st Edition.*

"CHARGES FOR THE MARTYR-BISHOPS AT OXFORD.—The following doleful memorial of the times, evidently the production of the jailor or bailiff of Oxford, has recently turned up among the papers of the British Museum, as if to prove the bitter reality of the scenes recorded in this chapter, which modern civilisation can hardly believe to have been possible :

Charge for the burning of the bodies of Latimer and Ridley :

	£	s.	d.
For 3 loads wood faggots to burn Latimer and Ridley,	0	12	0
Item, 1 load furze faggots,	0	3	4
Item, for carriage,	0	2	6
Item, a post,	0	1	4
Item, 2 chains,	0	3	4
Item, 2 staples,	0	0	6
Item, 4 labourers,	0	2	8
Total.	1	5	8

*English Presbytery within the Church of England, 1558-1625.*—“That Elizabeth was favorable to the Reformation cannot be questioned. The daughter of Anne Boleyn had firmly withstood all attempts to gain her over to the profession of the Romish faith, and she only escaped from the doom of heresy by maintaining a discreet silence. She disliked, Burnet tells us, the title of ‘Supreme Head of the Church,’ preferring that of ‘Supreme Governor of the Church of England.’ Unhappily, however, it soon became manifest that she claimed, under this less ambitious designation, all the spiritual authority exercised by Henry VIII. She soon began to evince a tendency to repress all attempts at farther Reformation of the Church. When the Protestants, creeping out of their hiding-places, and returning in large numbers from abroad, began to pull down popish images, and everything reminding them of the hateful idolatry from which they had escaped, and to set up King Edward’s Liturgy in the churches, the queen issued a proclamation against all such innovations, declaring that, while she sanctioned the use of English in the service, and forbade the elevation of the host, she advised her faithful subjects to follow her example until it should be otherwise ordered by Parliament. She herself retained in her private chapel, an altar, crucifix, and various Romish symbols. Indeed, it became apparent that, had her claims been recognised by the Romish Church, she might not have proved unwilling to acknowledge the Pope as the father of Christendom. In the good providence of God this was prevented. Elizabeth sent a respectful message to Pope Pius IV., through the official agent of her late sister, announcing her accession to the throne; but the haughty pontiff replied, that England belonged of right to the Holy See; that Elizabeth, as being illegitimate, had no right to the throne without his consent; and that only on the ground of renouncing her pretensions, and submitting the question wholly to him, would he take up her cause. As a woman, Elizabeth resented this insult; and, as a queen, she spurned at the humiliation. One thing only was wanting to make the breach irreparable. The Romish clergy, many of whom held benefices, joined with the Pope in repudi-

ating her claims; some of them even spoke of transferring their allegiance to Mary Queen of Scots. The die was cast, and England was severed from Rome. . . . But unfortunately the queen adopted a line of policy precisely the reverse, and, inheriting the temper of her father, carried all before her. Her object was to effect a sort of compromise with the Romish Church, and thus gain over her Roman Catholic subjects. With this view, she put an embargo upon preaching, or 'prophesying,' as it was called. Two or three preachers, she held, were quite enough for a whole county; and the curates should content themselves with reading the Homilies. On the other hand, she insisted on the most rigorous observance of the rites and rubrics of the Church. The liturgy, after being stripped of some phrases likely to prove offensive to the ears of the Romanists, and brought into closer affinity to the popish missal, was fixed down by parliamentary statute. In June, 1559, was passed the famous 'Act of Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church.' This act, at once a blot and a blunder in the otherwise prosperous reign of Elizabeth, remains to this day the fruitful mother of all the discontent within, and all the dissenterism outside, the Church of England. It stereotyped the Church, as it stood at a period when, instead of being brought more into harmony with the other Protestant churches, as its founders desired, it was suspended midway between Romanism and the Reformation, merely to serve political ends, and the pleasure of an arbitrary sovereign. And the consequence has been that, while England has been progressing as a nation, in religious thought and liberty, she still presents the strange anomaly of a free Parliament and an enslaved Church. . . . This obstinacy of the queen seems at first sight unaccountably inconsistent with her general character. She had taken an active part in assisting the Protestants of France and Scotland in their struggles for religious liberty; and, what is more strange, not only afforded the natives of foreign parts an asylum in her dominions, but permitted them to practise their religious rites as at home. But we fear that Elizabeth was not troubled with scruples of conscience herself, and was hardly able to appreciate the force of conscience in

others. To the Papists, she said she was surprised they could not go to her Church and keep their own religion in their pockets. On the other hand, she astonished the Dutch ambassadors, by asking: 'Why make such ado about the mass? Can't you attend it as you would do a play? I have got on a white gown now; suppose I should begin to act the mass-priest, would you think yourselves obliged to run away?' With such views, she could ascribe the conscientious scruples of the non-conformists only to bad humor or factious opposition to her sovereign authority. 'So absolute was the authority of the crown at that time,' says Hume, 'that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it is to this sect that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution. . . . It was this book that brought down upon its author the castigation of Andrew Melville, when summoned, in 1607, before King James and his council. On that occasion Bancroft charged Melville with treason, upon which the intrepid Scottish reformer stepped up to the council table, and shaking him by the lawn-sleeves, which he called 'Romish rags,' addressed him as follows: 'If you are the author of the book called *English Scottizing for Discipline*, then I regard you as the capital enemy of all the Reformed Churches in Europe, and as such I will profess myself an enemy to you and your proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of my blood; and it grieves me to think that such a man should have his majesty's ear, and set so high in this honorable council.' . . . Thomas Cartwright was unquestionably the leading and most learned man among the party we refer to. Born in 1535, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he obtained his degree of bachelor of divinity, he took an early share in the efforts made for the reformation of the Church. In 1570, he was chosen Lady Margaret's professor of divinity, a charge in which he gained many laurels. Eloquent as a speaker, and popular to such a degree, that when he preached the sexton was obliged to remove the windows to accommodate his numerous hearers, he was animated beyond the rest of his brethren by the genuine spirit and boldness of a reformer. Such was his distinguished reputation as a scholar and theo-

logian, that his counsel was frequently sought by foreign divines in the weightiest matters. The University of St. Andrews, by the advice of Andrew Melville, offered him, together with his friend, Walter Travers, professorships of divinity; and he was urgently solicited to write a refutation of the Rhemish translation of the New Testament, a work in which he made much progress, till Archbishop Whitgift, to his dishonor, forbade him to proceed. But his varied qualifications could not atone for his non-conformity. He was regarded as the standard-bearer of the party, and was summoned on more occasions than one before the Star Chamber and High Commission. On the last occasion, in 1590, he was thrown into prison, and no less than *thirty-one* articles were exhibited against him. . . . Walter Travers, B. D., of Cambridge University, was, next to Cartwright, the most zealous advocate of the Presbyterian discipline. At an early period, unwilling to take orders in the English Church, and submit to conformity, he travelled to the continent, and was ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of Antwerp. Returning home, he was invited to the lectureship of the Temple, the duties of which he discharged much to the satisfaction of that society; but latterly he came into collision with Mr. Richard Hooker, author of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' who was chosen as master. No two pictures can be more dissimilar than those which Fuller draws so graphically of the Lecturer and the Master of the Temple, and his testimony to Travers speaks as highly for the candor of the writer as it does for the character of the non-conformist, whom, churchman as he was, he seems so greatly to have admired: 'Mr. Hooker's voice was low, stature little, gesture none at all, standing stone-still in the pulpit, as if the posture of his body were the emblem of his mind, immovable in his opinions; where his eye was left fixed at the beginning, it was found fixed at the end of his sermon. His style was long and pithy, driving on a whole flock of several clauses before he came to the close of a sentence. Mr. Travers' utterance was graceful, gesture plausible, matter profitable, method plain, and his style carried in it *indolem pietatis*, 'a genius of grace,' flowing from his sanctified heart. Some say that the congre-



gation in the Temple ebbed in the forenoon, and flowed in the afternoon."

*English Presbytery in the Ascendant, 1625-1643—The Westminster Divines.*—“And, first, our attention is naturally directed to the prolocutor, Dr. William Twisse. We see before us a venerable man, verging on seventy years of age, with a long pale countenance, an imposing beard, lofty brow, and meditative eye, the whole contour indicating a life spent in severe and painful study. Such was the rector of Newbury, one of the most learned and laborious divines of his day. Educated at Oxford, where he spent sixteen years in the closest application to study, and acquired an extensive knowledge of logic, philosophy, and divinity; holy in his converse, quiet and unassuming in his manners, he gained the admiration of all his contemporaries, and friends and foes speak of him with profoundest respect. Dr. Owen, though he wrote against him, never mentions his name without an epithet of admiration: ‘This veteran leader, so well trained in the scholastic field—this great man—the very learned and illustrious Twisse.’ It is very apparent, however, that, with all his learning, the plodding and subtle controversialist is not the man exactly cut out for the situation in which he has been placed. He has no turn for public speaking, no talent for extemporaneous effusion, no great tact for guiding the deliberations of a mixed assembly. ‘The man,’ says Baillie, ‘as the world knows, is very learned in the questions he has studied, and very good, beloved by all, and highly esteemed; but *merely bookish*, and not much, as it seems, acquaint with conceived prayer, and among the unfittest of all the company for any action; so after the prayer he sits mute.’ ‘Good with the trowel,’ says Fuller, ‘but better with the sword, more happy in polemical divinity than edifying doctrine.’ During the warm and occasionally rather stormy debates of the Assembly, the good man sits uneasy, obviously longing for his quiet study at Newbury. At length, after about a year’s trial, exhausted and distressed by employment so uncongenial to his habits he requests permission to retire home. . . . Dr. Burgess, Vicar of Watford.

and one of the preachers in St. Paul's London, is a character exactly the reverse of the quiet and scholastic Twisse. 'He is a very active and sharp man,' says Baillie. Possessed of the spirited and manly character which eminently distinguished our reforming ancestors, he was early engaged in the strife, and suffered considerably from the bishops for his freedom in denouncing the corruptions of the Church. Preaching before Archbishop Laud, he condemned him to his face, and fairly frightened that little tyrant, by protesting that 'he would stand to what he had said in that sermon against all opposers, even to the death.' . . . The venerable-looking old man, of portly and dignified presence, seated next to Dr. Burgess, as his fellow-assessor, is his brother-in-law, Mr. John White, of Dorchester, generally known at the time by the honorable title of the *Patriarch of Dorchester*. 'A grave man,' says Fuller, 'but without moroseness, who would willingly contribute his shot of facetiousness on any just occasion.' The personification of piety, wisdom, and benevolence, an eloquent speaker, a man of hospitals and plans for the relief of pauperism, he had in his own sphere effected such a reform in the morals of the people, and done so much for enriching the industrious and relieving the poor, as well as providing an asylum for the persecuted in New England, that we are not surprised to learn 'he had great influence with his party both at home and abroad, who bore him more respect than they did to their diocesan.' Mr. White was the great-grandfather of John and Charles Wesley. . . . There, for example, is a knot of divines who joined together in the composition of that famous defence of presbyterial government in reply to Bishop Hall, entitled *Smectymnus*—'a startling word' as Calamy styles it, made up of the initial letters of their names, Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow. This work which was published in 1641, gave the first serious blow to prelacy. It was composed in a style superior to that of the Puritans in general, and was, by the confession of the learned Bishop Wilkins, 'a capital work against episcopacy.' The first in this group of divines, Mr. Stephen Marshall, who was now lecturer at St. Margaret's,

Westminster, was certainly one of the notabilities, if not the most illustrious character of his day. From the commencement of the civil war down to the restoration, he took the most active share in the political as well as ecclesiastical movements of the times, was ever in the fore-front of the battle, and only laid down his armor with his life. In 1640, we find him, along with Dr. Burgess, urging all, by animated speeches on the floor of Parliament, as well as by rousing sermons from the pulpit, to take up arms for securing the constitution, and to proceed with all dispatch in the work of reforming the Church. To powerful, popular talents as a speaker (Baillie calls him 'the best of preachers in England'), Marshall added the active business habits which qualified him for taking the lead in these boisterous times. Fuller tells us he was a great favorite in the Assembly—'their trumpet, by whom they sounded their solemn fasts; in their sickness their confessor; in the Assembly their counsellor; in their treaties their chaplain; in their disputations their champion.' . . . The Assembly of Divines had their hands full of work. The midnight chimes of Westminster would find them deeply immersed in their studies, some engaged on committees, others busy on controversial writings, or conning sermons to be preached before Parliament or in city churches. In these labors the Scots commissioners had their full share. The main business in the Assembly consisted in the compilation of those formularies since so well known as the Westminster Standards; and as the bishops had early retired from the Assembly, great harmony prevailed among the members that remained, especially in regard to doctrinal questions. . . . The Confession of Faith was first submitted to Parliament under the title of 'The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines, now by Authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, Concerning a Confession of Faith,' and was passed in December, 1646. Next followed the two Catechisms—the Shorter in November, 1647, and the the Larger in 1648. While the Scottish Confession bears the impress of John Knox, and the Thirty-nine Articles that of Melancthon, the Westminster Confession, substantially the same in doctrine, bears unmistakably the stamp of the Dutch theology in the sharp distinc-

tions, logical forms, and juridical terms into which the Reformed doctrine had gradually moulded itself under the red heat of the Arminian and Socinian controversies. The same remark applies to the Catechisms, which were prepared simultaneously with the Confession. The Shorter Catechism has generally been viewed as an abbreviation of the Larger. But, in point of fact, the Larger Catechism was not prepared till some time after the Shorter, of which it was evidently intended to form an amplification and exposition. Both are inimitable as theological summaries. . . . And experience has shown that few who have been carefully instructed in our Shorter Catechism have failed to discover the advantage of becoming acquainted in early life, even as a task, with that admirable 'form of sound words.' . . . Incidentally, we learn that the preparation of the Confession and the Catechisms largely devolved on Dr. Anthony Tuckney, vice-chancellor of Cambridge, a divine of great erudition, and author of several works. He held a high place in the esteem of his brethren; and an anecdote is told of him which reflects credit on his integrity and good sense. Some members of Parliament having requested him, in the usual style of the day, to pay regard to 'the truly godly' in his elections at the University, Dr. Tuckney replied: 'No man has a greater respect than I have to the truly godly: but I am determined to choose none but *scholars*. They may deceive me in their godliness; they cannot in their scholarship.' Dr. Reynolds, afterwards bishop of Norwich, Dr. Arrowsmith, and Mr. Palmer, had evidently a share in the framing of these Standards. The metrical version of the Psalms, being substantially the same still used in Scotland, was executed by Mr. Francis Rous, a member of the House of Commons, and lay-assessor in the Assembly.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT.—This deed is quite unprecedented and unparalleled in the annals of religion. Creeds and confessions have held sway over whole peoples, in virtue of fresh adherents to them from age to age. But the solemn league sprung up at once, stamped its image on the age which gave it birth, and stands forth to this day as the deed of a nation—done rightly or wrongly, for good or for evil, as it may be judged—

but done, like an act of murder, or an act of martyrdom in the case of the individual man—never to be recalled; done either ever afterwards to be repented of, or ever after to be commemorated. In Scotland it assumed the veritable form of a national deed; and in England and Ireland it was certainly subscribed and sworn by persons of all ranks and classes. What is more, it cannot, properly speaking, be repeated. Attempts indeed have been made in Scotland to reproduce it by what have been called renovations of our national covenants; but these, being neither strictly national, nor ecclesiastical, nor personal transactions, but a mixture of the three, can only be viewed as indicating a desire to recognise the grand act. Gradually, as the normal idea of nationality faded from men's minds, or ceased to be relished, it dwindled into a species of religious service or church-vow. But while many lived who signed the covenant with their blood, it became the rallying-cry in the field and the dying testimony on the scaffold, and it has been identified in the eyes of all true Scotsmen with the cause of civil and religious liberty. Even our national bard could not stand an offensive allusion to it:

‘The solemn league and covenant  
Cost Scotland blood—cost Scotland tears:  
But it sealed freedom's sacred cause;  
If thou'rt a slave, indulge thy sneers.’

If, in England, this deed is not regarded as properly national, it can hardly be viewed as deprived of its nationality by the profane act of the Second Charles which rescinded it. It has endured whole ages and volumes of abuse; and still, in spite of these and of modern contempt, it lifts its head, like some old ruined watch-tower, protesting against all ‘popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness.’ ”

*The Ejection of 1662.*—“And who are the men that have been thus so summarily ejected? A band of more worthy and excellent ministers never occupied the pulpits at the Church of

VOL. XXIII., NO. 4.—9.

England. Most of them men in the prime of life, between thirty and fifty years of age, of scholarly habits and liberal education; with hardly one exception, men of faith and prayer, deeply imbued with the spirit of the gospel which they preached, and earnest workers in the ministry which they adorned. The author of the 'Reformed Pastor' must be allowed to be a fair judge of ministerial qualifications, and he has said: 'For all the faults that are now among us, I do not believe that ever England had as able and faithful a ministry since it was a nation as it hath at this day; and I fear that few nations on earth, if any, have the like. Sure I am, the change is so great within these twelve years, that it is one of the greatest joys that ever I had in the world to behold it. Oh, how many congregations are now plainly and frequently taught that lived then in great obscurity! How graciously hath God prospered the studies of many young men that were little children in the beginning of the late troubles, so that now they cloud the most of their seniors!' . . . 'It raised a grievous cry over the nation,' writes Bishop Burnet, 'for here were many men much valued, and distinguished by their abilities and zeal, now cast out ignominiously, reduced to great poverty, and provoked by spiteful usage.' . . . 'Worthy, learned, pious, orthodox divines,' says the philosophic Locke, 'who did not throw themselves out of service, but were forcibly ejected.' . . . There stands, majestic and apostolic in mien as he is in nature, the image of his own 'Living Temple,' John Howe—just the man, from his look of dignity and tenderness, to have written 'The Redeemer's Tears over Lost Souls.' We see him as he looked when the bishop of Exeter asked him what hurt there was in his being twice ordained. 'Hurt, sir! it hurts my understanding; it is an absurdity. Nothing can have two beginnings; I am sure I am a minister of Christ already. I cannot begin again to be a minister.' A fine specimen of the Independent of the olden times. And there, by his side, is that sturdy old Presbyterian, Edmund Calamy; and there is Matthew Poole, with his learned 'Synopsis;' Matthew Meed, with his 'Almost Christian;' and Dr. Lazarus Seaman, a Cambridge scholar, never seen without his Hebrew Bible, and whose sermons

proved a perfect God-send to the young sprouts of prelacy when they pillaged his library; and the saintly Samuel Annesley, from whom John Wesley was descended, and deemed it enough to write on the tombstone of his grandmother: 'She was the youngest daughter of Dr. Annesley;' and there are Dr. Thomas Manton, and Dr. William Bates, *par nobile fratrum*, both of them distinguished for depth in theology and elocution in the pulpit—portly, princely-looking men, courted by the great, and to both of whom were proffered bishoprics; and there is Mr. Joseph Alleine, whose sweet courteous temper could not save him from cruel imprisonments, which cut him off in his thirty-fifth year, and whose 'Alarm to the Unconverted' has passed through more editions, and done more good, perhaps, than any other tract of the same kind; and there is a goodly array of learned doctors, John Owen, Stephen Charnock, Henry Wilkinson, Edmund Stanton, Theophilus Gale, with many others it were too tedious to mention; and there is the genius of his age, Richard Baxter, but 'fallen on evil days and evil tongues,' to whom we must assign a special niche in our Annals. No one can look on that extraordinary countenance, with its sharp, shrewd, aquiline features, piercing eye and firm set lips, and fail to see reflected in it the most accomplished polemic preacher and divine of his day. With the strongest sense of religion himself, no man could excite a more vivid sense of it in the thoughtless and the profligate. Bold as a lion, he discovered the same intrepidity when he reproved Cromwell, and expostulated with Charles II., as when he preached to a congregation of mechanics. He is supposed to have preached more sermons, engaged in more controversies, and written more books, than any other non-conformist of his age. His writings consist of a hundred and forty-five different treatises. 'This,' as one observes, 'is a very faint and imperfect sketch of Mr. Baxter's character; men of his size are not to be drawn in miniature. His portrait in full proportion is in his narrative of his Own Life and Times.' But even there he is a man entirely *per se*, and must be taken on his own terms. That he was a Presbyterian is certain, but he will not allow himself to be so called; he was the champion of Pres-

byterians, but he takes exception to the name. He was no Episcopalian, but he had a plan of his own, which he termed a 'reduced episcopacy.' He was no friend to the Book of Common Prayer, but he produced a 'reformed liturgy' of his own. He was no sectarian, for in his pulpit at Kidderminster he encountered a whole battalion of them from Cromwell's army, and kept his ground against them during the livelong day till midnight; for, said he, 'I knew that if I left the pulpit they would claim the victory.' And yet he may be said to have formed a sect himself; for although, in the main, he was an evangelical divine, he wrote a 'Catholic Theology' of his own, and he cut out a new path for himself, where none have exactly followed him, but which bears the name of Baxterianism. He would not subscribe the covenant, but he fought manfully against all comers. . . . These are but specimens of the ejected; and all who love the gospel will admit that the sudden and simultaneous quenching of two thousand such lights, simply because they could not submit to certain rites of man's devising, could not fail to be as disastrous to the Church and nation of England, as it was disgraceful to the instruments who effected it. With few exceptions, the two thousand ejected ministers were Presbyterians, who had subscribed the solemn league, and possessed livings in the Church."

*No Need of a Liturgy.*—"Like Paul and Silas in the prison, who 'prayed and sang praises to God' at midnight, when there was no light for reading prayers, and when their only pulpit was the stocks, in which their feet were made too fast to admit of ritual postures, there can be no doubt that these devout ministers could easily dispense with a liturgy. And as the prisoners heard the unwonted sounds, in like manner foes as well as friends were compelled to listen in reverence and wonder to 'the prayer of faith.' Bishop Richardson saw no incoherent rhapsody in the devotions of Thomas Watson, on the day before his ejection, when he followed him to the vestry, and begged for 'a copy of his prayer,' and was amazed to learn that 'he had not penned his prayer, but spoken it out of the abundance of



his heart.' And even the scoffing Pepys remained to pray with Dr. Bates, much pleased, and admiring the way in which he linked the Lord's Prayer with his own—'In whose comprehensive words we sum up all our imperfect desires, saying: Our Father, which art in heaven,' etc. The proficiency which they attained in this exercise in public, only showed how well they had practised it in their secret communion with God.'

*Portraits of Non-conformists in Williams' Library.*—“In the old library of Red-Cross Street, London, established by Dr. Daniel Williams, there was (as there may still remain in the new premises) a fine collection of portraits, hung on the walls of the staircase, representing the leading non-conformist ministers during the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. They afford a striking panoramic view of the contrast, in point of dress and even of physiognomy, between the men of the Commonwealth and of the Restoration, alluded to in the text. In a lower room there was a very remarkable picture, said to be the effigies of Sir John Oldcastle—Lord Cobham—though with what truth we cannot tell. The following slight reminiscences, referring chiefly to those noticed in the preceding narrative, selected from the author's notes, may afford some idea of this valuable collection:

“SAMUEL ANNESLEY, D. D.—Dark complexioned, sharp featured, and rather severe looking. His black wig is surmounted by a black skull-cap, and he wears short ruffles, stiff and pointed. 'like quills upon the fretful porcupine.' There is a solemn gravity in the whole features, and a deep intelligence in the eye.

“WILLIAM BATES, D. D.—Finely formed features, with a gentlemanly look; well-chiselled nose and compressed lips. He wears his natural hair, but long, and resting on his shoulders.

“RICHARD BAXTER.—This is the most singular portrait in the collection. The most prominent feature is the nose, which is irregularly aquiline, and the bridge of which, rising abruptly from the forehead, descends as abruptly towards the mouth, while the elevated eyebrows, the widely-opened sparkling eyes, and the puckered lips, convey a *qui-vive* expression, strongly in-

dicative of the promptitude and acuteness which distinguished the polemic and the divine. His attenuated frame tells of the ceaseless activity of his spirit.

“THOMAS MANTON, D. D.—A large, noble-looking man, with an expression of mingled majesty and meekness. Clarendon told Richard Baxter that he would not have despaired of his compliance ‘if he had been as fat as Manton.’ Wood describes him as ‘a round, plump, jolly man,’ and says, ‘he was like one fatted for the slaughter; while the royalists resembled apostles, with their macerated bodies and countenances; which Dr. Harris calls ‘a butcherly comparison.’ Dr. Manton became corpulent in advanced life from his sedentary habits, but certainly not from idleness, if we may judge from his works in five volumes folio. The whole contour of the man is in accordance with his character. ‘He disliked the forbidding rigors of some good people, and the rapturous pretensions of others; having found, from long observation, that the over-godly at one time would be under-godly at another.’

“JOHN HOWE.—A splendid countenance, full of grace and majesty. The face is smooth, and he wears a large, full-bottomed wig, broad ruff, gown and bands.

INCREASE MATHER.—A fine pleasant expression, full of benevolence, lighted up by great intelligence. Appears in full canonicals, large peruke, gown and bands.

“JOHN FLAVEL is represented as a good-looking young man, with long hair, a full round face, and neatly dressed, with broad bands and gown.

“OLIVER HEYWOOD presents a broad rubicund face, with a fine eye and firm mouth. His natural hair is white, and hangs in beautiful curls on his shoulders.

“HENRY NEWCOME.—The finest countenance in the whole group, aristocratic, mild and powerful in expression. Dress the same, but with a long narrow white tie hanging over the ruff and bands.

“THOMAS YOUNG, D. D.—This learned man, who deserves to have been mentioned as one of the *Smectymnuan* divines in the Westminster Assembly, was vicar of Stow Market, and is better

known as having been the tutor of John Milton, who ever held him in high esteem, and often visited him at his vicarage, where one of the mulberry trees which the poet planted still exists." . . .

*Present Condition and Prospects of Presbyterianism in England.*—“The total number of Presbyterian churches in England adhering to the Westminster Standards now amounts to upwards of two hundred and fifty, being an increase of a hundred during the last twenty years. Of these, the Presbyterian Church in England alone, which, when constituted in 1836, could number only thirty congregations, now numbers a hundred and thirty-three, so that, in thirty-five years, it has increased nearly five-fold. Should its numbers continue to augment at the same ratio, English Presbytery may yet take its place as a power in the land. With its simple order, it possesses this advantage over a large and wealthy establishment, that it is in no danger of being upset by becoming top-heavy and unwieldy in its movements, and that it has a power of self-adjustment enabling it to meet the exigencies of the times, the changing fortunes of social position, and the influences of national predilection. At the same time, by virtue of its organisation, it avoids the opposite disadvantage of shooting up into a vast multitude of isolated saplings, tall but attenuated; it carries bulk and strength with its breadth of root. And thus it bids fair, with the blessing of Heaven, to realise the growth of ancient Israel, ‘Thou hast prepared room before it, and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land.’ Everything, however, depends upon securing that blessing, and English Presbyterianism would do well to take warning and instruction from her past annals. These plainly admonish her to ‘hold fast that which she hath, that no man take her crown.’ They loudly call upon her to avoid a loose, latitudinarian policy, which would sacrifice truth for a false peace, and a good conscience for fancied charity. On the other hand, they bid her beware of internal discord, of endless divisions, and of a weak stickling and striving for small points. For her a more glorious mission could hardly be prayed for or predicted, than to point out to a distracted Church the

golden mean between Christian liberty and Christian order,—to afford a large, liberal resting-place for all that are ‘peaceable and faithful in Israel,’—and to present the spectacle, hitherto unwitnessed by the world, of a free, catholic, united, evangelical Church, ‘fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.’ ”

In confirmation of the historian’s just estimate of the character and influence of our venerable Martyr-Church, we subjoin the weighty remarks of the Right Honorable A. S. Ayrton, one the metropolitan members of Parliament, before a London audience :

“If they passed from the Established Church to the Non-conforming denomination, he knew of none which was more interesting to a member of the Church of England, or to society, than that great denomination which is established in Scotland as the Church of that country, namely, the Presbyterian Church. That Church was full of interest to them, and, indeed, he thought that there was a period of their history when they were within an ace of having the Presbyterian Church established in England, instead of the Episcopalian Church which now existed. There was also another great epoch in our history, when they nearly had an arrangement by which their Episcopalian system was to have been modified by a large infusion of the Presbyterian system of Church government—which was, in fact, to be a kind of amalgamation between the one and the other. When they considered what had occurred in this country from that time to this, and what had occurred in Scotland, he was disposed to think that it was a great misfortune to this country that we had an unalloyed Episcopalian religion established. If they looked at what was going on in the Established Church, if they saw the attempts that were being made to undermine its Protestant position and influence, and if they observed *how entirely Episcopacy had failed to vindicate the Protestant feeling of the country within the Church*, they could not but regret that they had not infused into the Church that strong Protestant influence which was found to be so preëminent in the Church of Scotland. (Cheers.) In these times it was not easy to say what would happen in the future, because he observed speculations were being made upon religious and political subjects by the very wisest people, which did not seem to carry them beyond the

reach almost of their noses, and what they said was going to happen. But if he were to venture upon a speculation, when every one was asking the question what was to be done with the Church of England to preserve its Protestant principles and Protestant administration of its services, he was disposed to say that he thought *they would have to look to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church for the means of giving new life and new energy, and of preserving the truth itself within the pale of the Church of England.* (Cheers.) It was therefore a matter of great interest to watch the progress of the Presbyterian Church in this country, and he need hardly say they would not be able to see it in its full efficacy, unless disconnected to a large extent from the Establishment, and in a self-sustaining condition."

May it be given to Old England to know the things that make for her safety, her honor, and her peace! May it be given to her to recognise the sole Headship of Christ her Lord, and to place around her brow that crown so long rejected—the peerless crown of a pure, unsullied, scriptural Presbyterianism! This would be her crown of glory far surpassing in splendor and value the jewelled diadem of kings and queens!

—♦—

ARTICLE VI.

SPIRITISM AND THE BIBLE.

1. *The Debatable Land between this World and the next.* By ROBERT DALE OWEN, Author of "Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World." New York: Carleton & Co.; and London: Trubner & Co. 1872. Pp. 542.
2. *The Clock Struck One, and Christian Spiritualist, being a Synopsis of the Investigations of Spirit Intercourse by an Episcopal Bishop, three Ministers, five Doctors, and others, at Memphis, Tenn., etc., etc.* By the Rev. SAMUEL WATSON. New York: S. R. Wells, Publisher. 1872. Pp. 208.
3. *Sundry Papers in the Scientific American, beginning Aug. 12th, 1871, on "Psychic Force," as an explanation of the*