

OUR BANNER.

VOL. VII.

AUGUST 16, 1880.

No. 8.

THE SANQUHAR DECLARATION.

BY THE REV. JAMES KENNEDY, NEW YORK.

“Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.”—Jeremiah vi. 16.

“And David said : What have I now done? Is there not a cause?”—1 Sam. xvii. 29.

In celebrating, this month, the bi-centenary of the Sanquhar declaration, we cannot fail to notice how much in line is this service with the language of the weeping prophet, and of the stripling David, above referred to. The faith, for which we earnestly contend, is “the faith *once* delivered to the saints,” in one unique, supernatural and perfect revelation, which can know no change, receive no addition, and is a path as old as the history of man. When our fathers, two hundred years ago, unfurled the flag inscribed “For Christ’s Crown and Covenant,” their banner differed really in nothing from the Standard of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, borne before the hosts of God in the wilderness, under the leadership of the mediatorial angel ; and when we go back to-day to their act at Sanquhar, we seek an old path which limits and defines for us still, as it did for them, the relations which, as Christ’s pledged followers, we can dutifully hold to all the civil institutions of men.

Nor does the occasion less suggest an inquiry concerning our fathers’ act at Sanquhar, in the language of David, What have they now done? Was there not a cause? Their bold act has brought upon their memories no small amount of blame and reproach. Historian and satirist, novelist and poet, churchmen and statesmen, have all, in many different forms, by word or deed, condemned, as not only unjustifiable, but as even foolish and mad, and in some respects even ludicrous, the position they then dared to assume. And if the celebration, this month, of that deed at Sanquhar, in different parts of the world, tend to demonstrate that their course was reasonable and just, and even necessary, and if it wipe off the dirt with which the ignorant and reckless have tried to smirch their principles and character, it will not be in vain. Strange it may seem that in this liberty-loving age any defence of men, struggling against tyranny and oppression, is needed ; but in this 19th century, we have still to defend even the Bible itself, and require, still, volumes of Christian apologetics ; no wonder then if the testimony of the Saints still requires vindication ; and that we still need Covenanter apologetics in this enlightened age. Besides, some such going back to the old paths will find good cause in the necessities of many members in our own covenanted church. The facts of our history are becoming less and less familiar to our people. We are forgetting fast all about the “killing times” and

“earnest contendings,” by which our privileges and liberties have been secured; books that made past generations familiar with the deeds of the martyrs are seldom seen now in our families, and something is needed to “stir up our minds by way of remembrance.”

To be able to understand the Sanquhar Declaration, and its necessity at the time at which it was made public, we must know something of the events in Great Britain which preceded it. We shall therefore introduce the Declaration itself, by an historical statement of the circumstances that in Providence called it into being.

The Reformation in Scotland, in the 16th century, differed from that in England in one most important particular. In Scotland the Reformers were guided by the Word of God, in England by the will and caprice of the Monarch. Henry VIII was denied by the Pope of a divorce from his Queen Katharine of Arragon, and that ultimately led to his patronizing the Reformation, although he had previously written a book against Luther, for which he had had conferred on him the title, still borne by the monarchs of England, “Defender of the Faith.” A Reformation thus originated, and guided by so capricious a spirit as Henry and his daughter Elizabeth displayed in matters connected with the church, could not fail to be arbitrary, inconsistent, and semi-popish, which three great features, it may be said, still in a marked degree to possess. In Scotland, on the other hand, the work was distinguished by three great scriptural features, being Presbyterian, Covenanted, and Universal. By the last of these terms we mean that it was the aim of the Reformers to include everything in the Reformation; not the church only, but the family, society in all its parts, and the commonwealth in all its institutions. As might be expected, however, these very excellences of the work excited against it, in many quarters, a most bitter, incessant, and long-continued opposition. First, Mary, Queen of Scots, and the party that sympathized with her, impeded the Reformation by every means in their power. When her son, James VI, of Scotland, came to the throne, though he professed great zeal for the reformed religion, and swore the National covenant, which indeed was drawn up at his desire as a bulwark against popery, yet he soon exhibited an intense dislike to the simple forms of Presbyterianism, and a desire to supplant it in Scotland by the grander forms of lordly Episcopacy, which not only were more to his taste, but as he thought better calculated to support him in those kingly prerogatives which he supposed to be his by divine right. Cautiously and craftily, therefore, he went to work to undermine the system which the Reformers had sought to establish. When, however, at the death of Elizabeth, he ascended the throne of England he became more avowed in his purpose, not only the more to please his English subjects, but more hopeful of success through the aid they would give him. He accordingly first induced the Parliament to restore the order of Bishops in the church; then he established high commission courts, composed of his own favorites and creatures, with power to harass, suspend, or depose any of the ministers who would oppose his measures, and at length induced a packed assembly to pass the five famous articles, known as the five articles of Perth, conforming the order and wor-

ship of the Scottish church to the English model. With a craft, cruelty, and perseverance, almost incredible, he steadily pursued this oppressive policy to the end of his reign, hoping ultimately to succeed in establishing in the north, as there was in the south, a full-fledged prelacy. In all this he was no doubt inspired by those arbitrary maxims of government, which he had adopted, and the full persuasion that it was, by divine right, the prerogative of kings to dictate to their subjects in all matters of religion, and mould the church according to their sovereign will and pleasure. And these maxims he transmitted to his son and to his grandsons, who persistently attempted, for 90 years, to carry out his policy, till they perished, the victims of their own mistakes.

Charles I., who succeeded to the throne in 1625, far surpassed his father in the exercise of what he claimed to be his hereditary rights. Taught to believe in the divine right of kings, he regarded himself as the sole fountain of authority and law both in the Church and in the State, and from being at first a despot became a tyrant, so intolerable in his rule that the nation was at last compelled to cast him off. In England, by the ministry of Laud, he not only most cruelly oppressed the Puritans, but sought to debauch them by leading them to sanction the grossest forms of immorality, and by imposing upon them ceremonies plainly Popish in their nature. In Scotland, for twenty years, he did not allow the General Assembly to hold a meeting; while even the Parliament was only suffered to meet once in eighteen years. Then, by the arbitrary and tyrannical powers of the High Commission Courts, and the ensnaring oaths and conditions imposed on the ministry, he sought to weed out all who had the courage to be faithful, and to fill all the pulpits in the land with his own creatures. In fact, his policy was such as soon, in both kingdoms, to lead to the suspicion that his ultimate design was to extirpate Protestantism and restore all to Rome. This fear was strengthened by the manner in which he sought to force on Scotland the use of a liturgy. By his direction a book of ecclesiastical canons and a liturgy were prepared, and it was noticed that a very marked feature of the latter was that, while in general it followed the English form, it was so changed in some parts as to bring it as near as possible to the Romish Breviary. The fact, too, that he proposed to introduce such changes solely by royal proclamation, in utter disregard and contempt of the authority of the Parliament or of the General Assembly, still farther confirmed people's fears. It so turned out, however, that this arbitrary and unconstitutional attempt not only proved a failure, but was overruled to the advancement of the cause which Charles sought to destroy. It had been arranged that the grand experiment of forcing a popish liturgy on Presbyterian Scotland should be made on Sabbath, 23d July, 1637, at the cathedral of St. Giles, Edinburgh. By the grace of the Monarch, Edinburgh could now boast both a bishop and a dean, the latter of whom, in full sacerdotal vestments, at the appointed hour, stood up to inaugurate the movement. The place was crowded with people in a high state of excitement, which, however, had for a time no outward expression, till the dean having proceeded some length in the service, a female near the desk, Janet Geddes—whose name and seat have both been immortalized by the

occasion—starting up in irrepressible indignation, cried aloud, "Villain dost thou say mass at my lug?" and to give emphasis to her words, hurled the stool, on which she had been sitting, at the dean's head, nothing loath, like the woman who cast the piece of millstone at Abimelech, even to break his skull. The result of this incident was marvelous. The nation was stirred to its center, patience seemed exhausted and no longer a virtue, and though for a time trying in vain to bring the king and his counsellors to reason, by the advice of Alexander Henderson, the nobles, gentry and people at last resolved to renew their National covenant, their great bulwark against Popery. For this purpose they enlarged the covenant of 1580, to adapt it more particularly to present circumstances. It had originally consisted of only the first of the three parts now found in it, but Henderson, and those now acting with him, added a second part, containing the acts of Parliament in favor of the Reformation in Scotland, to show that in their struggle with the King, on which they were now entering, they were acting legally. And to this they added the concluding section, as an additional bond to adapt it more fully to the circumstances of the nation. The work was consummated February 28, 1638.

This great act of covenant renovation, entered into so heartily by the great body of the people, of all ranks and degrees, was not only blessed to stem the tide of national defection, but was followed by results so wonderful and precious, that it may be said to have originated what is known as the Second Reformation. A great revival in the power of true religion was experienced throughout the land, new energy, zeal and faithfulness seemed everywhere to urge men forward, and the result was that, notwithstanding all that could be done to intimidate them and drive them from their purpose, the Covenanters, stimulated by the spirit of renewed consecration to God, demanded so strongly and universally a free assembly to redress their religious grievances and a meeting of Parliament to inquire into the affairs of the nation, that the King was constrained, though reluctantly, to comply. And very different from what he desired were the results of that assembly which came together November, 1638. Under the guidance of Henderson, it went with a will to the work of reforming the abuses which had sprung up during the last forty years, and notwithstanding that the Royal Commissioner protested against their proceedings, and did all he could to dissolve the Assembly, taking their stand on the church's own intrinsic power, they went steadily forward, till they had in good measure cleansed the sanctuary. The bishops were tried and deposed, and some of them, for their crimes, excommunicated; the five articles of Perth, Book of Canons, and ordination, and the liturgy swept away; the civil power and place of churchmen condemned, and many acts passed to promote purity of discipline, scriptural education and general reformation. The action of this assembly being supported by public opinion, and confirmed and enlarged by subsequent assemblies, was ratified by the Scottish Parliament in 1640, and had even the concurrence of the King himself, on the following year, though it was believed that his apparent yielding was the result of cunning and duplicity. His first thought, it would appear, when he saw the bold, defiant attitude of the Cov-

enanter, was to reduce them to submission by an army composed of English and Irish soldiers; but not only did he find a great indisposition in England to such a war, but when he led some troops northward, he was surprised to find the Scotch prepared for him, with forces greatly superior to his own. Admirably encamped, splendidly provided with artillery and other weapons, and at each captain's tent door a banner floating, not only bearing the National arms, but now, for the first, inscribed in letters of gold, "FOR CHRIST'S CROWN AND COVENANT," the Covenanters had planted themselves in a position towards him, whom they still recognized as their lawful King, from which they could not resile without unfaithfulness to God's cause, and without losing the whole fruits of their labors. It was not, however, at first clear to many how they could lawfully resist their sovereign on any grounds, till with deep and anxious solicitude they set themselves to the investigation of the momentous question. Then in the words of an historian "after the most profound and studious perusal of eminent divines and jurists, and especialy of the Bible, they arrived at the conclusion that a Christian people were entitled to take up arms in defence of their religious liberties, against any assailant" (Baillie). Thus early did the Covenanters recognize, in germ, the principle that dictated the Sanquhar Declaration, namely, that even recognized rulers may be lawfully resisted when they would unlawfully deprive us of natural, God-given rights. Hopeless of accomplishing his aims by violent means, Charles now became so yielding as to lead to the suspicion that he was only dissembling to gain time. The horrible, indiscriminate massacre, too, about this time in Ireland, of the Protestants, by hordes of Irish Roman Catholics, led on by their priests, which shocking deed Charles refused either to condemn or punish, strengthened the suspicion against him of being able to countenance any, even the most wicked and treacherous measures, to accomplish the ends he had in view.

These events both in Scotland and Ireland, had, therefore, the effect of greatly intensifying the jealousies and alienation, already existing between the King and the Parliament of England, and prepared the way for the calling of the famous Westminster assembly of divines, to prepare formularies of doctrine, government and worship, which met in 1643. In the meantime, at the suggestion of the Scotch, the English Parliament agreed to enter into a mutual league, to embrace all the three kingdoms, and to unite all the friends of the Reformation therein in the maintenance and defence of the true religion, and also to promote scriptural uniformity in all matters of faith and practice. For this purpose, what is known as the Solemn League and covenant, prepared by Henderson, was accepted, and largely entered into by the great body of the people, except the partisans of the King, as also by the assembly at Westminster, the Scottish assembly, and by the Scottish and English Parliaments, so that it became a truly National deed. And thus the whole community, not only accepted, but recognized itself as bound to maintain and defend the true religion in all its integrity; and faithfulness to this obligation was henceforth to be the bond of union in the mutual relations which the Covenanters were to hold, in future, to one another.

The disastrous consequences to Charles I, of his struggle with the will of the nation, and his condemnation and execution by the sectaries, headed by Cromwell, contrary to the influence and advice of the Covenanters, whom we vindicate from any share in the blame, might have taught his successors the futility of resisting the cause of God, yet, as his sons afterward showed, they seem to have learned nothing from the tragic fate of their father. When at the death of his father, an attempt was made to place Charles II on the throne of Scotland, before landing, in the presence of the Commissioners, he declared his adherence to the covenants, and, with his right hand lifted up to heaven, bound himself by oath to prosecute the ends of them to the utmost of his power. He afterwards issued a proclamation in which he lamented the opposition, made by his father to the work of Reformation, the idolatry of his mother, (a French Roman Catholic) and his own former enmity to the cause of God, protested his perfect sincerity in taking the covenants, and his fixed purpose to abide by them, "really, constantly, and sincerely, all the days of his life." At the beginning of the next year, in the presence of the Parliament, Commissioners of the General Assembly, and of a crowded congregation, the covenants were again administered to him in connection with the Coronation oath, according to the law of the Kingdom. And afterwards, at his restoration (1660), though no proper limits were stipulated as to the exercise of his authority, yet he wrote to the Presbytery of Edinburgh his purpose "to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland, as settled by law without violation." And yet, as his course afterward proved, all this was a compound of the most blasphemous impiety, shocking hypocrisy, and of that wretched duplicity and perfidy which had involved his father in so many and disastrous calamities.

Scarcely was Charles II seated on the throne when he commenced violently to overthrow the whole system established during the period of the Second Reformation. In England, he restored prelacy, and, by the infamous Act of Uniformity, drove out in one day from their flocks 2,000 ministers who were too faithful to their covenant engagements to comply with his measures; while in Scotland he inaugurated a reign of terror which lasted for twenty-eight years, and filled the whole land with crime and blood. By the aid of the infamous Sharpe, a Presbyterian minister, afterwards Archbishop Sharpe, Primate of the Kingdom of Scotland, of whom it has been said, that first, with the cunning of the fox, and then with the ferocity of the lion, he set himself to destroy the whole Reformation he was sent to London to watch over and protect, Charles soon found means to break down what had been built with labor and care. He had no difficulty in getting a servile Parliament to pass the act recissory, declaring the covenants treasonable, and all acts of Parliament since 1633 null and void. Immediately after he had it proclaimed that everything relating to the government and policy of the church belonged to his majesty, as an inherent right of the Crown. In the exercise of this he restored the bishops and all those abominations from which the land had been happily delivered for a time. Moreover, it was by his authority enacted that any one that spoke, wrote, printed, preached, or prayed on

behalf of the covenants, should be guilty of high treason, and be punished accordingly. Nor did these enactments long remain a dead letter. Unlike his father and grandfather, who, notwithstanding the arbitrary measures they sought to enforce, shed no blood, Charles II, before he was a year on the throne, executed, for refusing to accept these innovations, the Marquis of Argyle, who ten years before had placed the crown on his head. A few days later, James Guthrie, one of Scotland's most eminent and faithful ministers, also suffered for the same cause, and sometime afterward, Lord Warriston, who had been one of the Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly—a pretty fair beginning that gave promise that the "killing times" were fairly set in. When the community awoke to the reality of the situation, and began to remonstrate, more high-handed measures were taken. Nearly 400 ministers were ejected from their churches in one day, and all ministers in the Kingdom were prohibited from any exercise of their office who would not accept collation from the bishops. When the ejected ministers attempted to exercise their ministry in private houses, or in the fields, they were outlawed, and they, and all who waited on their ministry, became liable to the penalties of high treason, which latterly, any dragoon or supporter of the King's policy might inflict without any process of trial. All were also enjoined to attend upon the forms of religion sanctioned and set up by royal prerogative and authority, and soldiers were scattered throughout the land to compel obedience. Oaths and tests of loyalty, the most wicked, ensnaring, and even grossly contradictory, were imposed, binding the juror to renounce the covenants, own the King's supremacy, engage for his children, servants, tenants, and dependents, that they would support the King's policy, and to use all active means and measures to assist the royal party as spies, informers, and active helpers, to discover, punish, and, by all means, destroy all those suspected of being unfavorable to his majesty's designs. Penalties of the most cruel and unjustifiable nature, as fining, spoiling, imprisonment, banishing, torturing, burning, beheading, and exposing the dead to the terror of the living, inflicted often recklessly and indiscriminately, without any regard to human rights, soon filled the whole land with scenes of confusion and treachery, blood and crime, such as have seldom been paralleled. But history repeats itself, and here was the old, old story; the King had set up the image, and all who would not fall down and worship at his request and command—for them there was nothing but a fiery furnace heated seven times.

And now for nearly nine years, the King, and those in sympathy with him, had attempted to carry out his object in Scotland, with an intensity, fierceness, oppressiveness, and shocking details of the most wanton malice and cruelty, and yet the work on which he had set his heart was not accomplished, and still multitudes refused to conform or worship the image the King had set up. In 1669, however, a new device, to weaken and divide those who opposed his policy, was tried, namely, to offer an indulgence by which ministers might resume the exercise of their ministry, and the people be allowed to wait on them, without being exposed to the terrible penalties to which they had hitherto been liable. If they would only take out a license from the King, and agree only to hold or attend

sessions or Presbyteries under the authority of the bishops, not to preach or travel beyond certain limits without a bishop's license, nor marry or baptize persons belonging to another parish, nor countenance any in withdrawing from the ministry of the curates, to hold their communions all on the same day, and not admit into their pulpits any minister not indulged, and specially not to lecture or expound the scriptures, as contrary to Episcopal practice—on these terms his majesty would graciously indulge them with certain spiritual powers, which of course it was his prerogative either to grant or withhold. Though compliance with such conditions yielded the whole of what was claimed by the King, yet many, worn out with poverty, suffering and reproach, did accept them, not only in 1669, but afterwards, when renewed in 1672, and 1679, to the great weakening and discouragement of those who still remained faithful, whose position now became much more difficult. Their adversaries alleged that there was no excuse any longer to remain in an attitude of opposition, and their numbers being considerably reduced the King and his party now felt sure of being able finally to crush them. And consequently, for nine years more they were, with greatly reduced strength, subjected to a fury and rage and violence that knew no bounds, that far exceeded anything yet attempted, and which did not utterly exterminate them, only because the Lord was with them in the furnace.

And now, towards the end of this second period of nine years, or 1678-9, a question began to be agitated among the faithful few, namely, whether it was their duty any longer to bear allegiance to Charles and his Government, or own him as their lawful sovereign. Hitherto, while wholly condemning his arbitrary measures, and refusing compliance with his unlawful, unconstitutional and unscriptural enactments, and even by arms defending themselves against his murderous assaults, they never thought of casting off and disowning his authority as their lawful King. Indeed, extreme loyalty to the House of Stuart had hitherto been a marked weakness of the Scottish Covenanters. After, however, having had, about this time, some encounters with the King's troops—to which we shall afterwards more fully refer—many of them became convinced that it was one of the most grievous sins of the nation that it had done homage to the oppressor so long. The grounds on which they rested this belief are well set forth in the following extract: "That Charles had been received by Scotland as a sworn supporter of the Covenanted Reformation, and by the Coronation oath was bound to maintain the religion and liberties of the nation inviolate; but that the whole of his reign had been a deliberate and outrageous violation of his oath; that he had invaded the prerogative of the Son of God by usurping a blasphemous supremacy over the church; had overturned the whole fabric of Scotland's Reformation; had violently restored Episcopacy, which the nation had sworn to reject and extirpate; had changed the civil government into an intolerable despotism, filling all the principal offices of State with men profligate in principle and cruel in disposition; had poisoned the sources of justice and multiplied sanguinary laws; that the best subjects of his kingdom of all ranks, for peaceably assembling to worship God, had been proscribed, plundered, and harassed by a brutal soldiery,

immured in filthy dungeons, sold into slavery, and multitudes of them executed as felons, upon the scaffold." Before, however, taking any extreme steps they issued a paper, in a milder form, to define clearly their views concerning the measures pursued toward the interests of religion in the land by those who conducted the government. Indeed, altogether during the long, dismal period of persecution, in this and in the following reign, they issued four notable papers intended, first, as a protest at different times against prevailing evils and defections, and to wash their hands from any share in the sins of the nation; and then to explain and defend the course which they themselves felt bound, in faithfulness, to pursue. The first of these was the Rutherglen Declaration in 1679. The second the Sanquhar Declaration 22d June, 1680. The third was the Lanark Declaration in 1682. The fourth the Informatory Vindication by Renwick and his followers in 1687.

The first of these, the Rutherglen Declaration, was more specially a solemn, public protest against all those steps of defection, by which the covenanted uniformity had been subverted; against the claim of supremacy on the part of the King, which, if admitted, would not leave the smallest particle of liberty to the subject; against the act recissory, which unlawfully robbed the nation of its highest glory; and against the relentless persecutions to which the people of God had, for nineteen years, been so cruelly and causelessly subjected. In the Sanquhar Declaration, however, of the following year, they took a bolder and more definite position, and declared that they now felt warranted to renounce all allegiance to Charles II and his Government, and to seek deliverance from it, as a scourge from God against the land. This they made public, June 22d, 1680, in the following manner. On that day, about twenty persons came armed to the small burgh of Sanquhar, where Michael Cameron read at the cross, and left affixed there the following paper:

THE SANQUHAR DECLARATION.

"The DECLARATION and TESTIMONY of the true Presbyterian anti-prelatick, anti-erastian, persecuted party in Scotland, published at Sanquhar, June 22d, 1680.

It is not among the smallest of the Lord's mercies to this poor land, that there have always been some who have given their testimony against every course of defection (that many are guilty of), which is a token for good that he doth not as yet intend to cast us off altogether, but that he will leave a remnant in whom he will be glorious, if they, through his grace, keep themselves clean still, and walk in his way and method, as it has been walked in and owned by him in our predecessors of truly worthy memory, in their carrying on of our noble work of Reformation in the several steps thereof, from popery, prelacy, and likewise erastian supremacy, so much usurped by him, (who it is true as far as we know) is descended from the race of our Kings, yet he hath so far deborded (departed) from what he ought to have been, by his perjury and usurpation in church matters, and tyranny in matters civil, as is known by the whole land, that we have just reason to account it one of the Lord's great controversies against us, that we have not disowned him and

the men of his practices (whether inferior magistrates or any other), as enemies to our Lord and His Crown, and the true Protestant and Presbyterian interest in these lands, our Lord's espoused bride and church. Therefore, although we be for government and governors, such as the word of God and our covenants allow, yet we for ourselves, and all that will adhere to us, as the representatives of the true Presbyterian church, and Covenanted nation of Scotland, considering the great hazard of lying under such a sin any longer, do, by these presents, disown CHARLES STUART, that has been reigning (or rather tyrannizing, as we may say) on the throne of Britain these years bygone, as having any right, title to, or interest in the said crown of Scotland for government, as forfeited several years since, by his perjury and breach of covenant, both with God and his church, and usurpation of his crown and royal prerogatives therein, and many other breaches in matters ecclesiastic, and by his tyranny and breach of the very *leges regnandi* in matters civil. For which reason, we declare, that several years since he should have been denuded of being King, ruler, or magistrate, or of having any power to act, or to be obeyed as such. As also we, being under the standard of our Lord Jesus Christ, Captain of Salvation, do declare a war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of his practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ, and his cause and covenants; and against all such as have strengthened him, sided with, or in any wise acknowledged him in his tyranny, civil or ecclesiastic, yea, against all such as shall strengthen, side with, or anywise acknowledge any other in the like usurpation and tyranny, far more against such as would betray or deliver up our free Reformed Mother Church unto the bondage of Anti-Christ the Pope of Rome. And by this we homologate that testimony given at Rutherglen, 29th May, 1679, and all the faithful testimonies of those who have gone before, as also of those who have suffered of late. And we do disclaim that declaration published at Hamilton, June, 1679, chiefly because it takes in the King's interest, which we are several years since loosed from, because of the foresaid reasons, and others, which may after this (if the Lord will) be published. As also, we disown, and by this resent the reception of the Duke of York, that professed papist, as repugnant to our principles and vows to the Most High God, and as that which is the great, though not alone, just reproach of our church and nation. We also by this protest against his succeeding to the crown; and whatever has been done, or any one essaying to do in this land (given to the Lord), in prejudice to our work of Reformation. And to conclude, we hope after this none will blame us for, or offend at our rewarding those that are against us as they have done to us, as the Lord gives opportunity. This is not to exclude any that have declined, if they be willing to give satisfaction according to the degree of their offense.

Given at Sanquhar, June 22, 1680."

In another article we shall point out and vindicate the great moral principles, in respect to civil government and civil and religious liberty, contained in the Sanquhar Declaration, with special reference to the manner in which an approbation of it by the Church limits and defines our civil position and relations.