

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVII.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXVI.

ARTICLE I.

THE METAPHYSICAL POSTULATE OF HERBERT SPENCER'S FIRST PRINCIPLES.

First Principles of a New System of Philosophy. By HERBERT SPENCER. Second Edition. Appleton & Co. 1871.

Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform," etc By Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Bart. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1853.

The Limits of Religious Thought: Examined in Eight Lectures Delivered before the University of Oxford, in the Year MDCCCLVIII., on the Bampton Foundation. By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College; Tutor and Late Fellow of St. John's College. First American, from the third London, Edition. With the NOTES translated. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

The corner-stone of Positivism in all its forms is the doctrine, now so fashionable in scientific circles, of the unknowable; and the derivative doctrine as to ultimate causes, whether final or efficient. Since this is so, it is worthy of remark that the founder of French Positivism, M. Comte, has taken this doctrine of the unknowable for granted. There is not a scintilla of proof for it in the *Cours de Philosophie Positive*. We are not aware that either M.

VOL. XXVII., NO. 3—1.

ARTICLE II.

JOHN KNOX, AS THE ENGLISH AND AS THE SCOTTISH REFORMER.

John Knox and the Church of England: His work in her Pulpit, and his influence upon her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties. A Monograph, founded upon several important papers of Knox never before published. By PETER LORIMER, D. D., Professor of Theology, English Presbyterian College, author of "Patrick Hamilton," "The Scottish Reformation," etc. Henry S. King & Co., 65 Cornhill and 12 Paternoster Row, London. 1875.

Some three years ago, the amiable and accomplished Dr. Lorimer, of the English Presbyterian College, London, while mining in the rich quarry of the William's Library, London, laid his hand upon certain "Knox papers," in what is known as the "Morrice Collection" of manuscripts, which, for some unaccountable reason, had never yet been published. They consist of four papers, all relating to Knox's work as a Reformer in England, viz.: (1) "An Epistle to the Congregation in Berwick, in 1552;" (2) "A Memorial or Confession laid before the Privy Council of Edward VI. in 1552;" (3) "The Practice of the Lord's Supper, used in Berwick, by John Knox;" and (4) "A Letter written to Knox from London, 1566." These papers, though not originals, but transcripts from the originals—the one made by a contemporary of Knox, in the era of Edward VI., and the other in the last quarter of the seventeenth century—Dr. Lorimer has demonstrated to be, beyond all question, genuine productions of Knox and his contemporaries.

The discovery of these papers, furnishing so much new material towards a more correct estimate of the character of Knox, suggested to Dr. Lorimer the thought of re-writing the English section of Knox's life, interweaving with the facts already well known concerning him, the new facts brought out by these papers. The result of this happy thought is this *monograph* on the English section of Knox's life. He has done his work with singular skill and ability, and laid under lasting obligation to himself, all genuine Presbyterians; for genuine Presbyterians so reverence

the memory of Knox that an author who brings to light any new facts to his honor is looked upon with a sort of family affection, as having added to the honor and the good repute of the family name.

It gives special value and interest to the discovery and the labors of Dr. Lorimer that he has been enabled to bring out a phase of Knox's character hitherto almost entirely unnoticed. The current estimate of this grand historical personage makes him all sternness and boldness—distinguished for narrowness of view and uncompromising iron-sidedness—one ever ready

“ To prove his doctrine orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks.”

Nor has it been his enemies who have been responsible wholly for this injustice to the character of the great Reformer. His friends, many of them, have regarded his bold, fierce, unmerciful attacks upon those who set themselves openly or by treachery against the progress of the Reformation in Scotland as the crowning honor of his life and character, while others of them have been too ready to apologize, when no apology was necessary, for what they deem his too fierce spirit by pleading the spirit of the age in which he lived. Even Dr. Paul Henry, the eulogist of Calvin, is found indulging in the loosest and most careless statements in regard to the character of John Knox, whom he styles “the founder of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, from which arose the rude, fierce spirits of a subsequent period.” He even sets up Knox as a foil for the better display of the character of Calvin in the following style :

“The difference of character in Calvin and Knox was early displayed when the latter was in England and interested himself in the revision of the Prayer-book. Then, as subsequently, he exhibited the most decided hostility to the Anglican Church on account of its retaining some of the Catholic forms, and not adopting the severe rule of the Scotch. Calvin, who so energetically strove against superstition, was not in this case disposed to agree with Knox. He willingly suffered outward forms to remain, or at least did not *assail them with fanatical violence, as if they had a real importance.*”*

Now, in the first place, at the time when Knox was interested

*Life and Times of Calvin, vol. 2, p. 328.

in the revision of the English Prayer-book, he had never seen Calvin, nor probably had much acquaintance with Calvin's writings; for the revised Prayer-book of Edward VI. was just issuing from the press when Knox first landed in England after his captivity, and began his more public labors as a preacher. He could, therefore, have had no communication and comparison of views with Calvin on the subject. In the second place, it would have been little to Calvin's credit as a Reformer if he had differed seriously with Knox in his chief objection to Edward VI.'s Prayer-book, namely, the claim set up in one of its forty-two articles that the Church has the right to ordain rites and ceremonies, and, therefore, was competent to ordain kneeling at the Lord's Supper. And, in the third place, as will be seen further on, Knox, so far from "fanatical violence" against outward forms to which he objected, exhorted his former parishioners to conform to the order for kneeling at the Lord's Supper rather than create disturbance, as appears from one of the newly discovered papers.

It is gratifying to note that even before the recent discoveries of Mr. Tytler and Dr. Lorimer, more philosophic and less partisan writers, such as Thomas Carlyle, Froude, and Dean Stanley, had gathered even from the general history of those times the evidences on which they have felt bound to depart from the current estimate of the character of Knox. Carlyle had said of him, in his own quaint way :

"They go far wrong who think this Knox was a gloomy, spasmodic, shrieking fanatic. Not at all; he is one of the solidest men; a most shrewd, observing, quietly discerning man; an honest-hearted, brotherly man—brother to the high, brother also to the low: sincere in his sympathy with both: a cheery, social man with faces that loved him. An ill nature he decidedly had not. Kind, honest affections dwelt in the much-enduring, hard-worn, ever-battling man. Close at hand, he was found to be no mean, acrid man, but at heart a healthful, strong, sagacious man."

And the truthfulness to nature of this picture Dr. Lorimer's new discovery combines with Knox's letters, as published by Dr. Laing, to confirm. So the candid, nicely discriminating

Froude had said of Knox, among many similar references to his character in his history :

“Penetrated to the heart with this conviction, John Knox became thus the representative of all that was best in Scotland. *He was no narrow fanatic*, who, in a world in which God's grace was equally visible in a thousand creeds, could see the truth nowhere but in his formula. He was a large, noble, generous man, with a shrewd perception of actual fact, who found himself face to face with a system of hideous iniquity.”*

And, in spite of both ecclesiastical and Rationalistic prejudice, even Dean Stanley had suggested that “John Knox himself *had a tinge of moderation* which has been little recognised, either by his friends or his enemies,” though he cites as an evidence of his moderation the not very significant proofs that Knox proposed in the Confession prepared by him to take back any of its utterances which might be shown to impugn God's word; and also that Knox was not a rigid Sabbatarian.†

Dr. Lorimer shows from these newly discovered papers that in the capacity of an English Reformer Knox exhibited, in a remarkable degree, the combination of tenderness with strength; of playful humor with the profoundest seriousness; of all genial human sympathies with fervor of devotion and burning zeal for truth. And if our author had done nothing more than bring out the facts which go to establish these more just estimates of the character of the great Reformer, he would have done no mean service to the cause of truth and righteousness. But he has accomplished far more. He has drawn a distinct and most attractive picture of Knox as the English Reformer—the gospel preacher invited by the Privy Council of Edward VI. to preach the Reformation gospel in the north of England; singularly tender and wise as a guide of souls in trouble; the chaplain of Edward VI., having a high place in his confidence, and the confidential adviser of his Privy Council; in all of which official capacities he displayed remarkable wisdom and moderation. He has brought out not only another photograph of Knox, but one so contrived that when placed side by side with the old portrait,

*Froude's Hist. of England, Vol. 6, chap. 37.

†Lectures on the Church of Scotland, Lect. iii, p. 112.

the two combine to create a more distinct and life-like representation. Just as in the beautiful results of the stereoscope, it requires two pictures, somewhat varied in the point of view to be seen together as parts of a whole, in order to the beautiful statuesque effect; so the tame uniformity of the current portrait of the Scotch Reformer, when it is viewed side by side with this new portrait of Dr. Lorimer, has a sort of stereoscopic distinctness and completeness which it could not have alone.

Referring the reader to Dr. Lorimer's admirable monograph for the view of Knox as simply an English Reformer, it is proposed here to present the character and spirit of Knox as they appear from the combination of Dr. Lorimer's picture of the English Reformer Knox with the picture of McCrie and others of Knox as the Scottish Reformer.

It is worthy of note that nothing is known of the first forty years of Knox's life, beyond the mere fact that he was born in 1505; was educated in part at the University of Glasgow; at fifteen was the fellow-student of George Buchanan, under the famous scholastic Doctor John Mair; was admitted to orders in the Church of Rome as a secular priest, at the usual age; and that he united with the office of "Rood-Priest" in the chapel of St. Nicholas, in the neighborhood of his birthplace, the function of private tutor in the family of the Kers of Samuelston.

His character and convictions as a Reformer must have developed very slowly. For though the books of Luther and Tynedale had come into Scotland so early as 1525, and Patrick Hamilton had suffered martyrdom for the gospel truth in 1528; yet Knox is found so late as 1543 signing a notarial instrument of assignment as still an apostolic notary of the Church of Rome, entitling himself, "*Johannes Knox, sacri altaris minister, Sancti Andree diocesos auctoritate apostolica notarius.*"

But in 1546 we find him the friend and companion of the holy George Wishart, accompanying him with a two-handed sword to protect him, up to the time of his martyrdom. Calderwood relates that when Wishart was leaving Haddington on the evening of his arrest, "Johne Knox preassing to have gone with him, he said, 'Nay, returne to your childrein (his pupils) and God

blesse you. One is sufficient for one sacrifice. So he caused a two-handed sword which commounlie was carried with him to be takin from Johne Knox. He obeyed albeit unwillinglie, and returned with Hugh Dowglas to Langnidrie."* Knox had by this time thoroughly embraced the Reformation under the teaching of Guillaume and Wishart, and it must be borne in mind that Wishart's Protestantism was of the Helvetic type, demanding a "Thus saith the Lord" as authority for every religious opinion and practice. So that the life of Knox as a Protestant Reformer, of the Helvetic or Calvinistic type, began in his forty-second year, immediately after the martyrdom of Wishart. The death of this martyr being avenged by the taking of the Castle of St. Andrews and the murder of Cardinal Beaton by Norman Leslie and his fellow-conspirators, they continued to hold the castle as a place of refuge for themselves and other Protestants against the wrath of Cardinal Beaton's Popish adherents. Into this castle Knox retired for shelter in 1547. His own account of this going into the shelter of St. Andrews with his pupils, and the reasons for it, is thus given in his own History of the Reformation in Scotland :

" At the Pasche after (April, 1547) came to the Castell of Sanctandros Johnne Knox, who, wearied of removing from place to place by reassone of the persecution that came upon him by this Bischoppe of Sanctandros, was determinat to have left Scotland, and to have vesited the schooles of Germany (of England then he had no pleasur be reassone that the Paipe's name being suppressed, his laws and corruptions remaned in full vigor). But becaus he had the cair of some gentilmenes childrene whome certain yearis he had nurished in godlyness. thare fatheris solisted him to go to Sanctandros, that himself might have the benefit of the Castell and thare children the benefit of his doctrine; and so (we say) came he the tyme forsaid to the said place, and, having in his cumpanye Francis Dowglas, of Langnudrye, George, his brother, and Alexander Cockburne, eldast sonne then to the Lard of Ormestoun, began to exercise thame after his accustomed manner. Beside thare grammar and other human authoris, he redd unto them a catechisme, acompt whareof he caused thame gave publictlie in the parishe Kirk of Sanctandros. He redd moreover unto thame the Evangell of Johnne. Thei of the place, but especeallie Maister Henry Balnaves and Johnne

*Calderwood's Hist., vol. i, p. 195.

Rowght, preacher, perceaving the manner of his doctrin, begane earnestlie to travail with him, that he wold tak the preaching place upon him. But he utterlie refuissed, alledging that 'he wold nott ryne whare God had not called him.' meaning that he would do nothing without a lauchfull vocatioun.*

But, after advice with Sir David Lindsay, it was agreed that the preacher Rowght (Rough) should, after a sermon on the nature of a call, publicly demand of Knox that he enter upon the work of the ministry, in the name of God as now calling through them. He yielded and preached with great power on several occasions. But soon the French fleet came in the interest of Mary and the Papists, and captured the fortress of St. Andrews, carrying off the occupants as prisoners of war, and in violation of the Articles of Capitulation, which provided for carrying them to any port in Europe out of Scotland, they were kept as chained prisoners in the galley for eighteen months or more, and subjected to every sort of annoyance in order to bring them to the service of the mass. It was at this time that the celebrated scene occurred between the galley master and Knox, when the attempt was made to force the Scotchman to kiss a splendid image of the Virgin. The story is most interesting, as told by Knox himself, though he does not mention his own name. After speaking of their attempts to worry the prisoners back to the Popish services, he continues :

"Yea, when upon the Setterday at nicht thei sung thare *Salve Regina*, the holic Scottishmen pute on thare capps, thare hoodis, or such thing as thei had to cover thare headis; and when that otheris war compelled to kyss a paynted brod, (which thei called Nostre Dame,) thei war not pressed after ones; for this was the chance. Sone after the arrivall at Nances (Nantes) thare great *Salve* was song, and a glorious painted Lady was brought in to be kissed, and, amangis otheris, was presented to one of the Scotishmen then cheyned. He gentillye said: 'Truble me nott; such an idole is accursed; and therefore I will not tuich it.' The Patron and the Arguesin, with two officeris having the chief charge of all such materis, said: 'Thou shalt handill it,' and so thei violentlie thrust it to his face, and put it betwix his handis: who, seeing the extremitie, took the idole, and advisitlie looking about, he caist it into the rivare and said: 'Let our Ladie now saif herself; she is lycht aneuch:

*Knox's Hist. of Reformation, book i, p. 185.

let hir learne to swyme.' After that was no Scottish man urged with that idolatrie."*

It was during this imprisonment that his friend Balnaves wrote his treatise of Justification, and Knox the famous preface to it.

After eighteen months of such ignominious bondage as Knox describes it—"going in irons, miserably intreated, and sore troubled by bodily infirmitie"—the Reformer was released, probably by English interposition. He went to England, and then began his labors as an English Reformer in 1549, in the forty-fifth year of his age. And now of the twenty years of active public service that followed, a summary chronological statement will show that about one-half of them were spent in connection with the Church of England, either in England or with refugees from England on the continent. Thus, early in 1549 Knox came to England, and was appointed by the English Council to be preacher in the town of Berwick. At the close of 1550 he was removed from Berwick to Newcastle. In December, 1551, he was appointed by the Privy Council one of six chaplains to Edward VI., which led to his occasional residence in London during 1552 and 1553. In October, 1552, he was offered the Bishopric of Rochester, but declined the preferment. In April, 1553, he declined the vacant living of All-Hallows in London, and on his refusal was summoned before the Privy Council to show why he refused these positions. In July of that year Edward VI. died, after which followed the persecutions of the Protestants under "the Bloody Mary," which drove him with multitudes of others to the continent. In 1554 Knox was called to become minister of the English congregation of Frankfort. In 1555, on account of the troubles stirred up by Cox, Grindal and others concerning the use of the English Liturgy, and their unworthy accusations of Knox before the Government as a seditious person, to secure their partisan ends, Knox left Frankfort and went to Geneva, and became one of the pastors of the English congregation there. In 1555-6 he made a visit to Scotland, where he preached privately in Edinburgh and elsewhere. He married in 1556 and returned to Geneva. In 1559, at the

*Knox's Hist. of Reformation, book i, p. 226.

invitation of the "Lords of Congregation," he finally left Geneva and reached Edinburgh on the 2d of May, in which month the Queen Regent published her Declaration against the Protestants, and drove them to take up arms in self-defence, and to seek alliance with England. In 1560 English troops entered Scotland, and the Queen Regent died in the Castle of Edinburgh. Peace was concluded in July, and the Parliament assembled in August, adopted the Confession of Faith, and established the Protestant religion, and in December the first General Assembly met. In 1561, at the invitation of the Scotch nobility to their young Queen Mary to visit Scotland, she came and assumed the Government, and began the attempt at once to overthrow the Protestant established religion. From this time until 1567, when Lord Darnley was murdered, when Bothwell carried off the Queen, and when the young Prince James was crowned, Knox was engaged in a constant struggle, with the Queen on the one hand and the treacherous nobles on the other, to maintain the established religion. In 1569 Regent Murray was assassinated, and Knox preached his funeral. In the following year Knox had a stroke of apoplexy, and in 1572 died.

From this chronological outline it will be seen that the prime of Knox's life was devoted to the work of reformation among Englishmen, either in England or on the continent.

It is noteworthy that so little account is made of the five years of Knox's labors in England in the Scottish Church histories of that era. Calderwood despatches his chapter of "Mr. Knox; His Travells in England," in a very few lines beyond citations from his sermons before King Edward VI. and his Privy Council, and his apostrophe to England at Hammershame :

"Mr. Knox had taught at Berwick, Newcastle, London; at Winsore before the King's majestie; at Hampton Court, at Westminster, and many other places. In his admonition to the faithful in London, Newcastle, Berwick, printed *anno* 1554, we may perceave how painfullie, how powerfullie he taught the word in England since he was delivered out of the galleys. He foretold Newcastle and Berwick of the Tweate. He was free and plaine before the Duke of Northumberland at court. Before the Duke of Somerset he was apprehended."*

*Calderwood's Hist., vol. i, p. 279.

And even in Knox's own History of the Reformation in Scotland, though so largely occupied with transactions in which he took part, the account of his labors in England is summed up in one paragraph :

"The said Knox was first appointed preacher to Berwick, then to Newcastle; last he was called to London, and to the south parts of England, where he remained to the death of King Edward the Sixth, when he left England; then he passed to Geneva, and there remained at his private study till he was called by the English congregation that then was assembled at Franckforde to be preacher to them; which vocation he obeyed, (albeit unwillingly,) at the command of that notable servant of God, John Calvyne. At Franckforde he remained till that some of the learned (whose names we suppress) moir given to unprofitable ceremonies than to sinceritie of religion began to quarrell with the said Johnne: and because thei dispared to prevail before the magistrat there, for the establishing of their corruptionis, thei accused him of treason committed against the Emperoure and against thare Sovereigne Quein Marie, that in his 'ADMONITION TO ENGLANDE,' he called the one lyttle inferiour to Nero, and the other more cruell than Zezabel."*

But of however small importance this era of his life in the estimate of himself and the Scottish historians, as compared with the subsequent twelve years of his labors in Scotland, the papers now published by Dr. Lorimer show that, during his life among the English, Knox not only became intimately connected with English life, and connected himself by marriage with influential English families, but as a public man exerted a very great influence, not only while in England, but by his association on the continent afterwards with such men as Coverdale, Bale, Whittingham, Goodman and others, and, as the result of all, left his powerful impress upon the Reformation in England.

But our present purpose is to show that, though Knox's Reformation views, derived from Wishart, were of the most decided Helvetic type, as his discourses in the Castle of St. Andrews had clearly shown, and though he held that every question of doctrine and Church order must be brought to the test of the word of God, yet in all his teachings, and even in all his controversies, he exhibited a broadness of view and a true catholic spirit that surpassed most of his contemporaries. And on all oc-

*Knox's Hist. of Ref. in Scotland, vol. i, p. 231.

casions, so far from stickling at trifles, he proceeded upon the principle which Row has so comprehensively and philosophically stated: "Many thingis must be tolerated for a tyme in the infancie of a Kirk which may not be tolerated when the Kirk comes to greater perfection—many things in *ecclesia constituenda* which are not to be tolerated in *ecclesia constituta*;"* a principle, by the way, of very large application to the measures of the Presbyterian fathers.

Dr. Lorimer brings out very prominently the thought that Knox was a Puritan—entitled to be regarded as the father of English Puritanism. While the facts cited make it evident that Knox was indeed the champion of what would now be called Evangelical Protestantism as against the High Church half-way Reformation of the Church of England, which the people were subsequently compelled by the Government to be content with, it may be questioned whether the term "Puritan," as that term came to be understood afterwards in England, may be properly applied to John Knox. The Scottish as well as many of the English Protestants were indeed Puritans, and were banded together against the common enemy, the advocates of royal prerogative under the Tudors and Stuarts. But while the English Puritans fought the Tudors and the Stuarts, because they trod upon their individual rights as freemen, the Scottish Puritan resisted the Tudors and Stuarts with their high claims to prerogative because they trod upon the crown rights of Jesus Christ in his Church. English Puritanism represented the freedom of the *individual* conscience in religion as its primary idea; Scotch Puritanism represented as its primary idea the freedom of the Church of Christ as the spiritual commonwealth. This distinction was not developed in the era of Knox in England as subsequently. But one maintaining the principles of Knox would not, in the second Reformation of the following century, have been found in sympathy with the "thorough" school of English Non-conformists. His Presbyterianism, as all true Presbyterianism, was as churchly as the Church of England.

At Knox's advent in England, the Reformation, under the

*Row's Hist. Kirk of Scotland, p. 22.

young King Edward, had proceeded to the point of the issuing and the sanction by Parliament of the "*Book of Common Prayer* and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of Englande." To this Book, with its peculiarities, most of his work as a Reformer in England had reference. While the book was a vast advance on the superstitions of the Papal worship, it fell as far short of what the more zealous Protestants desired as its advance beyond Popery shocked the prejudices of the party, then immensely in the majority, who favored reconciliation with Rome. The book could not command the services of over a half dozen bishops in the whole kingdom to introduce it into their several dioceses. Hooper, in a letter to Bullinger, in 1549, declares: "On the other hand, a great portion of the kingdom so adheres to the Popish faction as altogether to set at nought God and the lawful authority of the magistrates, so that I am greatly afraid of a rebellion and civil discords." And in another letter, a few weeks later: "The Marquis of Dorset, the Earl of Warwick, and the greater part of the King's Council, favor the cause of Christ as much as they can. Our King is such an one for his age as the world has never seen." In still another letter Hooper points out the real difficulty: "It is no small hindrance to our exertions that the form which our Senate, or, as we term it, our Parliament, has prescribed for the whole realm is of so very defective and doubtful construction in some respects, indeed manifestly impious. I am so much offended with that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the Lord's Supper."

It will be seen, therefore, from this picture of the sad state of things in England at this period, and this protest of Hooper against the earlier forms of the English Liturgy, that any protests that Knox may have made were no evidence of peculiarly rigid and narrow views on his part; but that he only protested in common with Hooper and other earnest and godly men of the Church of England against principles fatal to true reformation.

The chief issue in controversy at the time may seem to us at

this day to have been trivial. The Liturgy offered by the Government to the Church, particularly the order for administration of the Sacraments, (which were the great subject of the controversy with Rome,) retained many of the old Popish usages, as vestments, candles, wafers, and kneeling to receive the emblems in the Lord's Supper. The last of these came into great prominence. To superficial thinkers and writers, this would seem too small a matter upon which to divide and agitate the Church. But as men can understand so readily how so small an affair as a three-penny tax upon tea could become representative of the great issues of constitutional liberty involved in the American Revolution, why can they not understand how this question of kneeling at the Lord's Supper might involve all the tremendous issues involved in the death struggle with Popery in England at the middle of the sixteenth century? This question did involve in it the question between a real and a half-way reformation from Popery.

The Ritual of Edward VI., though introduced by authority of Parliament in 1549, seems to have worked its way so slowly that so late as 1552 it had not been brought into use in the churches so far north as Berwick. Knox, though one of Cranmer's licensed preachers, seems to have preached and administered the Sacraments there according to his views of the word of God, without encumbering himself with the forms prescribed by the Prayer-book of Edward VI. His success as a minister among a rude, fierce people, in a border town, garrisoned with soldiers, seems to have been astonishing. In the popular impression and rumors of his success doubtless originated the charge repeated by Queen Mary ten years afterwards, that he had "practised necromancy upon the people in England when a minister there." He carried over the great bulk of his people from the superstitions of the mass to the simple form of the Lord's Supper, as administered by Presbyterians ever since. His bold, manly style seems to have been very attractive to the soldiers of which the town of Berwick, being on the border, was always kept full. And though within twelve months he was transferred to Newcastle, the letter to his congregation at Berwick which Dr. Lori-

mer recently discovered, shows that there grew up between him and them a lasting affection. In his famous vindication in response to the demand made of him in 1550 to give account of the doctrine he had constantly affirmed in Berwick, occurs this characteristic passage, when contrasting the doctrine of the mass with his true doctrine of the Lord's Supper:

“They differ in use, for in the Lord's Supper *the minister and congregation sat both at ane tabill*—no difference betwixt thame in pre-eminence nor habit, as witnesseth Jesus Christ with his discipills and the practice of the Apostles after his death. But in the Papisticall Masse the priestis (so they will be stylit) are placed by themselves at ane altar. And I wold ask of the autorite thair of and what scripture commandeth so to be done. They must be cled in a sevarill habit, whair of no mention is made in the New Testament. It will not excuse tham to say Paule commandit all to be done with ordour and decentlie. Dair thair be so bold as to affirme that the Supper of Jesus Chryst was done without ordour and undecentlie, whairin were seen no disagysit vestamentis? Or will thair set up to us agane the Leviticall priesthood? Suld not all be taught by the plane word?”

It is very manifest, therefore, that the popular conception of a ritual of the Church of England at that time, and also that of her real Reformers, and of the Council at whose request Knox made this exposition, was far different from that which was settled upon after the Bloody Mary had crushed out the first Protestantism. Knox, in this grand vindication before the Council and an immense crowd, represents the Protestantism of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Hooper.

In December, 1551, it was determined that the King should retain six chaplains in ordinary, who should not only attend upon him, but also be itineraries and preach the gospel over the whole of Britain—two of them remaining at court, and four of them to go preaching, two and two, changing circuits year by year. It was doubtless in this character as one of the Government itinerants that Knox preached next at Newcastle; for there is an entry in the Privy Council Journal of 1552 in these terms: “A warrant to the four gentlemen of the Privie Chamber to pay to Mr. Knoles, preacher in the North, in the way of the King's reward the sum of XL l.” And Knox himself refers in one of

his letters to the fact that "the Queen's majesty (Mary) or the Thesaurer will be XL pounds richer by me;" that is, that his stipend had failed to be paid by that much. As these six itinerant chaplains were selected on account of their distinction as preachers, here is evidence clear enough that Knox had gained the confidence of the pious young Edward VI. and his Privy Council. In such position it was occasionally his duty to speak of national affairs. No marvel, therefore, that a man who spoke with his faithfulness should arouse the fierce wrath of the Popish and semi-Popish nobles, and cause the memory of Knox's ministry in England to be execrated by these, and by their admiring biographers and historians, and the devotees of a half-reformed, mongrel, semi-Papal, semi-Protestant Church.

It was in the autumn of 1552 that Knox visited the court in his capacity as chaplain to the King, and preached the sermon before the court which created so much stir on the subject of kneeling at the Lord's Supper. This was no new question to the King and court, for Hooper, in one of his Lent sermons on Isaiah in 1550, had declared, touching the receiving of the Lord's Supper :

"The outward behaviour and gesture of the receiver should want all kind of suspicion, shew, or inclination of idolatry. Wherefore, seeing kneeling is a shew and external sign of honouring and worshipping, and heretofore hath grievous and damnable idolatry been committed by the honouring of the Sacrament, I would wish it were commanded by the magistrates that the communicators and receivers should do it standing or sitting."

Knox's sermon on the subject before the court is nowhere reported; but the record is that it was a vehement one and produced so great an effect upon the minds of the nobles and great men as to have excited the expectation that a further reform of the Church would grow out of it. The excitement was no doubt the greater because Parliament was then issuing a new Rubric for the first time *commanding* kneeling at the Lord's Supper. Nor is it singular that Knox, having taught his people for two years past that sitting was the proper position, and foreseeing the trouble which the new Rubric must excite in the Northern churches, should speak strongly as a royal chaplain against it.

That Knox displayed none of the spirit of a fanatic in his opposition against certain errors of the new Prayer-book, but with frankness and moderation stated his views, is evident from Calderwood's picture of the scene between Knox and the Privy Council, before which he was called to answer why he had refused, first, the Bishopric of Rochester, and subsequently also the benefice of All-Hallows in London. Since, so far from taking offence, the Council immediately sent him out again as a royal chaplain itinerant to Buckinghamshire :

"He was called before the Counsell the 14th of April, 1553, and demanded three questions: First, Why he refused the benefice offered to him? Next, Whether he thought that no Christian might serve in the ministree of England, according to the rites and lawes of the realme? Thirdly, Why he kneeled not at the Lord's Supper? To the first he answers that his conscience did witness to him that he might profite more in some other place than in London; and, further, Northumberland had given a contrare command. To the second, that unless many things were reformed, no minister could discharge his office before God in England, for no minister had authoritie to divide and separate the lepers from the whole, which was a cheefe point of his office. Yit he did not refuse such office as might appear to promote God's glory in utterance of Christ's gospel in a mean degre. To the third he answered that Christ's action was most perfyte; that it was most sure to follow his example; that kneeling was man's addition or imaginatioun. In this last question there was great contention between the whole table and him."*

And just here it is that the newly discovered letter to his congregation at Berwick a year or two later brings out the new view of Knox's character. Though his appeal was so powerful as to cause a desire in many of the Privy Council to reconsider the Rubric, Cranmer, who in this strongly dissented from Knox, pressed his point that Parliament had already decided the question, and went forward to put forth the order for kneeling. But Knox, with so much to arouse his spirit, when subsequently the new Rubric, as he anticipated, was likely to create great excitement in his old charge, wrote to them from the continent in the following considerate, compromising strain :

"These things granted unto me, I nether will gainstand godly magistrates, nether brak commune order, nor yit contend with my superiors or

*Calderwood's Hist., vol i, p. 280.

fellow-preachers, but with patience wile I bear that one thing; daylie thirsting and calling on God for reformation of that and others. * * * And, thairfore, brethren, it is not the feare of corporall punishment, but *onlye the feare that Christian charitie be violated* and brokin that swaideth and moves me to give place in this behalf. Albeit I could, with all soberness and dew obedience, shew causes why sitting at the Lord's table is to be preferred unto kneeling; yett if the upper powers, not admitting the same, would execute upon me the penaltie of their law, (because they may not suffer a common order to be violated,) assuredly 'Christian charitie was broken and dissolved,' &c.

"And besides the breach of charitie, which is always to be avoided, I have respect to the quieting of your consciences, that if ye shall be compelled by the rigor of a law to alter that order, which of God's assured truth ye have learned and received, that nether shall ye dampne yourselves as transgressours of any law or violators of any common order for that which before ye have godlie used; nether yet that ye shall be accused as declinars or fallen back from the treuthe for that which ye shall after do; for when ye followed and received Christ's simpill institution sitting at a tabill, thair was no law, (except the statute of that Roman Antichrist,) and, thairfore, where there is no law there can be no transgression. And if now, by especial command of your uppar powers, ye shall be compelled to observe the common order, God forbid that ye shall be dampned or judged as shrinking from Christ; if first ye rejois not that ye are called back again to a gesture that is joyned with danger in that action. * * * If these things by you be righteouslie observed, understand and believed, God forbid yat any of you shall be suspected, as that your former fervencaye toward the treuthe began to abaitt and wax cold, albeit contrary to your harts' desire, your order be altered; which unto my heart is so dolorous yat yf anye corporall pane that my wicked carcass is able to sustean nicht confirm and establish that ordour which Godd's treuthe hath planted among you, rather I should suffer deathe," &c.

Such is the tone in which the Berwick ex-pastor writes back to his beloved flock when the new Rubric concerning kneeling at the Sacrament is about to be enforced upon them by the Government. It tends greatly to enhance the force of this testimony in favor of moderation and peace in the Church, when we come now to examine another of these newly discovered papers, which proves to be a powerful "*Memorial to the Privy Council*," which Knox and some of his co-workers had presented to the court against the thirty-eighth of the forty-two articles of the Prayer-book of Edward VI., which seems to have been submitted

to them for their advice. While speaking in such a tone of moderation as we have seen to the body of the people, Knox (for this memorial to the Privy Council is evidently in large part his or inspired by him) can speak in tones of manliest protest to men in power against the very order to which he afterward advises the people to submit. The memorialists, taking exception to the thirty-eighth article on "The Book of Common Prayer," which declared the whole ritual, including the new Rubric, to be in conformity with the word of God, proceeds to except specially to this one ordinance of kneeling, and presents an elaborate argument against it, of which the following are some of the points:

"First. No mane as we suppose of holie judgment will denye but knelyng in the action of the Lord's table proceeded from a fals and erroneous opinion, to wit: That there was Christis naturall body containd either by way of transsubstanciation or else by conjunction reall or corporall of his body and blood within the visible elements. That the same deceivable opinion doith yet remayne in the heartes of many, experience itself will well testyfy and playnelie declare. Then if a law may be confirmed, (Goddess majesty not offended,) that ceremonie that hath spronge furthe from a false opinion, &c.

"Secondaryly. By knelyng in the Lord's Supper the consciences of weyke brethren are not a lyttel offended, &c.

"Third. The Churche of God that be strong and growne to some perfection is greatly injured; for it is permitted for idolatours to triumph over the Church of God, seeing that after so long contention between the professors of the treuthe and maintainers of idolatrie, the idolatours have vanquished; and of their victorie they glorie not a littel, &c.

"Finally. As knelyng is no gesture meete at the Lord's table, so doth it obscure the joyfull sygnifications of that holie mysterie," &c.

These extracts are of profound interest ecclesiastically as pointing out the origin of the famous "Declaration on Kneeling," which was appended to the English Prayer-book, and was the most Protestant thing in it; and also as an evidence of the powerful influence of Knox in framing the English Articles of Religion. But they have a special interest as bearing upon the personal character of Knox as a Reformer, showing, by a comparison with his letter to his former charge at Berwick, that whilst he could stand forth boldly for the truth before the court, he could act as pacificator of the people when disposed to rebel

against the very order of the Government which he had labored to prevent.

It adds still further to the force of the facts already stated that his moderation exposed Knox occasionally to the sorrowful rebukes of his brethren, as having taken a position in which his views were used by their enemies against them. This appears from the fourth of these newly discovered papers, which is "A Letter Written to Mr. Knoxe," from which we can present but brief extracts:

"Our brethren do give hartly thanks for your gentle letter written unto them, but, to be plain with you, *it is not in all points liked*; and, for my part, if I had known the tenor of it when I was with you, I would have said many words that I never spoke. * * *

"Whereas you wish that our consciences had a better ground, truly we cannot see by these Scriptures that should alter our consciences from a Reformed Church that hath those marks to go back to mixtures. * * * Also, when you say, 'God forbid that we should damn all for false prophets and heretics that agree not with us in our apparel, and other opinions that teacheth the substance of doctrine and salvation in Christ Jesus', we heartily thank you for your good desire, but we never were of that mind to condemn any man's person," &c.

Now, taking these presentations of Knox in these three papers—first, as the calm, moderate adviser of the people to waive every matter of feeling and prejudice against an obnoxious ritual; secondly, as the bold and manly profester again the Government action when proposing to order such ritual; thirdly, as bearing the reproaches of his brethren, interpreting his moderation as unfaithfulness to his testimony—and we have a character in many points the opposite that of the Knox who has heretofore figured in Presbyterian history. We add here an extract or two from Knox's private letters by way of showing that the internal movings of the man's spirit corresponded with this view of the gentleness and moderation of his public acts and deliverances.

Dr. McCrie tells us of the somewhat romantic courtship of Knox and Marjory Bowes, daughter of Richard Bowes, of Aske, whose family resided near Newcastle while Knox was there, and how, as usual, "the course of true love did not run smoothly," by reason of the opposition of the father to the marriage. But

Mrs. Bowes, the mother, was a woman of eminent piety, yet subject often to profound religious melancholy and doubts of her acceptance with Christ; and between her and Knox, who was her constant spiritual adviser, there grew up the strongest friendship. Dr. Laing, of the Advocate's Library, the editor of Knox's writings, who deserves the thanks and affectionate regards of all English speaking Presbyterians for his eminent services, has brought out in his "Knox's Works" (vol. 3) a collection of "Epistles to Mrs. Bowes and her daughter Marjory." In these letters we get views of the inmost heart of the great Reformer. In one of them, addressed to Mrs. Bowes to relieve her spiritual darkness, we find him saying of himself, after referring to former conversations with her:

"But now absent, and so absent that neither of us by corporeal presence can receive comfort of the other, I call to mind how that oftimes when, with dolorous hearts, we have begun our talking, God hath sent great comfort unto both, which now, for my own part, I commonly want. The exposition of your troubles and the acknowledging of your infirmities were first unto me a very mirror and glass wherein I beheld myself so rightly painted forth that nothing could be more evident to my own eyes," &c.

Then, again, in another letter, we find a paragraph in which this man, supposed to be so rough and plain spoken when reproving the sins of others, is as plain spoken of himself in sentences not less eloquent than the famous passage in Hooker which it so much resembles:

"Albeit I never lack the presence and plain image of my own wretched infirmity, yet, seeing sin so manifestly abound in all estates, I am compelled to thunder out the threatenings of God against all rebellers; in doing whereof (albeit as God knoweth I am no malicious and obstinate sinner) I sometimes am wounded, knowing myself criminal and guilty in many, yea, in all things, (malicious obstinacy laid aside,) that in others I reprehend. Judge not, mother, that I write these things debasing myself otherwise than I am. No! I am worse than my pen can express. In body ye think I am no adulterer; let so be. But the heart is infected with foul lusts, and will lust, albeit I lament never so much. Externally I commit no idolatry, but my wicked heart loveth the self, and cannot be refrained from vain imaginations; yea, not from such as were the fountain of all idolatry. I am no man-killer with my hands, but I help not my needy brother so liberally as I may and ought.

I steal not horse, money, nor clothes from my neighbor, but that small portion of worldly substance I bestow not so rightly as his holy law requireth. I bear no false witness against my neighbor, in judgment or otherwise, before men, but I speak not the truth of God so boldly as it becometh his true messenger to do. And thus, in conclusion, there is no vice repugning to God's holy will expressed in his law wherewith my heart is not infected."

It needs only the following extract from another letter to Mrs. Bowes, illustrative of the great Reformer's tenderness toward all troubled souls bewailing their sinfulness and helplessness, to complete the view of his inner life :

"Fear not, mother, that the care of you passes from my heart. Na! He to whom nothing is secret knoweth that I never present myself, by Jesus Christ, before the throne of my Father's mercy, but there also I commend you; and seldom is it that otherwise ye pass from my remembrance. The very instant hour that your letters were presented unto me I was talking of you, by reason that three honest poor women were come to me, and were compleaning of their great infirmity, and were showing unto me the great assaults of the enemy, and I was opening the cause and commodities thereof, whereby all our eyes weeped at one time, and I was praying unto God that ye and some others had been with me for the space of twa hours: and even at that instant came your letters into my hands, whereof ane part I read unto them, and ane of them said: 'O would to God I might speak with that person, for I perceive there be more tempted than I.'"

Behold, then, this fierce man of war, before whose Herculean blows the kingdom of Satan trembled and sinners in high places quaked, now unfolding the secrets of his own heart and confessing that his strokes at sinners fell first upon his own soul, and, anon, sitting weeping with three honest poor women, bewailing their sins together! Here we have the secret of that "necromancy" to which the unspiritual multitude attributed his power of fascination over the English people.

Space fails us to follow the Reformer through his labors among the English on the continent, to which they and he were alike driven on the death of young Edward VI. by the "Bloody Mary" and her parasites, now exalted to power. The history of his labors at Frankfort and Geneva could be shown to have been in tone and spirit but a continuation of his labors in England. Had he been left undisturbed in his labors at Frankfort,

there is every reason to believe his success would have been as wonderful as at Berwick and Newcastle. The influx of a new element from England, driven out by the inconsiderate savagery of Mary's rule, soon, however, disturbed the peace of the congregation. A coterie of those Ritualistic martinets, (whose pseudo-aristocratic airs, and their intensely narrow and brainless conceptions of the public worship of God as a display of man-millinery and lisping cockneyism, has exposed the Church of England, so far as represented by them, to the contempt of both Papists and Protestants,) came into the congregation of the exiles at Frankfort with insolent demands to introduce the Liturgy of Edward VI., which as yet one-tenth of the English people themselves had not accepted; and in order to get Knox, their fellow-exile, out of the way, were guilty of the Iscariotism of trumping up against him the charge of treason against the Emperor, founding the charge upon some old strongly rhetorical expression which he had used long before he came to the continent. Of course, a foreigner and an exile could not afford to discuss ritual questions with a party which sought to bring in the secular power to their aid. Knox, therefore, removed to Geneva, and labored there as pastor of the English congregation, enjoying meanwhile the society and the instructions of the illustrious Calvin. Through the whole of this period Knox's correspondence exhibits him as the same earnest but moderate advocate of the great doctrines of the Reformation, never stickling for forms and non-essentials, as Dr. Paul Henry and others represent, but in the spirit of a broad catholicity, laboring to bring all Protestants to stand upon a common platform in their protest against the tyranny and wickedness of Rome.

With the key thus furnished in the first ten years of his public ministry in the Church of England and among the English on the continent, we are able to unlock the secrets of the character, conduct, and spirit of Knox, the Scottish Reformer, when, in 1560, he was called by the "Lords of Congregation" to return to his native country, and became the guide of the Reformation movement there. We may now see that whatever of uncompromising harshness and unyielding stubbornness he may have ex-

hibited came not altogether from the personal disposition of the man, nor from his ambitious desires to rule or ruin, but from his courageous and earnest zeal for a true spiritual Church against avaricious nobles and other leaders, traitors to the cause, who sought to grasp the wealth of which the Church of Rome was despoiled; and the open effort of a Popish Queen, backed by the power of France and Spain, to crush out the Reformation in Scotland, as it was crushed out in France and Spain. Knox, who, as the English Reformer, was a man of peace, was, as the Scottish Reformer, compelled to become a man of war or prove faithless to his mission. Thus forced into the conflict, he recognised the fact that so many are slow to comprehend—that “war is war.”

The limits of one article forbid such illustration of this proposition as the subject merits. The other view of Knox as the Scottish Reformer must be left to a future occasion.

ARTICLE III.

THEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE, INVOLVING AN INFINITE ELEMENT.

FATHERS AND BRETHREN OF THE ASSEMBLY: Did not usage require that something be said touching my induction into this chair, I would prefer to be silent upon that subject. A few words will, I trust, suffice for the demands of the occasion, and I shall pass on to the discussion of a more congenial topic.

The act just performed in your presence scarcely needs comment—it speaks for itself. Yet it is proper that I should say it has been done without reserve. I accept your Standards in the sense in which they were construed by the Old School Church in 1837 and 1838, and in which they are notoriously understood by the Southern Presbyterian Church. Accustomed for years to teach those venerable documents in the pulpit, the Sabbath-

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVIII.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXVII.

ARTICLE I.

JOHN KNOX AS THE ENGLISH AND AS THE SCOTTISH REFORMER.

In connexion with a notice of Dr. Lorimer's monograph on the "Knox Papers," recently discovered in the Williams Library, it was proposed in our number for July last to present the character of John Knox as a Reformer in the new light thrown upon it by the discovery of these papers. And as the best method of presenting this character, it was proposed to exhibit him, first, in the light of the newly discovered papers, as the English Reformer; then, with the key to his character thus furnished, to reëxamine the current conception of Knox as the fierce, implacable, narrow, iron-sided Reformer of the Church of Scotland.

It has been shown from the "Knox Papers" that in his career as a Reformer of the Church of England under Edward VI., and among the English exiles on the Continent, embracing nearly the first half of his public life, Knox exhibited little of the fierceness and harshness of character which is popularly attributed to him; and therefore the presumption is that any fierceness and harshness exhibited by him during his career as the Scottish Reformer may not have been from the inherent tendencies of the man's mind and heart, but because the circumstances that surrounded him and the work which he was called upon to do, forced upon him as the leader of reform the exercise of harsh and seem-

ingly fierce treatment of his adversaries. The purpose of the present writing in continuation will be, by a brief examination of some peculiarities of the Reformation in Scotland, to show that whatever of fierceness, harshness, and apparent narrowness and bigotry may seem to have marked the public conduct of Knox, came not from any change of the nature, spirit, and character in Knox, the English Reformer, but from the necessities of his new position as a Reformer in Scotland.

It is very commonly said that the difference between the Reformations of England and Scotland was that in England the Reformation was accomplished by the king, whereas in Scotland it was a Reformation accomplished *by the people*. The true statement of the case is, as may be seen by a careful study of the details, that while in England the Reformation was indeed monarchical, in Scotland it was *baronial*. And this difference was most important in this, that, while in England the monarch was practically omnipotent at the era of the Reformation and did reform the Church at pleasure, in Scotland the principles and spirit of the feudal system still prevailed to such a degree that the barons were fully a match for the throne, not only when the throne was occupied by a woman or a child, but even when a vigorous man might be seated upon it. It was these barons who first began the conflict with Popery. Even before the death of James V., Cardinal Beaton is said to have presented to that monarch a list of 360 landed proprietors suspected of heresy. Wishart, anterior to 1546, had preached the gospel under protection of the powerful barons; and when he was murdered, a conspiracy of barons avenged his death.

But while many of these barons were, no doubt, true Christian men and sincere Protestants, many of them, on the other hand, were avaricious, self-seeking, treacherous politicians, who were ready enough to run with the Reformation and overthrow Popery, not chiefly because Popery had trod under foot their liberties, but because Popery had immense estates and offered a rich spoil. For at the period of the Reformation it is estimated that fully one-half of the whole property of the kingdom of Scotland was held by the Church. It is no railing accusation of the clergy

that these barons were avaricious beyond degree. It was the testimony of one of their own number. For even so early as 1543, the Regent Arran is represented to have said that unless the sin of covetousness made them reformers he did not see how a reformation could ever be effected. Nor was the propensity to plunder confined to barons on the Protestant side after the overthrow of Popery. The revenues of the crown in Scotland were very meagre, and when it came to providing means for the support of Queen Mary with all her French ideas of the grandeur and display suitable to the dignity of a queen, nothing was more natural than that she should look to these confiscated estates of the Church. Having been already wrested from the Church, no scruples of sacrilege hindered her from seizing them—nay rather of claiming them as part of the patrimony of the crown. The Protestant Reformer who assumed that these estates and revenues which had originally been consecrated to religion were still a sacred trust, to be devoted to the religious interests of the people, must necessarily, therefore, find himself in the position of an agent intrusted with treasure, between two hostile bands of freebooters, with no option, however amiable, if a brave and honest man, but to fight and to fight fiercely. The application of these suggestions to the case of Knox will be seen farther on.

It will be remembered that the overthrow of Popery as the religion of the kingdom of Scotland had already been practically effected by the barons and gentlemen combining under the title of "Lords of the Congregation," who represented such bodies of the people as had refused longer to attend upon the service of the mass, and were accustomed to gather in private houses for a separate worship. The document known as the "First Covenant" was signed by such powerful nobles as Argyle, Glencairne, Morton, John Erskine of Dun, and others, so early as Dec. 3d, 1557, nearly two years before the return of Knox from the Continent. This Covenant declares: "We do promise before the majesty of God and his congregation that we by his grace shall with all diligence continually apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives, to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed word of God and his congregation, and shall labor

at one possibility to have faithful ministers truly and properly to minister Christ's gospel and sacraments to his people." This bond had already knit these Protestants into one body and pledged them to a definite line of conduct.

In the following year we find these Protestants boldly petitioning the Queen for reformation in what Calderwood styles "*The first Oration and Petition of the Professors to the Queene Regent in the beginning of the yeere 1558.*" In this petition they crave protection "against the most unjust tyrannie used against your graces subjects by those that be called the estates ecclesisastical," and ask for these five things—

"*Furst*, humblie we aske, that as we have, by the lawes of this realme, after long debate, obtained libertie to reade the holie bookes of the Old and New Testament in our commoun tongue, as spirituall foode to our soules, so from hencefurth, it may be lawfull that we may meete, publickly or privatly, to the commoun prayers in our vulgar tongue, &c.

"*Secundly*, if it sall happin in our said meetings, anie hard place of Scripture to be read, of the which no profite ariseth to the hearers, it sall be lawfull to anie persons qualifeid with knowledge, being present, to interpret and open up the said hard places, to God's glorie and the profite of the auditorie, &c.

"*Thirdly*, that the holie sacrament of Baptism may be used in the vulgar tongue, that the godfathers and the godmothers and the witnesses may not onlie understand the points of the league and the contract made, &c.

"*Fourthly*, we desire that the holie sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or of his blessed bodie and blood, may likewise be ministred to us in the vulgar tongue, and in both kindes, according to the plaine institution of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

"*Lastly*, we most humblie require that the wicked, slaunders, and most detestable life of the Prelats, and of the state ecclesiasticall, may be reformed, that the people by them have not to occasioun (as of manie dayes they have had) to contemne their ministerie and preaching of the Word, whereof they sould be messingers," &c.*

And Calderwood relates how notwithstanding "in the moneth of Aprile this yeere, 1558, that mercilesse tyranne, the Bishop of Sanct Andrewes, apprehended and putt to death most cruellie Walter Mills;" and notwithstanding "the Queen Regent's double-dealing with the professours," still "the gospel flourished;"

*Calderwood's History, Vol. I., p. 335.

how the old Earl of Argyle took the protection of John Dowglas, caused him to preach publicly in his house, and reformed many things according "to his counsel;" and how "the congregation" struggled on against the Queen and the French through 1558 and 1559, until 21st October, 1559, when the lords, barons, and burgesses gathered in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, did after consultation and hearing an argument from Scripture on the lawfulness of deposing sovereigns, from John Willocke, the preacher of Edinburgh, did declare "An Act of Suspension of the Queen's regiment." So that everything was ripe for the great act of Parliament of August, 1560, which abolished Popery and established Protestantism, before John Knox stepped upon the public stage in Scotland on the 2d day of May, 1559.

And as it was not Knox who raised the storm in Scotland, so neither did he rush unbidden into the conflict as a volunteer warrior impelled by the love of conflict and battle. He had indeed kept up earnest communication with the Lords of Congregation. He had in October, 1557, written those letters from Dieppe which had so immediate and powerful an effect in rousing the languishing zeal of the reforming barons, and which probably caused the framing of the first covenant already referred to. But those letters, be it remembered, were occasioned by their having invited and urged him to come to Scotland and then themselves failing in faith. For the letters refer to sacrifices which they had caused him to make to no purpose—even the giving up his beloved flock at Geneva, the leave-taking that caused so many brave men to weep, the tearing himself away from his unprotected family, etc. The point of these letters is not that he is eager for the conflict, but that they should have disturbed his peace at Geneva and induced him to come to Dieppe, on his way to Scotland, there to learn that they had abandoned the enterprise in which they had implored his help.

It is true also that in 1558 he published "The Appellation of John Knox from the cruell and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishops and cleargie of Scotland; with his supplication and exhortation to the nobilitie, estates, and commonaltie of the same realme." But surely it is not to be

regarded as evidence of a fierce and warlike spirit that a man should assail indignantly a decree of death pronounced against him because in a visit to Scotland in 1556 he had preached the doctrine of justification by faith alone, of which he gives this account :

“This doctrine I did beleve to be so conformable to God’s holie Scriptures that I thought no creature could have beene so impudent as to have damned anie point or article of the same. Yitt neverthesse, me as an hereticke, and this doctrine as hereticall, have your false bishops and ungodlie clergie damned, pronouncing against me a sentence of death, in testificatioun whereof they have burnt a picture.”*

No doubt the vigorous and masterly argument into which this “Appellation” extends produced a profound impression in Scotland, and did much toward bringing about the uprising against Queen Mary and her French. But no one will say that a man whom ecclesiastical tyrants are endeavoring to disgrace before his countrymen by a sentence of death and burning in effigy, exhibits any special fierceness and malignity of spirit in making defence in no measured terms against such antagonists.

After turning back from Dieppe, discouraged and mortified, to his quiet studies and communion with Calvin in Geneva, it may well be supposed that Knox would not go back as a volunteer to the ecclesiastical battle that came to its crisis in 1560. It was only at the most earnest entreaties of the “Lords of the Congregation,” with expressions of sorrow for the previous failure of courage in 1557, the news of which stopped him on his journey to Scotland and turned him back at Dieppe, that he was induced to come. He came both because of the urgent appeals from Scotland, backed by appeals hardly less earnest from Calvin and the leading spirits of the Reformation.

It is sufficiently evident from the brief allusions already made to the condition of things in Scotland, that on Knox’s arrival it was too late for the most moderate and strife-hating man to preach peace and reconciliation. And indeed he must have been more than man if after his long exile all the energies of his nature had not been roused in preaching the gospel to his long oppressed

*Calderwood’s History, Vol. I., p. 348.

and benighted countrymen, now thirsting for the word of life. In a letter to Mrs. Anne Locke from Leith, May 3d, 1559, the day after his landing in Scotland, he says:

“I am uncertane as yitt what God sall further worke in this countrie, except that I see that the battell sall be great, for Satan rageth even to the uttermost, and I am come, I praise my God, in the brunt of the battell.”

And in another of his letters when as yet he had not been six weeks in the country, he bursts forth in this strain:

“O that my heart could be thankfull for the superexcellent benefite of my God! The long thirst of my wretched heart is satisfeid in abundance that is above my expectatioun: for now fortie dayes and moe, hath my God used my tongue in my native countrie to the manifestatioun of his glorie. Whatsoever now sall follow as tuiching my owne carcase, His holie name be praised! The thirst of the poore people here, as weill as of the nobilitie, is woundrous great, which putteth me in comfort that Christ Jesus sall triumphe for a space heere, in the north and the extreme parts of the earth. We feare that the tyrannie of France sall, under cloke of religioun, seeke a plaine conqueist of us. But God is potent,” &c.*

Here is the very spirit as yet of Knox, the English Reformer. The effects of his preaching is described by all contemporary writers as very marvellous. No doubt the main design of the Lords of Congregation in calling Knox to Scotland was that he might by his preaching rally the masses to sustain the work of Reformation now thoroughly begun. But he spoke no less freely and plainly to noble than to peasant. Even before the Parliament of 1560 had risen, he had preached that series of discourses on Haggai, the spirit of the whole of which is fairly represented by his bold appeal to the nobles against their selfish greed after the spoils—applying to them the words of the prophet and demanding of them—“Is it a time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses and this house lie waste?” It was this appeal that roused Lord Maitland to anger and drew from him the sneer, “We may now forget ourselves and bare the barrow to build the house of God.” It was soon apparent that many of the Lords of the Congregation were ready to cast off Knox as soon as he had served their purpose.

*Calderwood's History, Vol. I., p. 470.

The great theme of the revilers of Knox as a preacher has been the popular rising against the priests and monks and the destruction of ecclesiastical buildings and ornaments, which followed immediately upon his itinerant labors as a preacher immediately upon his arrival. But it is very questionable whether Knox is to be held responsible for the consequences of outbreaks of popular fury, which were evidently beyond his control. Row,* indeed, speaking of the arrival of Knox and his powerful preaching, accepts as probably authentic the simile of the crows which tradition attributes to the Reformer, and justifies its wisdom:

“So the Reformation,” says he, “passed forward daylie; needles kirks and idolatrous, prophan, sumptuous buildings, were demolished; and I think it wes true that Mr. Knox said, ‘Doun with those crow nests, else the crowes will big in them againe.’ And was there any wrong there? I will not justifie all particulare things done at that tyme, in easting doune some kirks which had been usefull for God’s service; in taking away bells, and ruggin doun such ornaments as might make the doers of that great commoditie worldlie (riche); for can any think that in such a great alteration in a kingdome everie man did everie thing rightlie?”

But Calderwood, in reciting the details of these riots of the Reformation, shows how again and again, as at the burning of Skoone, Mr. Knox and the lords endeavored to save ecclesiastical property from the hands of violence. And he makes it evident that the inciting cause to most of these devastations was not Knox’s preaching, but the sense of outrage suffered from the ecclesiastics by the masses. Thus he recites how at Skoone, as the destruction of the Abbey was going forward,

“A poore aged matron, seeing the flamme of fire ascending and perceaving manie offended [that is the lords and Knox’s friends who had dissuaded], said in sober maner, ‘Now I see God’s judgements are just, and no man is able to save (alluding to Knox) when He will punishe. According to my remembrance this place hath beene nothing elles but a denne of whoormongers. It is almost incredible to beleave how manie wives have beene defyled, and virgins deflowred, by these filthie beasts which have beene fostered in this denne, but speciallic by that wicked man, the bishop. If all men knew as mucche as I, they would praise God, and no man would be offended.’†

*Row’s History of Kirk of Scotland, p. 12.

†Calderwood’s History, Vol. I., p. 472.

So in the case of the destruction at Perth. The riot grew out of the circumstance, that, as after Knox's sermon against idolatry a priest undertook in contempt to celebrate mass, a boy who stood near the altar cried out against it; then, as Calderwood proceeds to narrate—

“The preest gave the boy a great blow; the boy in great anger taketh up a stone, and throwing it at the preest, hitt the tabernacle, and brake doun an image. Immediatlíe after, the whole multitude cast stones, and dispatched the tabernacle and other monuments of idolatrie, before the tenth man within the toun was advertised of it. When the noise of this went through the toun, a great multitude, not of gentlemen or zealous professors, but of rascalls and the inferiour sort of people, assembled to that church. When they found that nothing was further to be done there, they runne without deliberatioun to the Grey and Blacke friers. . . . The spoile was permitted to the poore. The preachers had before threatened all men that for covetousnesse' sake sould putt their hand to suche reformatioun. . . . Men's consciences were so beaten with the Word, that they had no respect to their own particular profite.”*

To the same purpose is Knox's own account (Knox Hist. of Ref. in Scotland, Vol. I., p. 318–19) of his arrival in Scotland and his relation to the Perth or Sanct Johnstown affair:

“The secound of Maij, 1559, arryved Johne Knox from France, who ludging two nyctis onlie in Edinburgh, hearing the day appointed to his brethren (to appear before the Queen) repared to Dundee, whare he earnestlie requyred thame, ‘That he myght be permitted to assist his brethren, and to geve confessioun of his faith with thame;’ which granted to him, he departed to Sanct Johnestoun with thame; whare he began to exhorte, according to the grace given unto him. . . . The Lard of Dun, cuming to Sanct Johnestoun, expounded the caise evin as it was (the Queen's order to ‘put the preachers to the horn, prohibiting all men to give aid and comfort to them’), whiche understand, the multitud was so enflammed, that *neyther could the exhortatioun of the preacheare, nor the commandiment of the magistrat, stay thame from distroying the places of idolatrie.*”

There is, therefore, no reason to suppose that Knox had any further responsibility for the destruction of the monasteries and other ecclesiastical property than have the public men immediately concerned for the destruction of property by infuriated mobs, which so often occurs even in the most enlightened and loyal States of what is claimed to be “the best government the

*Calderwood's History, Vol. I., p. 441–42.

world ever saw." And even assuming that it was his powerful appeals that excited the multitude, it was not unnatural that even a moderate and amiable man, under the sentence of death passed upon him by tyrants in contempt of all law, and speaking on the question of life or death to himself, should speak a little violently.

The historians and critics hostile to Knox, however, are wont to assail both him and his co-laborers in the ministry at a point further back, and to ring the charges upon the incongruity of a minister of the gospel of peace making use of his sacred position for assailing the political men and measures of the time at all. The obvious fallacy underlying this criticism is its anachronism in applying to the men of a revolutionary age, struggling against a despotism that recognised no such rights as either civil liberty or liberty of conscience, the measure of conduct proper to be applied to the ministry in the 19th century, under constitutional governments.

Mr. Froude suggests with excellent judgment and discrimination—

"The power of passing censure upon the conduct of public men in the name of right and wrong is one which in one form or other has existed and ought to exist in every well ordered community; and the pulpit critiques of the age grew out of the necessities of the case, since there was no press, as now, to canvass proceedings of the Parliament and the government."*

And Dr. McCrie, before him, had made, with still more point, a like suggestion:

"The pulpit was in fact the only organ by which public opinion was or could be expressed; and the ecclesiastical courts were the only assemblies in the nation which possessed anything that was entitled to the name of liberty or independence. Parliament had its business prepared to its hand and laid before it in the shape of acts, which required only its assent. Discussions and freedom of speech were unknown in its meetings. The courts of justice were dependent on the will of the sovereign, and frequently had their proceedings dictated by letters and messengers from the throne. It was the preachers who first taught the people to express an opinion; and the assemblies of the Church set the earliest examples of a regular and firm opposition to the arbi-

*Froude's *History of England*, chap. 29.

trary and unconstitutional measures of the court. This is a fact which has been overlooked by most modern writers, who instead of presenting accurate and liberal views of the state of society at that period, have too often amused their readers by pointing sarcasm or turning elegant periods on the arrogant pretensions and dangerous encroachments of a Presbyterian hierarchy."*

This statement of the case leaves nothing more to be said on this point.

So much, then, for the first movements of John Knox as a Scottish Reformer. There is nothing in his conduct at the opening of his career which, when properly considered, militates with the view of his spirit and conduct as an earnest but moderate Christian minister when laboring under the auspices of Edward VI. as a Reformer in England. Nor if we now proceed to consider the views of a reformation of religion upon which he proceeded, will there be found any evidence of want of moderation in the measures which he proposed to execute.

In his letter of exhortation to England, January 12, 1559, Knox develops the germinal principles of his scheme of Reformation. After declaring that Popish priests should not be allowed to direct the flock, that a plurality of benefices to one man should not be permitted, but the pastoral charges be given each to a single minister who shall be required to discharge fully the office of preaching Christ crucified, he proceeds to say—

“Lett none that be appointed to labour in Christ's vineyarde be entangled with civil affaires, and as yee call them the affaires of the realme. . . . For, as touching their yeerlie coming to Parliament for maters of religion, it sall be superfluous and vaine, if God's true religion be once so established, that after it never be called in controversie. . . . So that the ministers, albeit they lacke the glorious title of lords, and the divelish pompe which before appeared in proud prelats, yitt must they be so stout and bold, in God's cause, that if the king himself would usurpe anie other authoritie in God's religion than becometh a member of Christ's bodie, that first he be admonished according to God's Word, and after, if he contemne the same, be subject to the yoke of discipline. . . . Now last, for the preservatioun of religion, it is most expedient that schooles be universallie erected in citeis and all cheefe touns, the oversight whereof to be committed to the magistrats and godlie learned men, that of the

*McCrie's *Life of Melville*, Vol. I., p. 213.

youth, godlie instructed among them, a seede may be reserved and continued, for the profite of Christ's kirk in all ages."*

Here, then, we have the germinal ideas of Knox's programme of reformation, which will be found to be the key to all his subsequent conflicts in Scotland—an unsecularised ministry of one order only preaching Christ crucified, a spiritual free Church under Christ as its only Head, and education for not only the masses of the people, but education of the higher order, to secure an intelligent ministry. This last, if anything could be called such, may be termed "John Knox's hobby." And to his brave struggles and labors in that behalf, under God, has Scotland been indebted for the singular intelligence and intellectual superiority both of her people and her ministry for three hundred years past.

The limits of a single article are too restricted to allow us to follow the reform through the subsequent twelve years of his labors in Scotland, and prove that, in every important battle waged by him, it may be shown that his unyielding sternness and unsparing blows came not so much from any harshness or lack of calmness and moderation in the spirit of the man, but rather from the very nature of the issues involved and the peculiar circumstances of danger which continually surrounded him and the cause which he represented. These rendered it imperative upon him to keep up a perpetual battle for life or death. Referring now briefly to some of the more prominent causes of conflict in the attempt to carry out Knox's programme, it will be found that these may be comprehended under three general items: his struggles against the insincere and treacherous barons as soon as they found that he could not be used for their ends; his struggles with the remnants of the partially destroyed prelacy of Scotland; and his struggles against the usurpations of the crown.

It has been already intimated that the great peril to the Reformation in Scotland was the scramble for the spoils of the old Church, a prize so great as to cover one-half or more of all the property of the kingdom. Knox perceived at a glance on his arrival that the Church, though purged of her idolatry, was at the same time to be stripped of her possessions and turned a beg-

Calderwood's History, Vol. I., pp. 429, 430.

gar into the streets. True, the cause of Christ may, under ordinary circumstances, trust securely to the enlightened faith and piety of Christ's people for support, when that piety has become properly enlightened, and has a far richer fund in the liberality of its earnest members who consecrate themselves and their possessions to the Master's service, than in the coffers of the State or rich endowments. But at that period the great doctrine of the Christian oblation had not yet been developed. Knox and his compeers had not yet seen that great truth. And what wonder when so large a portion of Christian Scotland does not yet see this truth in all its fulness?

He therefore at once set up the claim, to the disgust of many even of the Lords of Congregation, that the estates and revenues of the Church, having been consecrated originally to religious purposes, should now be applied, in conformity with their sacred character, to the purposes of the Reformed Church, for the sustentation of the ministry, the feeding of the poor, and particularly to the education of the people. Therefore in the First Book of Discipline—the first Reformed Church constitution—provision is made for dividing the Church patrimony in accordance with the general purposes for which it had originally been given, to be distributed under the direction of deacons, into three portions: one for the support of preachers of the gospel among the people; one for the poor; and one for the support of schools for the Church and kingdom. Maitland truly represented a large number of the barons in pronouncing, from the first, the whole revenue “a devout imagination.” Knox found to his sorrow and surprise that barons might be zealous for religion without being themselves religious; or though they may have professed and thought themselves religious, yet their religion was no bar to their selfishness and greed. His experience at that early day was the experience of many a mistaken servant of God since, who has imagined that true religion may be promoted by alliance with kings or presidents, lords or senators, parliaments or congresses. He was never allowed to carry out the scheme of the First Book of Discipline by reason of the greed of these reforming barons; and even for so much as was gained, he was obliged to be in perpetual

conflict with the treacherous leaders of the state and fight his way foot by foot.

John Cunningham's *History*, page 356, with equal force and beauty remarks of the *First Book of Discipline*:

"No document could possibly throw more light upon the opinion of the Reformers. It is in fact the plan of the temple which they designed to rear. If in anything in our Church as it now stands differs from 'The Book of Discipline'—if it has not the breadth of foundation, or length of pinnaele, or richness of ornament there indicated, it is because the after execution has fallen short of the original plan—it is because the builders who raised the fabric had not the same views as the architects who designed it."

It cannot indeed be denied that Knox denounced "in the vernacular" this greed of the secular leaders; yet as is so often the case, the villainy of treacherous Judases is so astounding that if an honest man endeavors to characterise it even in the most moderate terms, he seems to the world at large, unacquainted with the facts, to speak in a harsh spirit and to be pouring forth the mere vituperation of passion.

Knox's own account of the difficulty of getting his "*First Book of Discipline*" accepted by the lords is indeed given in not very mellifluous terms. After relating how, at the request of the nobility, he himself and five other ministers prepared the Book, he proceeds:

"Which thei did and presented to the nobilitie, who did peruse it many days. Some approved it, and willed the saym have bene sett furth be a law. Otheris, perceaving their earnall libertie and worldlie commoditie somewhat to be impaired thairby grudged, insomueche that the name of the Booke of Discipline became odious unto thame. Everie thing that repugned to their corrupt affectionis, was termed in thair mockage 'devote imaginationis.' The caus we have befoir declaired; some had greadelie gripped to the possessionis of the kirk; and otheris thought thei wald nott laek thair part of Christis coat; yea, and that befoir that ever he was hanged, as by the Preachearis thei war oft rebuked. The cheaf great man that had professed Christ Jesus and refusied to subscribe the Book of Discipline was the Lord Erskyn; and no wonder, for he besydis that he has a verrey Jesabell to his wyffe, yf the poore, the schooles, and the ministerie of the kirk had their awin, his keching (kitchen) wald laek two parttis and more, of that whiche he injustlie now possesses. Assuredlye some of us have woudered how men that professe godlynes could of so

long continewance hear the threatnyngis of God against theavis and against thair housses, and knowing thame selfis guyltie in suche thingis, as war openlie rebucked, and that thei never had remorse of conscience, neather yitt intended to restore any thingis of that, whiche long thei had stollen and reft. Thair was none within the Realme more unmercyfull to the poore ministeris then war thei whiche had greatest rentis of the churches. But in that we have perceaved the old proverbe to be true—'Nothing can suffice a wreche;' and agane, 'The bellie hes none earis!' Yitt the same Book of Discipline was subscribed by a greate parte of the Nobilitie; to witt, the Duckis Grace, the Erle of Arrane," etc.*

In a subsequent portion of his History, referring to the miserable compromise to which the Assembly had to submit, viz., to allow the Queen and the avaricious nobles two-thirds of the Church revenues, leaving one-third only to the support of the Church, and that transferred with conditions and restrictions, he remarks, with still more sharpness, "The first two parts are *freely given* to the devil, and the third must be divided between God and the devil: and the devil *will soon get three parts of the third.*" Nor was he without grounds for such anticipation, as may be inferred from what subsequently became matter of grave historical record. It is affirmed that the Earl of Cassilis was negotiating with the Abbot of Glenlucé for the *feu* of his Abbey (for the Lords of the Congregation had generously agreed to leave incumbents in possession of their estates during life), when, pending negotiations, the Abbot died. The Earl bribed a monk to forge the necessary papers for the dead Abbot. He then employed one of his retainers to assassinate the monk lest he should reveal the forgery—on the principle that "dead men tell no tales"—and then, last of all, caused his uncle to hang the retainer lest he should reveal the murder! Moreover, this Earl, when another Abbot refused to recognise a contract with the preceding not ratified by the crown at the time of his assassination, roasted the recreant Abbot before a slow fire until he was induced to ratify the papers giving the Earl the *feu* of the abbey, though with a hand that could scarcely hold the pen. This Abbot brought his complaint before the Council: but the Earl was too powerful to be punished, and the matter was compromised by a

*Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, Vol. II., p. 128.

small pension paid by the noble tormentor to his victim, who was a cripple through life from the roasting.

Surely the man called to stand in his lot, defending the Church of God from such robbers, and rebuking sin in high places and low places in such a generation, should not be expected to mince words, to act with gentleness and contrive smooth and glossy compromises! The meekest and holiest of men must have become in such circumstances a man of war. And when it is remembered that these conflicts were not with the minions of Popery, but with men who were pretending to act with them as reformers of Popery, it must magnify one's conceptions of the marvellous courage of the man.

It will perhaps be said, however, that Knox betrayed the same harshness of spirit in his ecclesiastical controversies as well where the issue was not between him as an honest man and faithful servant of the Church and a den of thieves, but between one form of church government and another. But a little examination of the question will show that really the issues, as between Presbytery and Prelacy intrinsically, were hardly involved at all in the conflict between Knox and the secular Prelates in Scotland. It was chiefly because these nominal Prelates furnished the opportunity to the avaricious barons to carry on their stealings, and set before the Popish court an open door to enter and practise its strategies against the Reformed Church, that Knox and his friends had constant occasion for strife with them.

It has been already intimated that at the overthrow of Popery the Lords of the Congregation, partly perhaps from generosity, but also for political reasons, agreed not to disturb the incumbents of prelatial and other benefices during the lifetime of those then in possession, while at the same time prelacy was set aside and presbytery established in 1560, so far as concerned *spiritual jurisdiction*. Neither by the General Assembly nor the masses of the people was the jurisdiction of the prelates recognised thereafter in the Church. But for political reasons, in order to keep up the ecclesiastical branch of the Parliament, the sees seem to have remained undisturbed. The explanation of this anomaly of establishing Protestantism in 1560, and yet leaving the old

spiritual estate as it existed under the Papacy still existing as one of the estates of the realm, and in possession of a large part of the land of the country, is to be found in the indisposition of the Scotch to political changes and revolutions. The argument would be—Is it wise to let the spiritual estate come to nought, which heretofore has been the first estate in the realm? Shall none but barons and burgesses hereafter sit in Parliament? Shall the checks and balances of the constitution be destroyed? Will the throne and the aristocracy be safe against this rising power of the burghs without the aid of the clergy? What will become of the College of Justice if its eight ecclesiastical senators are taken away? So even though the thieving barons pounce upon the Church's estates, yet some way must be contrived to preserve at least the shadow of incumbency by ecclesiastics to fill the needful places in Parliament and in the Judiciary. Here, therefore, in the political necessities of the case, and not from any zeal for Episcopacy, are we to look for the explanation of the fact that side by side with Presbytery established are found Popish bishops in possession of their secular rights and dignities as appointees of the Pope, while all spiritual functions were taken away from them and all authority and exercise of jurisdiction in the Church was forbidden them. Superficial Episcopal writers have made use of this singular arrangement, as they have also of the arrangement for superintendents in the "First Book of Discipline," to show that the succession of the episcopal line was not broken, and that the ideas of Knox were somewhat prelatical. It was beyond doubt an unwise experiment for the Scottish Reformers. Taking advantage of it, the court and the avaricious nobles sought to make a permanent right out of what was at first a mere temporary concession. The court resisted the abolition of these mere political sees, because they counted just so many more votes for the court party in Parliament; the greedy barons, because it opened to them an opportunity of pocketing part of the revenues as a fee for protecting the bishops in them. Hence the singular anomaly of bishops without authority to exercise any of the functions which pertain to the bishop's office in the Church. Episcopacy is welcome to whatever advantage may accrue to the

argument in favor of Prelacy from the existence in Scotland of bishops, who, instead of watching over flocks "over which the Holy Ghost made them overseers," had no function but to vote with the court party in Parliament and perpetuate the title by "apostolic succession" to certain revenues for greedy nobles to prey upon. And this fact that the sees with their revenues were not abolished, though every sort of spiritual and ecclesiastical authority was taken away, is just all that can be claimed. It is the sheerest nonsense to say that the three classes of ministers provided for in the First Book of Discipline—superintendents, local pastors, and readers—was a conformity to Episcopacy, when the Book itself shows that the superintendent had none of the functions pertaining to a prelate, except those common to a bishop and an evangelist. Nor was the reason for the appointment of superintendents any other than simply the emergency of a Church without a sufficient number of ministers, which was therefore obliged to improvise readers, lay exhorters, under the oversight of superintending evangelists. To appoint superintendents and to give authority to them on the one hand, and to appoint Scripture readers under the direction of the evangelists on the other, was at the greatest possible remove from Prelacy. For the First Book of Discipline, under the head of Superintendents, expressly declares—

"We consider that if the ministers should be appointed to several places there to make their residence, that then the greatest part of the realm should be destitute of all doctrine: and *therefore* we have thought it a thing most expedient for this time, that from the whole number of godly men be selected ten or twelve to whom charge should be given to plant and erect kirks, to set in order and appoint ministers."

It was not, however, the fault of Knox and his co-reformers that this anomaly of bishops, having no spiritual functions, was allowed in Scotland. They seem indeed to have submitted in silence to the arrangement of the politicians, at first, so far as to allow the bishops then in office to enjoy their revenues during life, and indeed some of these bishops joined them as ministers in the General Assembly. But when in the course of time the sees became vacant by death, and the prospect was that the spiritual branch of the legislature should become extinct and the court

lose one of its powerful auxiliaries, there was evinced a determination to fill these vacancies. This of course was opposed by the Church, which was now organised and established as Presbyterian. The attempt to revive Episcopacy by the court was regarded as a virtual subversion of the spiritual powers of the Reformed Church, and Knox and his co-workers were obliged to take firm ground. It was a battle for life, and indeed was the beginning of the grand struggle between Presbytery and Prelacy, which continued with various success for the next one hundred and twenty years.

When the Parliament at Stirling in 1571, in spite of the General Assembly, appointed bishops to the vacant sees, Knox and his friends declared they would die rather than submit to such an exercise of the secular power in the Church and such an invasion of her liberties. And when the compromise was proposed at the Convention of Leith in 1572, that political bishops should be appointed to hold these secular sees only until the king's majority, as before the Reformation—that these dignities should be conferred on ministers only, that these bishops should be subject to the General Assembly in spiritual matters and to the king in temporals—though Erskine of Dun fell into the trap thus set by Lennox, Mar, and Regent Morton—Knox, now broken down age and infirmity, exerted all his remaining strength to extinguish this germ of Episcopacy thus attempted to be planted in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland under the deceitful plea of preserving unity. Both in his private correspondence, in the General Assembly, and in a public letter, with his characteristic firmness and courage he exposed this fraud of political bishops without pastoral office. The result was that the people derided them as “Tulchan Bishops”—stuffed calves, to deceive the cow and induce her to let down her milk freely. The true ministers refused to accept the office, and the Assembly—even though these “Tulchan Bishops” were subjected to the power of its superintendents and had not the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction over a whole diocese as prelates—never recognised the arrangement beyond merely the registration of the act, nor ceased to contend against it till the very shadow as

well as the power was removed. Still this stratagem afterwards furnished the enemies of Presbytery a *pou sto* for their machinations, and put such creatures as Boyd, Archbishop of Glasgow, into position to vex the Church.

That Knox was profoundly impressed with the conviction that Prelacy is contrary to the order which Christ established in his Church, is evident enough from the fact that he had refused a bishopric in England when not only it was pressed upon him, but when he was seriously called to account for refusing it. Still in England he worked as a reformer in perfect harmony with prelates. That he warred against and would make no compromise with Prelacy in Scotland implies no change of his views or of his catholic spirit after leaving England. For the issues in Scotland were not at all the intrinsic merits of Episcopacy as against Presbytery, but whether he would consent to the continuance of a political agency outside the Church which had been established to serve as an instrumentality to the crown and the nobles to plunder the Church's revenues and endanger the liberties of Presbyterianism.

But the contests of Knox with the royal authority, particularly with the famous Mary Queen of Scots, have furnished the chief ground for the indictment brought against him of harshness and narrowness, yea, even of savage ferocity. There is no space here to go into that large subject which has furnished material for hundreds of poets, romance writers, sentimental historians, and anti-Presbyterian essay writers, to say nothing of the thousand eloquent effusions of debating society orators. That Knox in all this conflict spoke and wrote harshly is freely admitted. The Fourth Book of his own History of the Reformation in Scotland furnishes abundant evidence that with a very rough hand he was wont to tear off the masks of the traitors who disgraced the Protestant religion which they professed by their plunderings, their conspiracies, their feuds, and their assassinations.

Cunningham,* while conceding to Knox qualities seldom found in such stormy periods of civil convulsion—describing him as

*Church History of Scotland, pages 406-7.

unselfish, sincere, consistent, unswerving, and firm amid continual vicissitudes; with hands clean of bribes and never enriched by the spoils—yet condemns him as guilty of coarse, virulent, and dictatorial conduct towards persons whose position commanded respect; of a fanatical fierceness towards Mary and her mother simply because they were Papists; and a cruelty which pursued them through life with a rancor rooted in religion. But that his rough denunciations of the queen did not come from his hatred of her as a Papist simply, but his hatred of her treachery and her despotic notions, is manifest from the fact that he dealt with the Protestant nobles just as roughly when they exhibited treachery and hypocrisy. Witness his account of what the preachers (no doubt meaning himself) uttered in the way of denunciation of the nobles in the winter of 1562 in Edinburgh, and in view of the recent death of the Earl Huntley in a fray, whose death Mary is said to have regretted, even though brought about by her own partisans:

“The winter after the death of the Erle Huntley the Court remaned for the maist part in Edinburgh. The preacheouris war wondrous vehement in reprehension of all manner of vice which then began to abound, and especially avarice, oppression of the poor, excess, ryotouse chear, banketting, immoderat dancing, and hurdome, that thair of ensues. Whairat the Courteouris began to storme and began to pyck querrallis against the preacheouris, alledging that all their preaching was turned to raylling. Whairunto one of them [no doubt Knox himself] gave answer as followeth: ‘It cumis to our earis that we are called raillaris, whair of albeit we wonder, yitt we are not eschamed, seeing that the most worthie servandis of God that befoir us have travailled in this vocation have so been steiled. But unto you do I say, that the same God who from the begynning has punished the contempt of his word, and hes poured furth his vengeance upon such proud mockeris, shall not spair you; yea, he shall not spair you befoir the eyes of this same wicked generation for the pleasur whair of ye despyse all holesome admonitionis. Have ye not sein one greater than any of you [meaning Huntley] sitting whair presentlie ye sitt, pyck his nails and pull down his bonnett over his eyes, when idolatrie, witchcraft, murther, oppression, and such vices, war rebuked? Was not his common talk, When the knaffis have railed their fill, then will thei hold their peace? Have ye not heard it affirmed to his owin face that God should revenge that his blasphemy even in the eyes of such as war witnesses? Then was the Erle Huntley accused by you as the manteaner of idolatrie and only hinderar of good order. Him has God

punished even according to the threatenings your ears heard; and by your hands hath God executed his judgments. But what amendment in any cause can be espyed in you? Idolatrie was never in greater rest; vertew and vertewouse men war never in more contempt; and vice was never more bold nor less feared punishment. And yet who gauds the queen and court? Who but the Protestantis? O horrible selanderaris of God, and of his holy evangell. Better it war in you plainelie to renounce Christ Jesus than thus to expone his blessed evangell to mockage. Yf God punishes not you that this same aige shall see and behold your punishment, the Spirit of rycheous judgment guideth me not.'

"This vehemence provoked the hatterent, not onlie of the courteouris, but also of divers others against the speaker: for such as be in credyte never lack flatteraris. (They said) 'their brethren of the court war irreverentlie handled. Thei did what they myght: such speaking would cause them do less.' And this was the frute the preacheris gathered of their just reprehensions.'*

In his roughest speeches to Queen Mary, the Reformer never exceeded the plainness of this denunciation of the treacheries and chicanery of the men of the Protestant party. It was not only, or even chiefly, as a Papist that Knox denounced Queen Mary; but because he evidently conceived her pretended convictions in favor of Popery to be worn as a cloak by her to hide her schemes for the overthrow of the liberties of Church and State.

The rudeness charged upon Knox in the case of the Queen is the more readily made to appear more blameworthy because it was harshness toward a fascinating young woman, whom gallantry should have caused a man of high instinct to treat with courteous consideration. But when the woman, however fascinating personally, becomes the agent and representative of the most dangerous despotism, scheming again to fasten the shackles of the cruelest slavery upon a free people who have just broken the shackles; nay, of a fanatical despotism, that with power in its hands, as recent experience in England and subsequent experience in France showed, would not hesitate a moment to *extirpate* any Protestant people, it was no time for playing the courtier. Knox was obliged to speak and act towards this seductive siren of Popery and prerogative, not as his native gallantry and courtesy would prompt him, but in a style that suited the people of

*Knox's History of the Reformation, Book IV., pp. 361-3.

that day, and which would enable them to perceive the snares laid for them. The selfish nobles, under the fascinations of royalty having, in Knox's figure, "received a baptism with the holy water of the court," played false to the people, and thereby laid upon Knox almost the whole burden of keeping them roused to a sense of their danger, which he could do only by the use of a language that suited their taste.

After all that the apologists of Mary may say in her behalf, these facts seem established beyond question: That she came from France to take the crown of Scotland in 1561, with a full knowledge of the overthrow of Popery and the establishment of Protestantism by formal law of the realm, and that law heartily sustained by the great body of the people; and came with deliberate purpose to overthrow the Reformation. That most imprudently she obtruded her Popery, and under the guise of private scruples of conscience sought to ensnare the nobility and withdraw them from the support of the Protestant cause by claiming their protection and support in her personal rights of conscience as a Papist; and then into a conspiracy with her to seize upon the ecclesiastical property as the patrimony of the crown. That she introduced among a plain and frugal people French courtiers and French debaucheries that filled all virtuous men with horror and alarm. That from the very first her insincerity and treachery, and contempt for all covenant engagements, made it impossible for the people to trust her even when she may have intended to keep her promise. That in a country which had established constitutional liberty and rights of conscience, she planted herself upon the monstrous old dogma, of the duty of the subject to obey the prince as the lord of the conscience. That she set at defiance all the established proprieties and decencies of good society in the amours and debaucheries of her court—herself setting the example of scandalous intrigues and being the occasion of murders and assassinations among rivals for her attentions, if not accessory to them. It is unnecessary to add, as might readily be done, to this list of the errors and the crimes of this woman, the fact that she signed, with others of the French royal family, the decree for the extermination of the French Pro-

testants. We had selected passages in abundant confirmation of this general statement from the contemporary records in the "Book of the Universal Kirk," and from the histories of Knox, Row, and Calderwood, and the Autobiography and Diary of James Melville, but space fails for further citations.

It may be confidently submitted to the judgment of candid and intelligent men whether it was not rather to the honor than to the reproach of John Knox, that when the barons and other political leaders of the people succumbed to the flatteries, the fascinations, and the intrigues of the queen, he sternly stood out against all the allurements whereby she sought to cast her toils over him also, and silence his testimony for the truth of Christ and the liberty of his people; that he stood out as a faithful tribune of the people contending earnestly for the faith. That in fulfilling his mission as a Reformer, he was stern, harsh, and uncompromising, is to be attributed to the circumstances that surrounded him in a great life-and-death struggle, rather than to any fierceness of nature, any fanaticism in his religion. His career as an English Reformer shows that he was neither fierce nor fanatical. He was indeed a man of genius, with a ready wit and a lively imagination, and his discourses and writing, sparkle everywhere with the flashings of his keen Damascus blade. It may be shown indeed—nay, he himself tells us—that sometimes his own brethren deprecated his uncompromising spirit, his bold measures, and his unsparing denunciations of villainy in high places. But what witness for the truth ever fought and won the battle for liberty in any great civil and religious convulsion, who had not precisely the same experience? His very success has come from a far-sightedness, a breadth of view, and strong convictions that ordinary men cannot enter into. A large part, if not a majority, even of good men, at such a time are men of feeble convictions or no convictions touching the great truths involved in the controversy. Their timidity, self-ease, and self-interest take upon them the guise of zeal for "the peace of the Church." The wily enemies of liberty and truth understand the strategy of assailing this weak point of the Church with the cry, "Let us have peace," and of sending away the ships of the Greeks, in order

to induce the voluntary breaking down of the impregnable wall and receiving within the fatal horse filled with enemies. Our own recent civil and ecclesiastical convulsions have abundantly illustrated, and are still illustrating, how men of broader views and stronger convictions, no matter how averse to strife, when compelled to witness for the truth and denounce its enemies, seem to the men of feebler convictions—and especially men of feeble brain as well as feeble convictions—to be “troublers of Israel.” And there is a certain cast of piety which prevails more or less in every generation which, forgetting the apostle’s admonition, “Add to your faith virtue,” (*ἀρετήν*, manly energy,) is piping ever its pusillanimous note of “peace, peace,” even when “the enemy are coming in like a flood.” We offer this general fact as sufficient offset to the showing that some of Knox’s friends deprecated his sternness and bold denunciations.

This article has extended far beyond the original purpose of the author. But we cannot forbear citing, as the last proof of Knox’s true nobility of nature, the beautiful picture of him in his old age and in his death, from James Melville:

“Bot of all the benefits I haid that yeir was the cuming of that maist notable profat and apostle of our nation, Mr. Jhone Knox, to St. Androis. * * I hard him ther teache the prophecie of Daniel that simmer and the wintar following. I haid my pen and my little book and tuk away sic things as I could comprehend. In the opening upe of his text he was moderate the space of an halft houre; but when he enterit to application he maad me sa to grew (shudder) and tremble that I could nocht hald a pen to wryt. * * Mr. Knox wald sumtimes cum in and repose him in our colleage yeard, and call us scholars unto him and bless us, and exhort us to knaw God and his work in our country, and stand be the guid cause; to use our time weill and lern the guid instructionis and follow the guid example of our maisters. Our haill college, maisters and scholars, war sound and zelus for the guid cause. The uther twa colleges nocht so. * * * I saw him everie day of his doctrine go hulie and fear with a furring of matriks about his neck, as taff in ane hand, and guid godlie Richart Bulenden his servant halding upe the other oxtar, from the abbey to the paroche kirk: and be the said Richard and another servant was lifted upe to the pulpit whar he behovit to lean at his first entrie; bot or he had done with his sermont he was sa active and vigorous that he was lyk to ding that pulpit in blads and flye out of it! Sa soon after his coming to Edinbruche he becam unable to preatche; and sa instituting in his room

be the ordinar calling of the kirk and congregation Mr. James Lansome, he tuk him to his chamber, and most happilie and comfortable departed this lyff."*

The man of whose last days the memories of a college student were such as these, could have been stern and harsh only for the same reason that Elijah was. And indeed the life and character of John Knox bears a striking resemblance to that of the great prophet reformer of Israel.

ARTICLE II.

THE ONE VISIBLE CHURCH AND THE MANY DENOMINATIONS.

When we speak of a local church convening in one place for the worship of God, there is no danger of being misunderstood. When the apostle Paul declares that "the care of all the churches" rests upon him, we easily apprehend his meaning. The churches of Macedonia or of Asia have a distinctness in our minds that requires no illustration to render the terms more expressive, or their signification more palpable. But when we undertake to define the Church in a more comprehensive sense, whether provincial, national, or universal, a difficulty is at once experienced that demands for its solution much thoughtful consideration, and a careful analysis. What do we mean by the "Church of England," the "Methodist Church," or the "Lutheran Church?" What exact idea is conveyed to our minds by "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth?" It is obvious that, in such cases, definition is as difficult as it is important. Its importance cannot be overestimated. As to the task, its arduous nature becomes more and more apparent as we advance in the effort to accomplish it. Whether it is possible to attain the end, in any degree satisfactory to the conscientious reader, is the object of the present inquiry.

*Mr. James Melville's Diary, pp. 26 and 33.