

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 33—January, 1898.

I.

THEISTIC EVOLUTION.

LESLIE STEPHEN somewhere cites a suggestion of Bishop Butler that nations as well as individuals may go mad. However this may be as to other professions, the imputation of aberrancy has for long time lain upon the investigators of nature, and the opinion is widespread that since the appearance of Darwin's famous book the disease has reached an acute stage. To outsiders it is difficult to comprehend why naturalists have abandoned the old scheme of instantaneous creations and catastrophic exterminations of species, which processes were supposed to have been enacted over and over again through long ages; and have rejected the types and archetypes of the comparative anatomists, with their beautiful evidences of design, in favor of a theory which seems to relegate all animated nature to the chapter of accidents.

Some intelligent people find it impossible even to understand what *Evolution* signifies, and start with erroneous definitions, deriving extraordinary conclusions from their own errors. The theory of Evolution does not, for example, teach that a dog, or that a dog's descendant, may be transformed into a cat; or that a dandelion, itself or its posterity, can in any length of time become a rose. Yet how great is the difficulty experienced by some in understanding that it does not break down any of the barriers of actually existing species? Its real effort is to account for the cross-resemblances now found between dog and cat, by the supposition that both have come from some common ancestor, which was neither one nor other. It also declares that "laws of nature" (whatever is understood by this term) and the whole environment

III.

THE ENGLAND OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

“ ‘**D**IEU seul est grand, mes frères.’ With these words, so simple, yet so loud-ringing, so full of contrast and significance, the famous orator, Massillon, the chosen mouthpiece of the French pulpit, began his great funeral sermon on the death of Louis XIV in the Sainte Chapelle at Paris. ‘This king, the terror of his neighbors, the amazement of the universe, the father of kings; this king, greater than his great ancestors, more magnificent than Solomon in all his glory, has also learnt that all is vanity.’ . . . The ideas underlying Massillon’s opening words, which gave them the startling sound of a trumpet-call in the night, win a clearer significance if we regard them, as we fairly may, as a first expression of that craving for equality and brotherhood which marks the eighteenth century. They announce the essential equality of all men, where God alone is great, and the fraternity of all under His fatherly care, a truth too much lost sight of in the pride and privilege of the reign now past. Yet religion speaks of the equality of all, while she seems to belie herself at every step. Her view is that in the presence of the eternal, the finite is as nothing; and that compared with the Almighty we are so immeasurably small that all human rank sinks into nothingness. In the eighteenth century a new rendering of these terms seized on the popular imagination; and the Church of France, which had, at the beginning, helped to proclaim it, was in the end powerless to find any solace for the wants, any answer to the demands of the people; and she also for the time fell prostrate before the storm.’ * ”

The picture presented to our minds by this striking passage from Dean Kitchin’s *History of France* affords a noteworthy commentary on the last act of the great drama of the reign of Elizabeth. The reigns of Louis and Elizabeth were strongly alike in the focusing of power in a single person, in the patience with which that person was borne with, and in the relief experienced when the

* Kitchin, *History of France*, Vol. iii. p. 358.

burden of this oppressive personality was lifted from the realm. They were glorious rulers, but the glory had grown too great for earth. That they had each found a large place in the courts above none ventured to doubt. Quaint old Fuller, in his *Holy State*, did not hesitate to declare: "Thus died Queen Elizabeth; whilst living, the first maid on earth; and, when dead, the second in heaven." We may well hesitate to imagine to what heights French adulation was disposed to exalt the dead Louis le Grand. The people, too, were deeply meditating the question of the equality of all men. But here the likeness ceases. As the powers of the great queen had been expended in a superb conservative struggle to hold the straining forces of change and progress in leash, while the "grand monarch" had spent his strength in completing the ruin of already declining movements; so the English Church stood ready with a deep sense of moral responsibility to assume and direct the aspirations of the people, where the French Church had bartered its liberty and light for liturgical splendor and worldly welfare.

All the best impulses of the Renaissance and the Reformation came to England in the reign of Elizabeth. It was an immense benefit to the country that the intellectual revival of the one was quickened by the moral earnestness of the other. It was no loss that the keenest intellectual concern was for the books of the Bible rather than the dialogues of Plato, and that the most treasured triumphs in the creation of a literature in the vulgar tongue should bear the names of the translators of the Bible and the supremely earnest as well as supremely great dramatist, rather than those of Petrarch and Boccaccio. But no estimate of mere movements can weigh the history of Tudor England. The robust and royal race that reigned upon the throne truly ruled her destinies. Guided by the infinite providence of God, upheld by the most vigorous elements in the State, the Tudors stamped their will upon the land. The personal issue of the divorce, the dissolution of the monasteries, the maintenance of the forms of parliamentary government, forced England along lines of ecclesiastical, social and political development in which these personal policies were the determining factors.

Loyal to her father's conceptions, as far as she can be supposed to have known and understood them, Elizabeth governed the State with large sympathy for the public needs and abiding confidence in the necessity to Church and State of rest and peace. It was easy to understand such a policy while Mary Stuart menaced the realm on the one hand and Philip II on the other, holding in their united plots the threads of treason and sedition at home and of war and persecution abroad. But when Mary's head

had fallen upon the bloek and Philip's vaunted Armada had been swept in ghastly ruin from the sea ; when English patriotism had leaped to a new birth and English enterprise was girdling the earth : it was hard to understand why English hands should be tied and English tongues should be stilled. Who was any longer to be feared ? Neither pope nor prince had been able to prevail when England was divided against herself and no man knew but that his neighbor might harbor a Jesuit or correspond with an emissary of the Scottish queen. What was now to hinder the reaching forth of hands to persecuted brethren, the modification of ritual, the vigorous defense of England's rights on every sea ? The hand that had once been loved for its strong grasp began to gall by what now seemed needless restraint in matters of Church and State, affecting both forms and doctrine in the one, and the administration of justice and the privileges of Parliament in the other. But patience and indulgence on both sides kept the irritation that appeared from time to time from growing serious, and the country consoled itself with the thought that the queen was growing old, and she satisfied her heart with the prayer : " Grant peace in our time, O Lord."

Natural science declares that periods of development are also periods of differentiation. History shows us that ages of rapid progress are marked by movements on large lines, and are followed by periods of definition and division. Nowhere is the working of this law better seen than in Elizabethan and Stuart England. The England of the great queen abounded in variety and life. The bonds of feudalism had been burst asunder. A new legal atmosphere in which contract took the place of status ; a new political theory in which the rights of the governed were placed above the prerogatives of the ruler ; a new conception of society in which wealth and personal qualities rose above ancient class distinctions and the supremacy of landed interests ; a new Church which taught the right of private judgment instead of priestly authority, and replaced the confessional with an open Bible ; a new literature which with marvelous fertility of form and substance woke the people to a self-conscious realization of their individual and national existence and all the accompanying privileges, duties and opportunities—are but a few of the varied forms in which the spirit of the age manifested itself. Over this seething, surging sea of life, the queen reigned with rude but liberal hand. She interfered with everything that tended to enforce crystallization. She trespassed upon the rights of Parliament, but avoided by consummate tact and prudence all open conflict and adjusted differences on personal terms rather than on such abstract grounds as would

harden into precedents. She threatened to unfrock her bishops and forced her views upon them, but evaded all attempts to settle ecclesiastical questions. Time was her great ally. Her land needed peace, opportunity for commercial growth, a chance to work out the mighty problems of Church and State. So she patronized genius, but employed mediocrity, provided it was gifted with common sense and safe sagacity in business.

The close of such a reign naturally saw every man of conscious purpose eager for the next reign. Proud as they were of the past, the future was to give scope for the triumph of their ideas. The discontented Romanists looked to the son of Mary Stuart to relax the penal statutes beneath which they groaned. The enthusiastic Presbyterians expected the son of the Kirk to organize his new kingdom on Presbyterian lines. The Puritans of every shade looked for progress in the Church towards the type of the Reformed Churches of the continent, with relaxation of liturgical rules and reformation of morals. The more ardent longed for a more vigorous foreign policy, with England as the definite head of the Protestant world. The merchant adventures expected a bolder and more consistent attitude towards projects of foreign and colonial trade. The great nobles hoped to recover lost ground for their rank. The simple citizens hoped to break down yet more the pretenses of mere rank, and to shake off the burden of privilege as in the case of the control of spiritual ministration by the private right of presentation, and in material matters of monopolies of trade and manufacture. Men of genius, such as Bacon and Raleigh, trusted that their rightful preëminence would be attained under a young and ambitious sovereign.

Every hope was destined to disappointment. It is not too much to say that James utterly crushed the spirit of enterprise. The great policy of delay became in his hands mere dilatoriness. The royal rebuke degenerated into mere scolding. The large trust in the leadership of the monarch was replaced by a despairing sense of the necessity of the people to save themselves. The fundamental trouble with James, aside from a lack of genius for administration, was his failure to master fully the history of the country he came to rule. He could have commanded the services of men in high official station who could have made plain to him the true nature of the English Constitution, opening up to him its facts and its fictions, its great central principles and its interpretative precedents. But though he fell into good hands at first, and though he leaned for nearly a decade (1603-12) upon the capable minister, Sir Robert Cecil, whom Elizabeth had bequeathed to him, he seems never to have had any true conception of English law or English life.

In his first Parliament he set himself at variance with the great legislative branch of the government, and took up the false position which was eventually to destroy his dynasty. As early as the reign of Edward III, John Wyclif had cogently stated the claims of England to complete independence, whether of pope or emperor; and Henry VIII had fully developed the principle and the Tudors had successfully vindicated it under the phrase, "England is an absolute monarchy." No one ever dreamed of deducing from this statement the claim that the king of England was absolute, until James sought to do so. Having thus turned the phrase which was England's bulwark against foreign oppression into a fortress threatening her internal freedom, he proceeded to claim for his attitude divine authority. Thus came to birth the Tudor theory of "The divine right of kings," which when tricked out in the fine fabrics of Dr. Manwaring's imaginings became a chief cause of Stuart ruin. The essential falsehood in the theory lay in its placing the king above law, as was afterwards plainly stated in Judge Berkley's foolish dictum, in his opinion in Hampden's case: "I have never read or heard that *lex* was *rex*, but it is common and most true that *rex* is *lex*." This view made the coronation oath a piece of silly trumpery, and changed the kingship into a supreme instead of a coördinate branch of the government with the Houses of Parliament.

The moderate requests of the millenary petition led to the Hampton Court Conference, and there the hopes of every element of the great Puritan party were crushed. James chose to seize upon the desire for at least a modification of the Episcopate to enunciate another unfortunate part of his program, and the divine right of kings was sustained by the divine right of bishops and the phrase, "No bishop, no king." The people asked for bread and he gave them a stone.

Then began the long war of definition. The country longed for reforms. The way of progress was blocked by outworn customs and ill-observed laws. James, instead of responding to the call, began to justify and define, harking back to every forgotten and dishonored precedent that his flatterers could discover. His own *Law of Free Monarchies*, Crowell's *Interpreter* (a law dictionary), and the Canons of 1606, illustrate the definite beginning of the war of definition against amendment, of retrogression against progress.

Thus James threw himself in the path of every kind of advance, and by twenty years (1603-25) of misgovernment weakened the land and disintegrated the great forces which made for righteousness. It was a very different people whom he passed on to his son

from that whom he received from his great kinswoman. The generation which had felt the glorious thrill of triumph, which ran through the land when the great Armada failed, had passed away. The age of Burleigh, Walsingham and the elder Bacon, of Howard, Hawkins and Drake, of Frobisher, Winter and Gilbert, of Leicester, Raleigh and Sydney, of Shakespeare, Spenser and Francis Bacon, had passed away. A few great hearts still carried on the traditions of the past in every sphere, high-minded statesmen, lofty patriots, eloquent preachers, gifted prose writers and inspired poets were not wanting in England. But they were no longer the varied representative exponents of a great national movement of patriotism and progress. Henceforth we are met by a war of different schools of thought and open antagonism among the leaders of opinion. It is no longer for England that men strive, but for king or Parliament; it is no longer for a united Church content with its open Bible and its Calvinistic theology, but for the rule of priest and prelate or the liberty of Presbyterian republicanism. It is not merely Hobbes and Hooker who lock horns in political and ecclesiastical debate, but the pious hearts of Milton and Herbert cannot join to sing in tune in heavenly rhapsodies. James had dishonored his court by introducing into it such favorites as the disreputable Robert Carr and the dissolute George Villiers, and had permitted them to make the court life unspeakably base and vile. He had set aside his natural advisers for these unworthy upstarts, and by raising them and their creatures to the peerage he struck a deadly blow at the influence of the House of Lords. And most fatal of all, by his book of sports, his attacks upon the leaders of Church reform, and the favor shown to time-servers among the clergy, he brought about a decay of morals which broke the once almost united front of the great movement for Church reform.

Despite all these influences, the great body of the upper classes were still on the side of reform at the beginning of Charles' reign. Thus, to quote a few scraps of evidence from a thoroughly hostile source, we are told by a recent biographer of Archbishop Laud that "when Elizabeth died the universities had been thoroughly purged of Romanism only to fall into the extremity of Calvinism. . . . At the close of the reign of James . . . Calvinism was supreme at the universities. . . . It was strong among the clergy; and it was by Calvinists that England was represented abroad when the king sent delegates to the Synod of Dort." Even at so late a date as the actual outbreak of the war, he says that "the churchmen as a whole were indubitably monarchy men, 'No bishop, no king.' Presbyterians, as in Scot-

land, were essentially oligarchs. To their party belonged the great peers who still cherished the idea of baronial independence and aristocratic rule. The Independents . . . were of necessity Republicans.* We can afford to smile at the "essential oligarchy of the Presbyterians." No citations from friend or foe are needed to prove that the great middle classes were imbued with the deep piety and pure morality of the Calvinistic theology. The names of Elliot, Hampden, Pym, Winthrop, Hutchinson and Cromwell will forever testify to the attitude of the country gentry. The thousands upon thousands who in battle and exile maintained the cause they loved are the deathless memorial of the faith and fidelity of the sturdy merchants and manufacturers of London and the towns.

There is nothing which needs to be emphasized so strongly in this day as the alliance of these great elements in society against the Stuart conspiracy. It was not a small body of intense religious enthusiasts among the clergy, nor a body of reactionary nobles among the peers, nor yet a small but able body of political managers among the commons, nor a combination of these naturally antagonistic characters, which brought on the Puritan Revolution. Such claims have been iterated and reiterated, but without a shred of evidence. The whole period has been overlaid with extravagant imaginings, until, in the eyes of some devoted churchmen, Charles, of whom Mr. Hutton has said that "it seemed as though he had no fixed moral principles," has been glorified into a saint; while Clarendon set a standard for vituperation by declaring, in his so-called *History*, that Cromwell "had all the wickednesses against which damnation is denounced and for which hell-fire is prepared."† The sober fact is that James began and Charles completed the work of consolidating, against the royal claim to prerogatives long unknown in England, the great body of the intelligent classes, including the majority of the greater and lesser peers, the country gentry, the universities, the Church and the towns. Mr. John Richard Green estimates the Puritan party as no less than nine-tenths of the whole people. The Stuart policy was at once illegal and illiberal. It struck at the privileges of the peers and of the commons, it destroyed confidence in the administration of justice, it took away liberty of choice in the services of the Church and prescribed rules which were not more objectionable in themselves than in the way in which they were imposed. Three great cries rang in the people's ears continually: The king was

* Rev. W. H. Hutton, of St. John's College, Oxford, in *Social England*, Vol. iv, pp. 88, 25 and 246.

† Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, xv, 156.

seeking to overthrow the privileges of Parliament, to betray the Church to the pope, and to debase the morals of the people.

There is no room to question the essential correctness of the charges embodied in the first and second of these complaints. Parliamentary government was at its last gasp on the continent in the early years of the seventeenth century, and England made no mistake in battling for it with all her might. Not a few members of the House of Lords no doubt were much stronger parliamentarians than they were Puritans. Yet it is a great mistake to underestimate the devotion of the new nobility, whose houses were largely founded on the ruins of the monasteries, to the great Church of the Reformation; and they were neither ingenious enough to explain away the essentials of old truths with Chillingworth and Lord Herbert, nor subtle enough to construct a new basis of Church polity with Andrewes and Laud. We can see plainly enough that Charles and Laud had no conscious intention of handing over the Church of England to papal bondage; but it is fair to recognize that the new channel was not nearly so well worn in the seventeenth as in the nineteenth century, and that the work of the Tractarian movement of this century is a very instructive commentary on the Anglican ideas of Laud and his followers, even if we are so generous as to overlook the cases of such leading churchmen as Bishops Montague and Goodman, the perverts from the queen's circle in the court, and the future of the house of Stuart itself. There was enough to dread in the straight-jacket of liturgical enforcement and the Arminianism of Laud to justify the opposition of the leaders of Calvinistic thought, apart from the more popular fear of a surrender to the papacy. Every one felt the value of morals and manners as a testimony to the worth of religious pretensions, and the great improvement in the court life of Charles' reign is decisive evidence of the influence of Puritan teaching. Archbishop Laud, too, was a vigorous upholder of a high standard of private life. But the exigencies of the cause he was serving made his personal efforts bear little fruit. We can hardly praise the morals of the man who leaned most on the Duke of Buckingham and tolerated the irregularities of the Earl of Strafford, and it is not unfair to think that poverty and the shadows of civil war did much to save a court in which Henrietta Maria was so important a figure, from occasion for regret, if not scandal. It is but just to Charles and Laud to keep the fact well before us that the decay in morals was not primarily due to them. "Even before the policy of Laud rose into the ascendant, Puritanism began to fare more and more hardly within the Church itself.

Then came a serious decay of religious life in the nation. Every

form of moral earnestness was treated with contempt. If a country gentleman only discountenanced vice among his neighbors, or protected the oppressed among the Puritans, he was denounced as a Puritan himself and scoffed at accordingly.* Many of the highest nobles had abandoned the court early in James' reign and lived in voluntary exile upon their estates or in foreign lands. Men like Hampden and Winthrop fled the city of London and the growing corruption of the higher circles of society. Every earnest heart looked with pain and apprehension to the future. It is quite true that there were many pious souls who could not follow the Puritan path. They would nevertheless have found ample room in such a Church as the Puritans were pleading for. But there was no room for the Puritan in the Church of Charles and Laud. Mr. John Henry Shorthouse, who in his great novel has given us so sweet a picture of the retreat of the Ferrars at Little Gidding, says, in speaking of the poet Herbert : "What seems to have been the peculiar mission of Herbert and of his fellows is that they showed the English people what a fine gentleman, who was also a Christian and a churchman, might be. They set the tone of the Church of England, and they revealed, with no inefficient or temporary effect, to the uncultured and unlearned the true refinement of worship. They united delicacy of taste in their choice of ornament and of music with culture of expression and of reserve and they showed that this was not incompatible with devoted work and life."

It was doubtless a noble mission to show "the English people what a fine gentleman, who was also a Christian and a churchman, might be:" but it was equally well performed by such Puritans as Lord Fairfax and John Hampden.† And the Puritan preacher and the Puritan hearer had a higher mission which they well performed. That mission was nothing less than to show to England and to the whole world, for their lives are still as lamps to the nations, how pure and gentle rough and unlearned men and women could become under the influence of a vital and sublime faith in God. Not only did they have a mission, but as Mr. Gardiner, the great historian of the age, has well observed, "there was that in these men which could not be conquered." They were the servants of God, elect, precious in His sight, and heirs of the promises. And the promises are "unto him that overeometh."

When the Long Parliament met, Charles and Laud and Strafford were called upon to meet a united England. Behind the king and his ministers stood but a feeble party. What little strength it had

* Rev. John Brown, D.D., in *Social England*, iv, p. 41.

† See Macaulay's beautiful tribute in his essay on Hampden.

lay in its advantage of position. Its elements were, first, the personal and official adherents of the administration of Church and State ; secondly, the time-servers who forever wait upon the hands of him who has anything to give ; and, thirdly, that large body of the blindly conservative to whom what is, is always best. But the last element, which was the only element of any real strength, was in a state of complete passivity, where it was not for the time being actually supporting the Parliament as the real representative of conservatism. Mr. Gardiner has well said : " No Parliament had ever met, since the days of Earl Simon (de Montfort), with so great a strength of popular support." And he has embodied the inevitable breach with the king in the statement : " It was impossible that the view of public affairs taken by the king should satisfy the men who now came together from every part of England. They were firmly persuaded, not that a few things had gone wrong, but that everything had gone wrong. The future Cavalier and the future Roundhead were of one mind in this. Nor would they be content to submit the choice of the abuses to be abolished to the reason and conscience of the king. They had resolved to measure by their own reason and conscience the remedies which they desired."* And now by the reckless folly of the royal assaults on the liberties of his kingdom of Scotland, Charles had put into his Parliament's hand such a weapon as no Parliament had ever before possessed. It is a strange and instructive commentary on the vaunted kingcraft of the Stuarts that they should have so changed the ancient hostility and the recent jealousy of the two kingdoms as to make the Parliament of England regard a Scottish army of invasion as a body of friends and allies, and the royal levies as an enemy.

The Long Parliament met November 3, 1640, and it remained in nominal existence until Oliver Cromwell finally turned the " Rump " out of doors, April 20, 1653. The period of its real greatness is the period of the leadership of the greatest statesman of the age, John Pym. When he died, December 8, 1643, the centre of influence was transferred from the Parliament to the army. Oliver Cromwell was no less great a man. But he was far less capable a leader of a parliamentary struggle in England. Pym was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of parliamentary government, a perfect master of its precedents and procedure, a consummate student of the arts of combination and control of men, and a careful respecter of the prejudice of the English mind for change in the interpretation rather than the form of law. His great successor was of a far more radical temper. He was too

* *History of England*, Vol. ix, p. 218.

impatient of forms which seemed only to conceal the substance, too ruthless, even where he was right, in tearing down, too impatient in his zeal for setting up new methods and institutions. Pym had learned from the lamented Eliot a devotion to parliamentary government, which never took possession of Cromwell's mind. The stark old soldier doubtless never knew how utterly he had lost the spirit of parliamentary government when he urged that power should be entrusted to "one person, and the Parliament along with him while the Parliament sits."* That was a not illogical development of the Tudor practice, and it was to be developed in due time in genuine English fashion in America, but it was not in line with the parliamentary theory which Eliot had taught and which generations of liberty-loving followers were to establish fully in Great Britain.

Pym was something more than the great parliamentary leader, however. His great strength lay in his complete and supreme sympathy with the demand for a thorough-going reform of the Church, a reform which was to be in accordance with the best practice of the Reformed Churches of the continent and such as to secure the coöperation and fellowship of the Church of Scotland. It was, moreover, to be a reformation of the Church. He was not an advocate of loose toleration. He desired a definite establishment of a well-governed Church, in accord with the best opinion of the clergy, but in accord, too, with the conscience of the laity. He was less outspoken on the question of form than on some others, but his inclinations were certainly towards the Presbyterian system. The burning question of the headship of the Church he could have answered in no other way than did the great body of the Puritans, by recognizing in Jesus Christ the only true Head of the Church. Without running to the extremes of some of the notable Erastians, his practical mind not unnaturally put to one side the debated points, and held a control of the forms and doctrines of the English Church in Parliament not inconsistent with the real headship of Christ and necessary to the welfare of the Church itself. In his age a complete separation of Church and State such as now seems so simple and so practicable was little better than a wild theory of restless dreamers. He was not by nature a reformer, but a man of deep conservatism. His final domination of the reform party was due to the immense power a conservative reform always carries with it. He won his way to leadership because he was trusted by the conservative lords like Bedford, the conservative commoners like Hampden, and could command the support of the hot-headed Strode,

* Speech to his first Parliament, September 12, 1654.

the determined St. John, and the great body of discontented and resolute enemies of the king and his ministers.

The party which thus formed under Pym's guidance was bound to triumph and bound to disintegrate with the progress of its triumph. Nothing was too high for it, but each step it climbed reduced its numbers. As the fall of Buckingham had cost the party of the Parliament the support of Wentworth, so the fall of Wentworth himself was destined to cost the same party the adherence of others who thought the lesson given the king was sufficient for the time. As time went on the moderate royalists and the moderate Churchmen, the jealous aristocrats and the non-Puritan indifferentists gradually dropped out of the ranks of the consolidated party of opposition, till at length the Parliament became reduced to two bodies, popularly known as the Presbyterians and the Independents, both wholly committed to a Calvinistic theology and a popular State, but at variance as to the form of government in Church and State. The one leaned on a parliamentary State and a Presbyterian Church; the other turned to a democratic State and a Congregational Church. The death of Pym left the Parliament without a competent hand to guide it, and there is no sadder spectacle in the history of popular government than the miserable faction fights of its last years. Its weakness lay mainly in the fact that it had severed its connection with its fountain of power. Its indefinite extension of its own duration had not only struck at one of the fundamental principles of popular government, but had thrown it entirely upon its own resources. Success became the only test of its administration. And its history is thenceforth the mournful story of attempts to justify itself by expulsions from its midst of every independent element. It failed to accomplish any constructive work because it refused to take the people into partnership. It destroyed the work of the Stuarts in the State, and it taught the people that frequent and free Parliaments alone could build up the shattered fragments. It stopped the oppressive and reactionary policy of Laud in the Church, but gave England no great Church, and only half taught the lesson of toleration.

The responsibility for these failures lies primarily with Charles, whose duplicity kept open a struggle that a man of ordinary intelligence and honesty of purpose would have brought to an end both from desire for the public weal and from self-interest. He had no large confidence in the ultimate triumph of his cause as being founded in right, no high patriotism which could make him wish his people happy under a government of their own contriving, and was so deeply bred in a habit of playing off one party against another that at last he could not resist the temptation to parley, postpone

and plot when any person of ordinary penetration could scarcely have failed to see that he was playing into the hands of the rising power of the army and its resourceful chief, and fast bringing down upon himself and his race personal and official ruin. But if Charles is primarily responsible for the long years of tortuous intrigue, the Parliament must share the responsibility with him. It failed signally in two points. In the first place, it failed in promptitude and directness in its dealings with Charles. The utter fatuity of a policy which delays when it should despatch, which negotiates when it should act, was plainly exemplified. But the greater failure lay in the refusal to observe the cardinal principle of representative government, the essential subordination of the representative to those he represents. It may have been dangerous to dissolve Parliament in the midst of civil war. But it was not so dangerous as to take the responsibility and conduct of the war out of the hands of the people. A Tudor would no more have made such a mistake than an Abraham Lincoln. It was the people's battle and the people should have had as large a share in its conduct as possible. When Parliament assumed the conduct of the contest, it ceased to represent anybody but itself. Every radical measure thenceforth became the excuse for secessions from the Houses of the moderate men, whose presence was a guaranty of broad policy within and of support without. The inevitable result was the strengthening of the royal and Episcopal party both by recruiting their ranks and by developing a great neutral party distrusting the Parliament only less than they distrusted the king.

When the Westminster Assembly met, the Long Parliament was at the great crisis of its career. As yet it was strong in Pym's leadership. The relations with the Scots were in their best phase. The party of Church reform was strong in the adhesion of moderate Episcopalians and Independents, and no breach had been made to appear between those who were for the Presbyterian order because it was most expedient and those who held it to be of divine appointment. A rapid execution of their task would have doubtless seen the English Church thoroughly organized on a Presbyterian basis. But the Parliament undertook to direct the proceedings of the Assembly too much, and while the Assembly debated the opportunity was lost.

There are many notable contrasts presented by this age. As it was an age of rapid development, men swung through large orbits. We are struck by the remarkable phases of character development in men like Wentworth, who was driven from opposition to staunch advocacy of royal prerogative without violating consistency, yet

with apparent disloyalty to every trust; like Milton, who swept through the course of mental and moral ruin which leaves men sure only of self and utterly skeptical of human and divine order; like Cromwell, who from self-distrust rose to resolute supremacy by the influence of a deep conviction of duty and fearless fidelity to its dictates; like Hyde (Clarendon), who from a moderate supporter of liberal policy was thrust into the front of a reactionary movement and finally forced into the position of an embittered and half-convinced apologist. If we can pause in our pursuit of the main lines of policy and turn aside into the by-ways of the period, we find a vast amount of interesting material for study in the careers of men and of movements intense enough in themselves, but never rising to rôles of the first importance.

We find in Viscount Falkland, for instance, one of the types of men naturally formed by the trend of the times. Generous and sympathetic in temperament, with a strong inclination to a studious life, he found in the vigorous Puritanism of his grandfather and the drift of his mother to Romanism an unsettling conflict in the religious relations of his youth. A lover of mild order, he leaned to the royal prerogative till he entered the House of Commons. The essential righteousness of the Parliament's cause captivated his mind, until he was lured into the king's service. Once more influenced by surroundings, he followed the king, thinking his cause the lesser evil. All the while his heart was in his literary friendships and the memory of his once happy retreat in Oxfordshire, and he longed to leave war and debate and find repose in study and philosophical discussion. Allowing Hyde to dominate his political views, he let Chillingworth determine his philosophical attitude, and so he became a moderate royalist and a rationalist. Feminine in temper, his ideal of "sweet reasonableness" was too timid and tenuous for the robust energy of the conflict that ebbed and flowed about him, and he flung away his life in what was practically suicide on the field of Newbury. The other extreme is well represented by John Lilburne, who was sprung of a good family of Durham, but early removed to London. From his earliest manhood he developed an inclination to adopt novel views and to maintain them with the most violent disputations. He early caught the current craze for pamphleteering and contributed some of the most fantastic and violent publications that appeared.*

* A single title from Lilburne's pamphlets will afford some idea of the man: "Come out of Her, My People; or, An Answer to the Questions of a Gentlewoman, a Professor in the Anti-Christian Church of England about Hearing the public Ministers; where it is largely discussed and proved unlawful. Also a Just Apology for the way of Total Separation, commonly but falsely called 'Brownism;' That it is the truth of God tho' lightly esteemed in the eyes of

He made himself not only obnoxious, but positively dangerous to every party, and he suffered imprisonment at the hands of royal, Presbyterian and Independent authorities. Marten said of him, "If the world was emptied of all but John Lilburne, Lilburne would quarrel with John, and John with Lilburne." After many experiences in prison, in the army, in the pillory, and in exile, he finally became a Quaker, and gave up "carnal sword-fightings and fleshly bustlings," and settled down to peace and a quiet life.

England refused to be distracted from the main issues by any of the temptations thrust in the way of reform. History must join with her in keeping her eyes on the central facts and the great leaders. Charles, Land and Wentworth must forever stand over against Pym, Hampden and Cromwell. Had Pym lived to bring his work to a successful termination, his victory would have meant a long anticipation of the triumph of parliamentary government and of the union with Scotland, and scarcely less certainly the settlement of the great Church of England under the Westminster Standards. It is not possible for one who loves and reverences those glorious documents, and who knows how much they have done to keep pure in Scotland and America the truth once delivered to the saints, not to regret that such a result was not realized. The Presbyterians pushed to the front once more in the reign of Charles II and steadied the ship of State, but, lacking any longer a central rallying point, they were forced to give up their individual preferences and rally to the defense of the great principles of Protestantism which were threatened by the worldliness and Romanism of Charles II and James II. After the revolution of 1688 they lost ground in a State that had at last obtained a satisfactory settlement of its Constitution, and in a religious world in which earnestness of spirit was in a mournful decline while a latitudinarian toleration within the Established Church made room for most of the representatives of the old Presbyterian party.

Puritanism as a party cry died away, both because among those who professed its principles the old vital spirit was exchanged for a rude ritual of conduct, and in an age of prosperity and peace the ruling classes in Church and State lost the spur of persecution to rouse them to noble aspiration. But it never died out in the land. As the embers from the fire Wyclif and his simple preachers kindled with the divine spark of Bible truth glowed on upon

the world. With a challenge To dispute them publicly before King and Council, to prove whatsoever I have said at the pillory against them: viz., that the calling of them is *jure Diaboli* even from the Devil himself. By one, John Lilburne, close prisoner in the Fleet for the cause of Christ. Printed in the year of hope of England's Purgation and the Prelates' Dissolution. 1639."

many humble hearthstones till fanned once more into flame by Tyndale, Coverdale and their fellows, so the Puritan faith was kept sacredly in many simple homes in England and America, as well as in Scotland and the north of Ireland. Again and again it has burst into life under the preaching of men like Whitefield, the Wesleys and Spurgeon, proving the permanence of the impression made upon the English race. As a force working for practical morality, it has made the home life of England wholesome and pure, and asserted itself in many political crises as a deep undercurrent in the domestic and foreign affairs of the kingdom.

Mr. Whittier has summed up the period in a striking passage in his essay on John Bunyan, who with Richard Baxter best represents Puritan literature after the Restoration:—

“ The English revolution of the seventeenth century, whilst it humbled the false and oppressive aristocracy of rank and title, was prodigal of the real nobility of mind and heart. Its history is bright with the footprints of men whose very names still stir the hearts of freemen, the world over, like a trumpet peal. Say what we may of its fanaticism, laugh as we may at its extravagant enjoyment of newly acquired religious and civil liberty, who shall now venture to deny that it was the golden age of England ? ”

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD.