

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1850.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The relations of Religion to what are called Diseases of the Mind.*

Our attention has been particularly directed to this subject by an elaborate and somewhat ingenious article in a foreign periodical of great respectability.* In a cursory examination of the article upon its first appearance we were disposed to question some of its positions, but, in hope that it would be better and more quickly done elsewhere, the purpose was dismissed, and casually revived by a reference to some of the cases which it records in support or illustration of the author's views. A more particular examination reveals to us a vein of error running through the body of the argument, and tinging all the doctrines and inferences which it sets forth.

No one can contemplate the present provision for the comfort and cure of the insane without gratitude to God, nor without admiration of the philanthropy and science which have together

* Winslow's Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology. April, 1848. London.

this vast country, and soon to spread beyond it. Additional reasons might be drawn from the manifest relation of this great race to the cause and kingdom of Christ, and the conversion of the world, but the length to which these remarks have already run, admonishes us to hold our hand.

By John Forseyth

ART. V.—*History of England from the Accession of James II.*
By Thomas Babington Macaulay. 2 vols. Harper, Brothers. 1849.

This is one of those rare works, which at once take rank among the classics of the language; and while they stand in no need of the heralding of reviews, every reviewer of note is nevertheless expected to make them the subject of his criticism. Mr. Macaulay, already widely known as an essayist, a poet, an orator, and a statesman, at a single bound has reached a position among the great historians of England. Reviewers of the most opposite political opinions, Tory, Whig and Radical, (with a solitary exception) have joined in a hearty and harmonious tribute of praise, re-echoing with unexampled zeal the shouts of applause with which the general public have hailed the appearance of these volumes. For years it had been rumoured that such a work was in preparation, and meanwhile the author was earning for himself a distinguished reputation as a man of letters, by a succession of brilliant essays, which, from their subjects being connected with the political and literary history of England, indicated the nature of his studies, and naturally awakened the greatest expectation. The manifold editions and the immense circulation which the work has reached within the short time that has elapsed since its first appearance, and the praise bestowed upon it, with such unusual unanimity by critics of all parties, afford decisive proof that the hopes of the public have been in a good degree realized.

These volumes will not only bear a second perusal, but, if we may judge others by ourselves, we may even affirm, that no one who omits to read them twice can really form a calm and candid estimate of their worth as a history. Mr. Macaulay is a per-

fect master in all the arts of rhetoric; the splendour of his style is so dazzling, his narrative flows on so delightfully—"puroque simillimus amni,"—his episodes are introduced with such consummate skill, his pictures of persons and of social life are so dramatic, and, in pronouncing judgment on the character of statesmen and the policy of parties, there is such an air of rigid historic justice, the faults of Whigs and the virtues of Tories are brought out with so much apparent candour, that we found ourselves on a first perusal quite unable to exercise "the right of private judgment," and were not surprised at the enthusiasm of some friends who expressed the wish that all the books of human literature were written by a Macaulay.

Even a second reading scarcely diminishes the interest awakened by the charming page. But we are more masters of ourselves; and we then detect blemishes which at first attracted little notice. Some of them we regard as of very grave importance, and seriously detracting from the value of the work as a history of the eventful times which the author has undertaken to describe.

Our first objection respects the point at which Mr. Macaulay fairly begins his narrative, viz., the accession of James II. His first four chapters are therefore only introductory, and, with the exception of the third, containing a picture of the social condition of England in the times of the Stuarts, (on some accounts the most interesting chapter in the book) they are designed to give a rapid view of the process of amalgamation of Briton, Dane, Saxon, Norman, the result of which was the English race, and of the process of development which brought out the distinctive principles of the English constitution. We must express our regret that he did not adopt a different method, and select an earlier starting point. The first two chapters would have answered admirably for a review, but as an introduction to a work like the present they are too long, as a history too cursory. James's accession to the throne was in no sense the commencement of a remarkable epoch; his reign is connected historically and politically with that of his brother Charles; there was a change of persons but not of policy. He might as well have chosen for his point of departure the middle, as the beginning of the reign of James. And in fact, the narrative flows on so uninterruptedly, broken only by the pictorial episode

respecting the physical and social state of England, to which we have referred, that the reader is quite unaware (unless he has read the title page) of his having reached the real opening of the story. No one acquainted with Mr. Macaulay's writings can doubt that he has long and deeply studied the annals of the Stuart race. All his essays indicate an uncommon acquaintance with those times. We deeply regret, therefore, that he did not take as his starting point, the accession of the Stuarts to the throne of England. That event marked the opening of a period pregnant with issues of the highest magnitude, a period the most eventful, beyond comparison, in the annals of Britain. Long before the extinction of the Tudors, the first faint notes were indeed heard of that strife of principles, which ultimately swelled into the mightiest battle ever fought upon the English soil; still the dynastic change just mentioned may be properly regarded as the outset of this notable era. Henry and Elizabeth were no less fond of power, and exercised the prerogative even more absolutely, than James or Charles; but they fought no battle for it; haughty and self-willed as they were, they had sense enough to know when to yield and how to do it gracefully; though they wielded an iron sceptre, they nevertheless contrived to retain a firm hold of the national heart. With the new family which inherited the throne, a different kind of manager appeared upon the stage; a succession of monarchs as destitute of common sense as of moral principles, under whose administration a small, and politically speaking insignificant party, speedily acquired vast numbers, wide-spread influence, in a word, an organization and an energy before which the proud and self-willed Stuart quailed. The history of the eighty-five years of the Stuart dynasty forms a complete chapter, and the historian who would do full justice to the great events included in it, must begin at the beginning. During this period, the old contest between royal prerogative and popular rights, and the more recently originated strife between conscience and human authority, were terminated, after a struggle fierce and bloody, the marks of which still exist; terminated triumphantly for the cause of liberty and religion. But for the accession of the Stuart family, it is quite possible that the indecisive skirmishing of earlier days might have been kept up till our own times. This period was, in other respects, remarkable. Our English tongue

one of the fruits of the fusion of the Saxon and Norman races, during this era, put on, in the main, its permanent form and features; our literature made an immense advance; it was the age of Shakspeare, Jonson, Bacon, Milton, Dryden, Locke, not to mention the giants in theological learning. The manners of the people were greatly improved: no previous century had witnessed an equal progress in the refinements and comforts of social life. It was in fact a wonderful age—a fit theme for a noble epic—having a beginning, a middle, and an end; and we must again express our surprise that Mr. Macaulay, instead of commencing his narrative at a point unattended by any of those circumstances which mark an epoch, and expending his strength on a reign which had already engaged the pens of Fox and Macintosh, did not undertake to give us the full story of the Stuart race.

But there are far graver objections, to which, in our judgment, his work is open. In many parts of it there are clear indications that he wants what we deem an essential qualification in a historian of those eventful times, deep and earnest religious convictions.

As we have before intimated, that which renders the Stuart period so profoundly interesting is the conflict of principles and parties. Under the Plantagenets and Tudors there were struggles between the King and his barons; many bloody battles were fought by opposing factions; during the wars of the Roses not a few noble and gentle families disappeared forever. These earlier contests were usually occasioned by some special grievance; or the appeal was made to arms to settle the question of succession to the throne. To the mass of the nation it was a matter of little moment who gained the prize. Whether the White or Red rose triumphed their condition was in no degree affected by the event, except as it might be influenced by the personal virtues or vices of the victor. But the conflicts during the Stuart dynasty involved principles of infinite value both in religion and politics; principles entering into the very life of the church and the state. The points raised by the nation in that grand debate, were—whether as Christians they should be free to follow the dictates of conscience, or be bound to worship God in a form prescribed by human authority—whether as citizens

they should be governed by law, or the arbitrary will of the prince.

Now it should never be forgotten, that while civil rights were at stake, they did not originate the contest. Religion was the occasion of it; and hence the necessity for that qualification in its historian, which, as we shall presently show, Mr. Macaulay lacks. It was the struggle to gain exemption from prescribed forms of divine worship, which aroused and quickened inquiry respecting political rights. The Puritans were the men who first unfurled the banner of freedom, and they never deserted it. Arbitrary power they always detested; the supremacy of law they always asserted. There were certain rights of the subject, and certain prerogatives of Parliament, which the English people never would suffer to be invaded; yet we venture to affirm, that if the religious differences which began under Elizabeth had been satisfactorily adjusted, if the rulers of the church had been wise enough to treat tender consciences with kindness, tolerating circumstantial diversity, when they had substantial unity among her members, the political condition of England would have been widely different from what it is. Cromwell might then have lived and died a farmer; Edgehill and Naseby had been names unknown to history. Each political grievance, as it rose, would have been dealt with as in the days of the Plantagenets—endured until it became unendurable, and then thrown off by a sudden outburst of the national energy. These spasmodic displays of the spirit of liberty excepted, the stream of popular life might have flowed on in its old accustomed channel. But grievances of conscience are widely different from grievances affecting the mere citizen. No one can be really sensible of the former, without a considerable share of religious knowledge and an earnest conviction of its importance. The men whom Elizabeth and the Stuarts fancied they could bend and mould at will, were divinely instructed in the true nature and sublime objects of religion. In their view it was a thing of infinite moment, involving transactions between their own souls and the eternal God, of awful solemnity. They felt that they had souls to be lost or saved, the fear of Him who held their everlasting destinies in his hands excluded all other fear, so that like the early heralds of the cross they could give the calm but bold challenge to the haughtiest of monarchs—

"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." But it is needless to dwell upon the character of these glorious men, who amid tears and blood planted that tree beneath whose goodly shade we sit, and every day eat of its pleasant fruits. Their portrait has been often drawn, and by no one in more glowing colours than by Mr. Macaulay himself.

We have adverted to the character of the men and the times, simply to show that no man is completely fitted to tell their story, who is a stranger to the power of godliness. He may be, as Mr. Macaulay unquestionably is, intimately acquainted with its literature, he may have all the archives of all the cabinets of Europe at his disposal, he may have all the mental endowments necessary to the historian, but if destitute of deep religious convictions he wants an essential requisite. His love of liberty, as the word is now understood, may induce him to denounce acts of oppression, to sympathize with Leighton denuded of his ears, and inveigh against the ruthless bigotry of Laud; but after all, he can have no cordial affection for the principles which Leighton loved and Laud hated; there are many transactions which he cannot comprehend, many struggles which to him can have no interest whatever. And this we conceive to be Mr. Macaulay's grand defect. He is a Christian, in the loose sense in which the term is applied to multitudes who believe that the Bible is a divine book, while at the same time they regard the manifold forms of Christianity as about equal in value. He conceives it to be highly problematical whether Popery or Protestantism has done most for Britain. We might quote numerous passages which betray a spirit of indifference to positive Christianity; passages which prove him to be culpably ignorant of the relative merits of the Calvinistic and Arminian systems, on which he nevertheless ventures to make passing criticisms with the tone of one who had studied and digested them. On several occasions it comes in his way to advert to the doctrine of a particular Providence, and he treats it as if it were a dogma too absurd to be gravely refuted, which no man can adopt unless on the bias of early education, or a latent tendency to superstition. For instance, in describing the character of William of Orange, he says—"He had ruminated on the *great enigmas* which had been discussed in the Synod of Dort, and had found in the

austere and inflexible logic of the Genevan school something which suited his intellect and temper. The tenet of Predestination was the keystone of his religion. He *even* declared that if he were to abandon that tenet he must abandon all belief in a superintending Providence." The logic of Geneva is indeed "austere and inflexible," (it would be worthless if it were not) as the enemies of the system of divine truth which Calvin taught have repeatedly found, though it is obvious from the tone of the passage that these predicates are used by Mr. Macaulay merely to give grace and roundness to the period. If his account of William's creed be correct, the prince proved himself to be a sounder logician than the historian.

Again, in illustrating the dreadful sufferings inflicted upon the Scottish people during the bloody era between the Restoration and the Revolution, some examples of which he gives from Wodrow, he says: "Some rigid Calvinists, from the doctrine of reprobation had drawn the consequence that to pray for any person who had been predestined to perdition was an act of mutiny against the eternal decrees of the Supreme Being." Then follows an account of the murder in cold blood of three labouring men, "deeply imbued with this unamiable divinity," for refusing to pray for James II. Mr. Macaulay has been highly lauded for the exactness with which he quotes his authorities, and the praise is no doubt merited where they refer to political and literary topics; but in this instance he certainly has drawn largely on his own fancy. There is not one word in Wodrow (his only authority) that warrants him in charging "some rigid Calvinists" with holding "this unamiable divinity." Wodrow simply states that the men, when asked if they would pray for the king replied, "they would pray for all within the election of grace." Major Balfour said, "Do you question the king's election": they answered, "sometimes they questioned their own." "He swore dreadfully and ordered them to be executed on the spot." Such is the story as told by Wodrow; but as thus told, it is quite too plain for our historian; he must therefore first deck it from the stores of his exuberant rhetoric, and then in the exercise of his own peculiar logic infer from it the unamiable divinity of "some rigid Calvinists." Were it necessary, we might bring other proofs of Mr. Macaulay's ignorance of the doctrines which the Puritans zealously maintained,

not as "great enigmas," but all-important verities adapted to exert a controlling influence on the life of man, and which left so deep an impress on their own character.

As a consequence of this want of sympathy with the religious principles of the Puritans, Mr. Macaulay does them great injustice, in the first place, by not bringing out clearly and distinctly *who they were*. Surely a body of men like the Puritans, whose doings belong to the history, as their writings do to the literature of England, merited if not a separate chapter, at least so careful and exact a description of them, that the reader could be in no doubt as to the persons to whom that honoured name really belongs. They figure so largely in the scenes which he describes, that he is forced to speak of them very often; he professes to give some of their peculiarities, and in occasional passages intimates that under a common name, various parties were included. Yet the tone of his narrative is such as to leave the impression on the reader's mind that the Puritans (i. e. the great mass of the party) were bitter enemies of all the elegant arts of life, denounced all popular pastimes, and during the heyday of their power were guilty of as gross and wanton tyranny as their opposers. Now, admitting that "Puritan stone masons attempted to make Nymphs and Graces, the work of Ionian chisels decent,"—and that there were "lank haired" Puritans who "discussed election and reprobation through their noses," in the coffee houses where they were wont to assemble, is it true that the great body of the Puritans were distinguished by these and similar peculiarities which moved the derision of Prelatists and libertines? We venture to affirm that no one will answer this question affirmatively, who has thoroughly studied the history of the Puritans, and know who they were.

The term Puritan—the Anglican form of a Greek word in use in the Church as a party name so early as the fifth century—properly denotes, as the most recent historian of British Puritanism observes, "a body of men who were Church of England men, and not Dissenters, advocates for the establishment of Christianity and of their own views of Christianity by law."² Even in the time of Edward VI., but particularly under Elizabeth, the term was applied to all those members of the

* Prof. Stowell. History of the Puritans.

Church of England who had a warm and hearty love for the Reformation, who wished to remove from her forms of worship and discipline those relics of the ancient superstition, which so many of her sons in later times have regarded as her most glorious distinction; and who would have succeeded in their designs, if their efforts had not been thwarted by the haughty and semi-popish Defenders of the Faith. That such views were entertained by Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Cox, Jewell, and many other of their contemporaries, is put beyond all reasonable doubt, by documents published by Burnet, and more recently by the Zurich Letters. These men were Puritans. If they had been able to carry out their wishes, they would have removed from the constitution and forms of the English Church those features, which others less zealous for her purity than themselves insisted upon retaining, partly to please the Queen, and partly with the hope of gaining the Papists, who were still very numerous in certain portions of the kingdom. Hence the name applies to many who never separated, and never meant to separate from the established church, to the large number forced out of her pale by civil and ecclesiastical authority for persisting in their scruples about the use of certain rites and vestments, and finally, at a later period, to those who objected to the form of her constitution, and were in the proper sense of the term dissenters. In the days of Elizabeth and James, the Puritans were not a party distinct from and hostile to the Church; they remained in her communion; the party included all who loved the pure gospel, had a heart hatred of Popery, and wished to cultivate closer fellowship with the reformed churches on the continent. On minor matters they were not all of one mind: some would have used the pruning knife more vigorously than others, and hence the seeds of the unfortunate divisions which took place among them during the days of Charles and Cromwell.

At the breaking out of the contest between Charles and his Parliament, England was divided into two great parties, viz. the Puritan or Presbyterian, and the Prelatic.* The fact to which

* Neal. We say Presbyterians, because at this time most of the Puritans were Presbyterians. Men like Usher, Reynolds, &c., who were at heart Puritans though professing a modified Episcopacy, went, some with one party, some with the other.

we have already adverted, that the point at which reformation should stop had never been determined by the Puritans as a body, prepared the way for their subsequent divisions. The reins of ecclesiastical government were necessarily held with a slack hand during the civil troubles; and it was natural that the freedom to think and act, so suddenly gained, combined as it was with an intense religious feeling, should produce strange developments. Soon the Independents showed themselves agreeing with the Presbyterians on all subjects except church government, yet forming a distinct party. Then there were those who maintained that every Christian had the right—which they themselves exercised—of holding forth when and where he pleased; a class of enthusiasts (for we cannot consent to apply the term fanatic to men who knew how to unite the saint and the soldier to a degree never before, and never since witnessed) in the army. As for the Muggletonians, Quakers and Fifth-monarchy men, it were a dishonour to the Puritan name, to include them under that designation, as Mr. Macaulay in some places seems to do. These minor sects, and even those whom we prefer to call enthusiasts, whose peculiarities were the standing theme of ridicule to the licentious wits of the Restoration, bore an insignificant proportion, not only to the nation as a whole, but even to the great body of the Puritans. We have no doubt that the oddities of this extreme section of the Puritans have been greatly exaggerated, for a reason mentioned by Mr. Macaulay in his well known description of them, viz. that “for many years after the Restoration they were the theme of unmeasured invective and derision, were exposed to the utmost licentiousness of the press and the stage, at a time when the press and the stage were most licentious.” Is it right, we ask, for any historian to rely on such authorities, when painting the character of any class of men? Yet these are the very writers to whom he refers when he represents the Puritans as distinguished by ostentatious simplicity of dress, sour aspect, nasal twang, contempt of human learning, and detestation of polite amusements. But even if the bitter enemies of the Puritans, though heaping unmeasured abuse upon them, were really faithful painters, we still affirm that they drew the picture of only a small party, and that there were thousands entitled to

and actually bearing the name of Puritans on whose countenances no such dismal features could be traced.*

Another cause of Mr. Macaulay's failure to do justice to the Puritans is his *excessive effort to be candid*; he is so far elevated above the prejudices of sect and party, that he has just as much and just as little sympathy with the Papist as the Protestant, with the Prelatist as the Puritan. Such is the impression which he seems desirous to make upon the reader's mind; as religious parties he feels no more interest in the one than the other. Is this an essential element of candour? Must the historian, who would be candid, regard all the varied forms of Christianity as equally good? Not only do we deny this, we hold that any one imbued with this sentiment, who attempts to give the history of a period like that of the Stuarts, must do injustice to the cause of truth. Such a man will be slow to recognise the connexion between true religion and social progress; there are many events whose real causes he will wholly fail to discern. As little is he to be deemed a candid historian who in dealing with this period, contents himself with simply stating the naked fact that all parties were chargeable with the same crimes and errors, leaving his reader to infer, or perhaps affirming in so many words, that in point of blameworthiness there is not much if any difference between them. The Prelatists, for example, were bitter persecutors, but so were the Puritans; the Prelatists denounced conventicles; but then the Puritans forbade the use of the prayer-book; the Royalists were to the last degree loose in their morals; but then the Puritans put on a solemn face, shut up the theatres, and passed severe laws against the "lighter vices" of adultery and profaneness.

This is Mr. Macaulay's method of exhibiting impartiality. In these volumes, and in his other writings, he invariably represents the Puritans as chargeable to a large extent with producing the unexampled licentiousness which reigned after the Restoration; the excessive morality of Cromwell's days naturally led to the excessive wickedness of Charles's. He accuses them of exhibiting a bigotry as exclusive, a tyranny as wanton, in the day of their power, as ever their enemies had exercised upon themselves; and hence he declares that the infamous

* See Stowell, p. 19.

treatment they received at the hands of the restored Cavaliers was natural and even excusable. Now we unhesitatingly assert that such a representation of the conduct of the Puritans in power, is the opposite of fair and candid.

In saying this we do not mean to deny that they committed great errors. We acknowledge that they did so, and if Mr. Macaulay instead of giving such prominence to their foibles, had clearly and distinctly exhibited their errors, he would have discharged, much more worthily than he has, the office of the historian. Our readers, we trust, will pardon us for enlarging a little on this point. The errors, into which the Puritans fell, were the result, partly of their peculiar circumstances, and partly of the principles which in that age belonged to the common faith of Christendom. All parties allowed the civil magistrate a voice in spiritual things which we in this land and age have been taught to refuse him as alike injurious to the cause of religion and the welfare of the state. The idea of a national church, with which all the Reformers were imbued, and on which the whole Protestant world had acted, was as familiar to the mind of the Puritan as the Prelatist. The former wished to remodel and reform the Church of England, but it was still to be the Church of England; all they wanted, was a purer and simpler form of government and discipline in the established church, and if the Presbyterians had not been led astray by the ignis fatuus of uniformity, this grand achievement might have been effected. Their intolerant and persecuting spirit, of which we shall presently speak, was the natural fruit of this idea.

The grand error of the Puritans was the split between the two leading sections of the party, the Presbyterians and Independents. At the breaking out of the troubles, or prior to the meeting of the Westminster Assembly, the Presbyterians were predominant in Parliament and in the country. With the exception of those who held Prelacy to be essential to the being of a church, they had no antagonists worthy of the name. The cruelties of which Prelacy had been guilty, while enforcing uniformity in rites and ceremonies, combined with its obvious affinity for absolute monarchy, had awakened the disgust of thousands who cared little for forms of worship in themselves; and the undisguised tendency of Laudism to Popery had exci-

ted alarm among the sincere friends of Protestantism; so that the conviction that the church needed to be remodelled was almost universal. Every thing indeed seemed favourable for accomplishing the good work of eliminating from the constitution of the Anglican church the noxious elements which had been incorporated with it, and thus of completing the half reformation of Edward and Elizabeth. It was one of these occasions for doing a great work, which occur only at rare intervals in the life of nations. The fair prospect was soon overclouded by the unwise rigidity of the Presbyterians, by their attempting to extirpate at once every trace of Prelacy, and to introduce in its stead a system claiming the same absolute *jus divinum*, and breathing apparently the same intolerant and persecuting spirit. No wonder that Milton, at first the zealous friend, soon became the determined opposer of the Presbyterians, saying that Presbyter was nothing more than "old Priest writ large." To set up Presbytery seemed to be a mere exchange of yokes.

Nor is it surprising that the Independents so rapidly grew in numbers and influence. As a party, they were not, in principle, more liberal than the Presbyterians; but as they were in a position to need toleration, they naturally became its recognised advocates. They wished to enjoy the privilege of forming churches according to their own notions of the New Testament model; they sought toleration for themselves; but liberty of worship as we understand it, was a doctrine which neither party admitted. Both were for maintaining the union of church and state; and if the scheme of compromise, or rather of comprehension, which the Independents proposed, had been consented to by the Presbyterians, the former would probably have exhibited as little fondness for sectaries as the latter. It is an instructive fact, that every sect under persecution has got a glimpse of the rights of conscience, and that every sect in power has to a greater or less extent violated them.

This, we repeat, was the first great error of the leading section of the Puritan party: by grasping at too much, by unwise efforts after absolute uniformity, the seeds of division and alienation were sown. Two parties, with the strongest possible affinities for each other in regard to doctrine, discipline, and worship, that could exist short of complete identity, parties which united might have held undisputed sway in the kingdom

and might have given stability and permanence to the incipient reformation, presented the spectacle and met the usual fate of a house divided against itself. The Independents were forced into the unnatural position of antagonism to the Presbyterians and the Parliament; and then, when the power had passed into the hands of Cromwell and the army, the Presbyterians fell into another grave error, by maintaining a sullen mood towards the greatest prince that Britain ever saw or is likely to see again. One of the finest things in these volumes is Mr. Macaulay's portrait of Cromwell. It is a particular favourite of our historian, who, however, does no more than justice to the glorious man, in whose presence the Plantagenets and Tudors shrink into pigmies. His memory has been loaded with obloquy by those who should have known better; but the world is beginning to appreciate the real character of Cromwell; a man forced to adopt many measures by circumstances over which he had no control; a man not without ambition, but it was ambition of a noble kind; who, as he won the sceptre of Britain by matchless valour in the field, proved that he was worthy to wield it by unsurpassed wisdom in the cabinet. By principle as well as from policy, Cromwell was the advocate of toleration. He was not a leader; he was not a revolutionist; he did not overthrow the Presbyterian establishment when it existed, though he could have done it by a word. An Independent in principle, he was not the enemy of Presbyterians; and if they had rallied round him as they should have done, he might have relieved himself of that extraordinary army, which was at once the main stay of his power, and the main obstacle in the way of his doing for his country all that was in his heart.

Another grievous error of the Presbyterians—the natural consequence of those just adverted to—was the share they took in the Restoration of the exiled Stuarts. If they had been wholly ignorant of the character of Charles II., their attachment to that embodiment of wickedness, would have been unwise indeed, yet excusable. But he had been in Scotland, they knew what solemn professions he had made, what solemn oaths he had taken, and how shamelessly he had cast them aside the moment he found himself safe again on the continent; they had abundant proof that he had no more conscience than a statue; they knew that he was a debased sensualist, with not one re-

deeming trait except that sort of good nature which would not inflict pain out of mere wantonness, yet which cares not how much blood is shed, or how much misery is caused, if necessary to gain an end. To restore such a man to the throne, unbound by any public and formal pledge to maintain the liberties of church or state, the Presbyterians united with a party with which they could have no real sympathy, and by which they were absolutely abhorred. Charles, who would promise any thing if he could thereby regain the throne, had indeed entered into private engagements with the Presbyterian leaders, who otherwise would not for an instant have entertained the proposal to restore him; but they were of such a nature that he could, as he did, throw the responsibility of breaking them on Parliament.

Mr. Macaulay says that "some zealous friends of freedom have without reason condemned the Restoration," and particularly the admission of Charles II., free of all conditions other than those agreed upon in private. He maintains that this course, all things considered, was the wisest that could have been chosen, and enters into a long argument in support of his opinion; but his reasoning strikes us as very unsatisfactory. We are not at all convinced by it, that the consequences, which he pronounces inevitable, would have followed, if the power had remained in the hands of the army. It was, as he himself repeatedly declares, an army the like of which had never before been seen. "Fifty thousand men, accustomed to the profession of arms, were at once thrown upon the world; experience seemed to warrant the belief that this change would produce great misery. No such result followed. Royalists themselves confessed that in every department of honest industry, the discarded warriors prospered beyond other men." I. 142. We firmly believe that an army composed of such materials never would have permitted the establishment of a military tyranny, or any other form of absolute government. They might and probably would have introduced great political changes; they might have prevented the re-creation of the throne; they might have greatly diminished the power of the aristocracy; but so far as respected the perpetration of outrage upon the individual citizen, the restriction of personal liberty, and the invasion of personal property, we are persuaded that England had far less reason to fear such consequences from the rule of the army, than from the restora-

tion of the Stuarts. Be this as it may, the position assumed by the Presbyterians, and the consequent division of that great body which comprised the real friends of freedom and reform, was an error of which they soon had ample reason to repent.

That the Puritans are open to the charge of having persecuted, and that their laws against what our historian calls "the lighter vices" were in some respects unwise, we readily admit. This was another of their mistakes. At the same time we maintain that Mr. Macaulay gives a distorted view of their conduct in this particular, and subjects them to unmerited odium, when he says, that they were guilty of persecution as cruel as any that they themselves had endured. Now let us look for a moment at the treatment of the Prelatists, who would naturally suffer most severely at their hands. How were they dealt with? They were excluded from office in church and college; they were forbidden to use the liturgy; they were heavily fined. Keeping in view the principles respecting the relation of church and state common to all parties, we say that the Prelatists had no more right to complain of this exclusion from office, than the Papists under Elizabeth. The state had chosen to remodel the church, and to connect new conditions with the enjoyment of ecclesiastical dignities; and if they could not comply with the condition, they must forego the emolument. None could doubt the competence of the state to change the tenure of such offices, for the power had been repeatedly exercised since the days of Henry VIII. Besides, in the existing condition of the kingdom, amid the struggles of a revolution, it was impossible for Parliament to adopt any other course, and secure the object for which they had embarked in the contest with the king. To leave their deadly enemies in possession of their benefices in the church and the universities had been the height of absurdity. Such the Prelatists notoriously were. They were devoted to the king, heart and soul, they raised large sums on their estates, they melted down their plate to replenish the royal coffers; they wanted to restore him to the throne in the full possession of his prerogatives. Even after his overthrow, they were perpetually plotting against the government, and in order to gain their end, not scrupling to think about admitting an assassin as their co-adjutor. While the Parliament was in power, and afterwards under Cromwell, it was impossible to keep them down unless

by a strong hand. Politics and religion thus became so interlaced, that it is difficult to separate the one from the other, or accurately determine the proportions of suffering for religious dissent, and punishment for political delinquencies. Every rectory containing a Prelatic parson was a centre of sedition. The liturgy was as much the badge of a political party, as the symbol of religious faith; and whenever its admirers assembled, whether in conventicle or private house, it was perfectly well known that they met for other purposes than simply to worship God.

This makes an immense difference between Puritan and Prelatic persecution. The sufferings, of which the latter complained so loudly, were inflicted upon them, not merely, or even chiefly, because they could not pray without a book, nor own a church without a bishop, but on political grounds. On the other hand, the Puritans were persecuted by the Prelatists when the latter had undisputed possession of the whole power of the kingdom, in a time of profound peace, and on religious grounds exclusively. "Who can answer?"—says a candid Episcopalian treating of this very period—"for the violence and injustice of a civil war? Those sufferings of the Prelatists were in a time of general calamity; these of the Puritans in a time of peace. The former were plundered, not because they were conformists, but cavaliers of the king's party."

We do not make these remarks with the view of justifying in all respects the conduct of the Puritans towards the Prelatic party. That they did persecute is not to be denied. With the rights of conscience they were imperfectly acquainted. They allowed the civil magistrate a power *circa sacra* which, if fully exercised, would produce persecution, leading him to deal with heresy as a crime against the state as well as a sin against God. They shared in the sentiment of their age. Struggling so long to gain toleration for themselves, no wonder that they were so slow to grant to others what had cost them so much toil and blood. But it deserves to be considered, that the persecuting principles adopted by the Puritans were not the native fruit of what we may call the Puritan system of Christianity; on the contrary, there is no affinity whatever between them. It is a system which makes every thing of the individual conscience, which insists upon universal Christian education, and the uni-

versal circulation of the Bible. Hence we say, that the persecuting principles of the Puritans were a mere accident of their faith, a remnant of the spirit of their own age, an element not combining with their system, but kept in contact with it by a sort of mechanical pressure; an element at war with the fundamental principles of their faith respecting God's claims and man's duty. In quiet times it must soon have worked itself out. For these two reasons, we affirm that the Puritan, whether regarded as a persecutor in fact, or in principle, is not to be put in the same category with the prelatists and the royalists; and if Mr. Macaulay had taken the pains to compare the two, and point out the distinctions which facts and reason alike demand, instead of indulging in finely worded but empty declamation, he would have better deserved the name of a fair and candid historian.

"He who approaches this subject," said Mr. Macaulay in one of his earliest reviews, "should carefully guard himself against the influence of that potent ridicule, which has already misled so many excellent writers. Those who roused the people to resistance, who formed out of the most unpromising materials the finest army that Europe had ever seen—who in the short intervals of domestic sedition made the name of England terrible to every nation on the face of the earth, were no vulgar fanatics." This is as true as it is well said, and we deeply regret that the writer, in these volumes, has so often forgotten his own rule. Had he kept it in mind, instead of dwelling so much on the surface of Puritan character, he would have gone beneath it: and while exhibiting fully and fairly their errors, with their causes and palliations, could also have shown how much Britain and the world owe them. With all their faults, their internal divisions, their ignorance of the rights of conscience, their religious intolerance, we can say of them what cannot be said of any other party in England, that from first to last they remained true to the great principles of civil liberty. Their political creed may be summed up in two words—the title of a well-known book by Samuel Rutherford, which had the honour of being burned by the hangman, by order of Charles II. the moment he took his seat on the throne of his fathers—*Lex Rex*—the Law, the King. From this creed they never swerved. They

asserted the absolute supremacy of law—that the national will expressed by freely chosen representatives of the people ought to be more potent than the arbitrary will of any monarch, and after fifty years struggling for these vital truths, “there came out,—says Carlyle, in his quaint way,—what we call the *glorious* Revolution, Habeas corpus act, True Parliaments, and much also!” “Alas—he adds—how many earnest, rugged Cromwells, Knoxes, poor peasant Covenanters, wrestling, battling for very life, in rough, miry places, have to struggle and suffer and fall greatly censured, *bemired*—before a beautiful Revolution of Eighty-eight can step over them in official pumps and silk stockings with universal three times three.”* Honour then to whom honour is due. Great as were the failings and errors of the Puritans, they are not to be named in comparison with the magnitude of their services in the cause of freedom and religion. We hold it to be foul injustice to their memory to say, as Mr. Macaulay does, that in the day of their power they proved themselves as intolerant and as meddling as Laud; and that because Puritan stone-masons attempted “to make Nymphs and Graces, the work of Ionian chisels decent,” and Puritan legislators passed sharp laws against betting, adultery, masques, boxing-matches, and bear-baiting, the savage and faithless cruelties inflicted on them by the restored Cavaliers were not only “natural but excusable.” He will not even allow the Puritan the credit of having been actuated by good motives when he enacted laws against “the lighter vices;” he was induced to make adultery a misdemeanor, not so much by his love of virtue as his hatred of pleasure; he denounced bear-baiting not out of compassion for the sufferings of dumb animals, but simply to deprive the spectators of their sport; he shut up the theatre not because it was demoralizing, but only on account of its being a place of amusement. And in confirmation of these statements he quotes a passage from the Diurnal, in which it is mentioned that Col. Pride, once coming into a town where a bear-bait was in progress, dispersed the crowd and ordered the bears to be killed. Now this, we are constrained to say, is worse than trifling. Mr. Macaulay not only assumes the delicate office of a judge of human motives, but he pro-

* Hero-worship, p. 131.

nounces a sentence the very opposite of that which the religious character of the Puritans, and the manifest aim of these laws would dictate. Whether they were wise or unwise, well-fitted or ill-fitted to attain their end, is a question admitting of debate: but no reasonable and candid man can hesitate to own that these laws were enacted with the view of introducing a higher and purer social morality; of putting an end to popular amusements whose exclusive tendency and inevitable effect is to degrade human beings to the level of brutes. Precisely similar laws have been passed by our own legislatures, within the last twenty years, and are at this moment in force.

In thus stating our objections to the work before us, we have dwelt particularly on those portions of it which relate to the Puritans, because we regard them as the most defective and unsatisfactory. It would be quite superfluous for us to say, that we venerate the memory of the Puritans, for their sufferings and services in the cause of God and humanity. No intelligent and candid man can doubt that they were the early heralds of those principles of religious and civil freedom, which are now incorporated with the constitutions of Britain and the United States: that they planted the tree of liberty beneath whose goodly shade we sit: and when we heard that Mr. Macaulay was engaged on a history of England, we expected that tardy but ample justice would be done them; we expected that in his volumes, his readers would find a clear and faithful account of the origin of the party, of their divisions, of their errors and mistakes, and the nature and extent of the debt which Britain owes them. For such a narrative we look in vain. While this is in our judgment the most serious defect, it is not, however, the only point in regard to which the historian is open to censure. With all his rare gifts and attainments (and there is hardly a branch of literature or science with which he does not betray some acquaintance), Mr. Macaulay is not, in the highest sense of the terms, either a philosopher or a reasoner. Soon after he entered on his literary career, Sir James Macintosh appended a note to his *History of Ethical Philosophy* (in which he quotes and comments on one of Mr. M.'s reviews), which seems to have been added to his work for no other reason than just to give him an opportunity of delicately cautioning his

friend to restrain his fondness for saying things in a striking way, and to guard against a disposition to substitute glittering rhetoric for plain and solid logic. The venerable man expresses, at the same time, the confident hope that "the admirable writer who at an early age has mastered every species of composition, will doubtless hold fast to simplicity." If the limits of this article permitted, we could adduce not a few passages from Mr. Macaulay's *Miscellanies* and his *History*, to prove that this complimentary expectation has not been realized to so large an extent as could be desired. When we closely examine his brilliant antithesis and rounded periods, we discover, in not a few cases, that what seems to be profound philosophy or elegant reasoning is really nothing but a bold truism or sheer sophistry. The popularity of a history, and we have no doubt that these volumes will long be popular, is a very uncertain test of its intrinsic value. Rapin has written a far more truthful history of England, than Hume; yet the latter, with all his notorious unfairness and offensive toryism, has gone through edition after edition, and even at this present time is in great demand, while honest Rapin sleeps upon the dusty shelf. The basis of Hume's popularity is rhetorical art, rather than historical research; he tells his story with so much grace, that we read it with delight, even when we have good reason to be suspicious of its truth and fairness. Of course we do not mean to put Hume and Macaulay in precisely the same category; the latter has unquestionably the highest claims to popularity. Equal if not superior to Hume as a mere writer, he has what Hume had not, a mind saturated with political and literary knowledge; he has ransacked repositories of information all covered with the dust of time; he has trodden the most retired lanes as well as the common roads in the domain of letters. In a word, he has adorned his story of the past with those refined charms which mark the highest forms of modern literature, and has told it with all that dramatic power which might be expected only in one who, having mingled in the scenes, narrates to us what he had himself seen and done.