

The Monthly Advocate.

VOL. I.

JULY, 1880.

No. 3.

THE BUSH BURNING: OR, SCOTLAND TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

In the Old Grey Friars Churchyard, Edinburgh, there is a monument erected to the memory of 18,000 persons who suffered martyrdom from 1661 to 1688. Of that "noble army of martyrs" the first was the Marquis of Argyle, one of the ancestors of the present Governor General of Canada, the Marquis of Lorne; the last was the youthful, the devoted, the immortal Renwick. Having, in a previous paper, presented a brief historical sketch of the persecution, it remains that some notice be taken of certain questions suggested by that narrative.

1st. Were those people who refused the proffered Indulgences justifiable in their refusal? These were offered on three separate occasions, viz.: in 1669, 1672, 1679. And then there was the "Toleration" granted by King James in 1687, one year before the Revolution. The great body of Presbyterians accepted these Indulgences—complied with the conditions on which they were offered, and in the case of the Toleration of James, went so far as to send up an address of thanks to the king, for his "surprising favour." A small party, however, would neither accept the Indulgences of Charles nor the Toleration of James. Were they justifiable in their declinature?

This question leads to an inquiry into the *nature* of these Indulgences, the *source* whence they flowed, and the *conditions* on which they were granted. In regard to the whole of them, truth requires the assertion, that they flowed from the King's usurped supremacy in ecclesiastical causes. To have accepted them, flowing from such a source, would have been a recognition of that anti-christian supremacy. It would have been a virtual and practical abandonment of the great leading principle of the Presbyterian Church, viz.: that "the Lord Jesus Christ is the sole Head and King of His Church, and hath therein appointed a government distinct from that of the civil magistrat." It would have been a virtual abandonment of their ministerial commission from Christ, and a taking out of a new commission from an earthly king. And, then, these Indulgences were all clogged with such conditions as no faithful minister of Christ could comply with; such as that they were not to go beyond the boundaries of their own parish—they were not to preach in the fields—they were not to allow persons from other parishes to wait on their ministry, and they were not to open their lips to speak against the ecclesiastical supremacy of the king. What faithful minister of Christ could yield to such conditions? Hetherington, the Free Church historian, expresses the truth on this subject, when he declares: "Not one of the

Vol. 1, No 3, 1880