ter ſent over to the king at Breda to procure from him. if poſſible, the eſtabliſhment of preſbyterianiſm. On his return, he assured his friends that “ he had found the king very affectionate to Scotland, and reſolved not to wrong the settled government of the church: but he apprehended they were miſtaken who went about to eſtabliſh the preſhyterian government.”

Charles was ſoon after reſtored without any terms. All the laws paſſed in Scotland ſince the year 1633 were repealed ; the king and his miniſters reſolved at all ha­zards to reſtore prelacy. Mr Sharp, who had been commiſſioned by the Scotch preſbyterians to manage their intereſts with the king, was prevailed upon to abandon the party; and, as a reward for his compliance, he was made archbiſhop of St Andrew’s. This conduct rendered him very odious in Scotland ; he was accuſed of treachery and perfidy, and reproached by his old friends as a traitor and a renegado. The abſurd and wanton cruelties which were afterwards committed, and which were imputed in a great meaſure to the archbi­ſhop, rendered him ſtill more deteſted. Nor is it pro­bable that theſe accuſations were without foundation : the very circumſtance of his having been formerly of the presbyterian party would induce him, after forſaking them, to treat them with ſeverity. Beſides, it is certain, that when after the rout at Pentland-hills he received an order from the king to ſtop the executions, he kept it for ſome time before he produced it to council.

There was one Mitchell a preacher, and a deſperate fanatic, who had formed the deſign of taking vengeance for theſe cruelties by aſſaſſinating the archbiſhop. He fired a piſtol at him as he was fitting in his coach ; but the biſhop of Orkney, lifting up his hand at the moment, intercepted the ball. Though this happened in the midſt of Edinburgh, the primate was ſo much deteſted, that nobody ſtopped the aſſaſſin ; who, having walked leiſurely home, and thrown off his diſguiſe, returned, and mixed unſsuspected with the crowd. Some years after, the archbiſhop obſerving a man eyeing him with keenneſs, ſuſpected that he was the aſſaſſin, and ordered him to be brought before him. It was Mitchell. Two loaded piſtols were found in his pocket. The primate offered him a pardon if he would confeſs the crime : the man complied ; but Sharp, regardleſs of his promiſe, conducted him to the council. The council alſo gave him a ſolemn promiſe of pardon if he would confeſs his guilt, and diſcover his accomplices. They were much diſappointed to hear that only one man was privy to his purpoſe, who was ſince dead. Mitchell was then brought before a court of juſtice, and ordered to make a third conſeſſion, which he refuſed. He was imprisoned for ſeveral years, and then tried. His own confeſſion was urged againſt him. It was in vain for him to plead the illegality of that evidence, and to appeal to the promiſe

of pardon previouſly given. The council took an oath that they had given no ſuch promiſe; and Mitchell was condemned. Lauderdale, who at that time governed Scotland, would have pardoned him, but the primate infilled on his execution ; obſerving, that if aſſaſſins were permitted to go unpuniſhed, his life must be continually in danger. Mitchell was accordingly executed.

Sharp had a servant, one Carmichael, who by his cruelty had rendered himſelf particularly odious to the zealots. Nine men formed the reſolution of waylaying him in Magus-muir, about three miles from St Andrew’s. While they were waiting for this man, the primate him­ſelf appeared with very few attendants. This they look­ed upon as a declaration of heaven in their favour ; and calling out, “the Lord has delivered him into our hands,” they ran up to the carriage. They fired at him with­out effect ; a circumſtance which was afterwards impu­ted to magic. They then diſpatched him with their ſwords, regardleſs of the tears and intreaties of his daughter, who accompanied him @@(a).

Thus fell archbiſhop Sharp, whoſe memory is even at preſent deteſted by the common people of Scotland, His abilities were certainly good, and in the early part of his life he appears with honour and dignity. But his conduct afterwards was too cruel and insincere to merit approbation. His treatment of Mitchell was mean and vindictive. How far he contributed to the meaſures adopted againſt the preſhyterians is not certain. They were equally cruel and impolitic; nor did their ef­fects ceaſe with the meaſures themſelves. The un­heard-of cruelties exerciſed by the miniſters of Cha. II. againſt the adherents of the covenant, raiſed ſuch a flame of enthuſiaſm and bigotry as is not yet entirely extinguiſhed.

Sharp (Dr John), archbiſhop of York, was deſcended from the Sharps of Little Norton, a family of Brad­ford Dale in Yorkſhire ; and was ſon of an eminent tradeſman of Bradford, where he was born in 1644. He was educated at Cambridge, and in 1667 entered into orders. That ſame year he became domeſtic chap­lain to Sir Heneage Finch, then attorney-general. In 1672 he was collated to the archdeaconry of Berkſhire. In 1675 he was inſtalled a prebendary in the cathedral church of Norwich ; and the year following was inſtituted into the rectory of St Bartholomew ncar the Royal Exchange, London. In 1681 he was, by the intereſt of his patron Sir Heneage Finch, then lord high chancellor of England, made dean of Norwich ; but in 1686 was ſuſpended for taking occasion, in ſome of his fermons, to vindicate the doctrine of the church of Eng­land in oppoſition to Popery. In 1688 he was ſworn chaplain to king James II. being then probably reſtored after his ſuſpension ; for it is certain that he was cha­plain to king Charles II. and attended as a court cha-

@@@(a) Such is the account given by all our hiſtorians of the murder of archbiſhop Sharp ; and that he fell by the hands of fanatics, whom he perſecuted, is certain. A tradition, however, has been preſerved in different fa­milies descended from him, which may be mentioned, and is in itſelf certainly not incredible. The primate, it ſeems, who, when miniſter of Crail, was peculiarly ſevere in puniſhing the sin of fornication, had, in the plenitude of his archiepiſcopal authority, taken notice of a criminal amour carried on between a nobleman high in office and a lady of ſome faſhion who lived within his dioeefe. This interference was in that licentious age deemed very impertinent ; and the archbishop’s deſeendants believe that the proud peer inſtigatcd the deluded rabble to murder their anceſtor.