

The

HISTORICAL SETTING

of the

SCOTTISH COVENANTS

of

the REIGN of

CHARLES the FIRST.

---

Rev. J. W. McEwan M.A., B.Sc.,  
13 Princes Street,  
Pollokshields,  
GLASGOW S.1.

ProQuest Number: 13905302

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13905302

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

## P R E F A C E .

The aim of this Thesis is to present in a succinct and strictly impartial manner the Historical Setting of the Scottish Covenants of the Reign of Charles the First.

To present these Covenants in proper relief it is necessary -

- 1) To sketch the history of religion in the country from the time of the Reformation till the introduction of what is known as Laud's Liturgy in 1637. Had there been no Reformation in Scotland, and had it not taken the course it did, there had no Covenants been signed or fought for.
- 2) To trace the course of events from the signing of the National Covenant in Greyfriars, Edinburgh, till the close of the Commonwealth.
- 3) To give some account of the struggles of the Covenanters from the Restoration till the Revolution of 1688.

The amount of literature dealing with this period in whole or in part is very large, and it is quite impossible in an essay like this to narrate every incident in detail. I have only attempted to deal with those which serve to show the trend of the national mind, and so help to elucidate the significance of actions which follow. And this I have done in brief terms.

Much of that literature, alike contemporary and more recent, is written in a strongly partizan spirit, which has often led to a distorted view of the historical facts, and consequently to conflicting accounts of the same incident and its results.

Judging by quite different standards, one writer minimises what another exaggerates, and what one applauds another condemns.

It has been my endeavour to avoid such errors, and to give a true, if brief, account of what actually happened at any given place or time, and a fair estimate of its effects.

## C O N T E N T S.

### I. PREPARATION FOR THE COVENANTS.

1. The Establishment of Protestantism	1
2. The Establishment of Presbyterianism	23
3. James VI. Episcopacy vs. Presbyterianism	44
4. Charles I. Ascension. Revocation.	77
5. The Canons and the Liturgy	98

### II. THE DAYS OF THE COVENANTS.

6. The National Covenant of 1638	115
7. The Glasgow General Assembly of 1638	143
8. The First Bishops' War	176
9. The Second Bishops' War	198
10. The Solemn League and Covenant	220
11. The Civil War	247
12. The Commonwealth in Scotland	275
13. The Social Conditions	309

### III. THE END OF THE COVENANTS.

14. The Restoration	335
15. The Killing Time	359
16. The Revolution of 1688	397

Preface	i
Summary of Contents	iii
Books Consulted	xxiv

# C O N T E N T S .

## I. PREPARATION FOR THE COVENANTS.

### CHAPTER I.

#### The Establishment of Protestantism.

State of the Romish Church prior to Reformation	1
Causes at work tending to a Reformation	1
The spiritual element in the Reformation	2
Early martyrs of the Reformation	2
Lollardism in Scotland	3
Influence of Luther	3
Literary influences. Sir David Lyndsay	4
State of Education in Scotland	5
Early Protestant preachers	5
Opposition of the Romish Church	6
Martyrdom of Patrick Hamilton	7
Political influences	7
Suggested union of England and Scotland	8
Provincial Assembly of Edinburgh, in 1552	10
The Queen Mother appointed Regent	10
The "First Covenant"	11
Marriage of Mary and the Dauphin	12
Martyrdom of Walter Mill	12
Protestant petition for reform	12
The preachers summoned	13
The last Provincial Council in Scotland, 1559	15
John Knox returns to Scotland	16
The Protestants and the Regent at war	17
The French at Leith	19
Queen Elizabeth helps the Scottish Protestants	19
The Scottish Parliament of 1660	20
Knox's Confession of Faith	21
Some effects of the Reformation	21

## CHAPTER II.

### The Establishment of Presbyterianism.

Polity of Protestant Church not yet fixed	23
First Book of Discipline	23
Provisional form of government proposed	23
Discipline of the Church	25
Patrimony of the Church	26
Ratification of the Reformation Acts refused	27
Return of Queen Mary to Scotland	27
Proportion of Protestants and Catholics in Scotland	28
Mary's imprisonment and abdication	29
Failure of her cause in Scotland	29
Regency of Earl Moray	30
Death of Lennox	31
Earl of Mar succeeds as Regent	31
Act of 1571: All ecclesiastical property to be held from the Crown	32
"Concordat of Leith"	32
"Tulchan Bishops"	33
Leith Concordat reluctantly accepted by the General Assembly	34
Death of Knox	35
Death of Mar: Morton succeeds	35
Andrew Melville in Scotland	36
Opposition to Episcopacy	37
King James takes up the reigns of government	38
The Second Book of Discipline submitted	38
Various Acts passed by Parliament	39
Morton temporarily regains his power	40
Office of Bishop declared to have no Scriptural authority	41
Glasgow General Assembly of 1581	41

Second Book of Discipline: Contents	41
1581. Presbyterianism set up in Scotland	43

### CHAPTER III.

#### James VI. Prelacy and Presbyterianism.

James VI. His youth.	44
His idea of the royal prerogative	44
D'Aubigne and Captain James Stewart	45
"The First National Covenant"	46
The King and the Presbyters	48
The Raid of Ruthven	49
The Church approves of the Raid	49
The King's escape and revenge	50
James attacks the ministers	51
Episcopacy restored in a modified form	52
Elizabeth determines on the execution of Mary	53
Act of 1587. Church lands annexed to the Crown	53
The Spanish Armada	54
1589. Marriage of the King	54
James' speech in favour of Presbytery	54
Petition of the Glasgow Assembly of 1592	55
The "Magna Charta of Presbyterianism"	55
Popish plots. (the Spanish blanks)	56
The Battle of Glenlivet	57
Andrew Melville and the King at Falkland	58
High Church Presbyterian position	58
David Black's sermon	59
Edinburgh riot. The King leaves the city	60
Perth Assembly, March 1597	60
The Dundee Assembly, May 1597	61
Ministers to have seats in Parliament	61



The Gowrie Conspiracy	62
James succeeds Elizabeth	62
The Aberdeen Assembly, 1604	62
Banishment of ministers	64
Restoration of bishops	65
Eight prominent Scotch ministers invited to London	65
Andrew Melville's epigram and punishment	66
Assembly at Linlithgow, December 1608	66
Court of High Commission established	67
Glasgow Assembly, June 1610	67
Scottish bishops consecrated in England 1612. The "Magna Charta" repealed	68
Aberdeen Assembly, August 1616	69
The King visits Scotland, 1617.	70
Trial of Calderwood and others	71
The Five Articles proposed	72
The Perth Assembly of 1618	73
The Five Articles passed	74
Popular resentment	75
Last days of James VI	76

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### Charles I. Accession and Revocation.

Charles I succeeds his father	77
Character of Charles	77
He resolves to follow the example of James as regards Scottish ecclesiastical affairs	78
Changes in the government and the Revocation	79
July 1626. Opposition in Convention of Estates	80
Some account of the teinds	81
The decreets-arbitral. The settlemeent	83

1633. Visit of Charles to Scotland	85
Northward journey and reception in Edinburgh	86
Bishop Laud	87
His previous visit to Scotland	88
Coronation of Charles	89
The Scottish Parliament	91
1633. Proceedings of the Parliament	92
An Act against his Majesty's royal prerogative	93
Petition of the ministers	94
Roths submits a petition from the Estates	95
Palmerino. Trial and sentence	95
Charles returns to England	97

## CHAPTER V.

### The Canons and Liturgy.

James' plan for a new Prayer Book	98
Charles misunderstands the temper of the Scots	99
The Book of Canons	100
Criticisms of the Canons	102
No ecclesiastical sanction for the Book	102
Popular dislike of the bishops	103
Publication of the Liturgy	104
Prose and metrical Psalters	105
The Privy Council enjoins the use of Liturgy	105
Row's Criticism of the Liturgy	106
The Liturgy introduced, 23rd July 1637	107
Its riotous reception	108
Traquair's absence from Edinburgh	111
Reception of the Liturgy in other parts of the country	111
Presbyterian leaders accused of organising riot	111

## II. THE DAYS OF THE COVENANTS.

### CHAPTER VI.

#### The National Covenant of 1638.

The Privy Council and the riots	115
King Charles is angry	115
Archbishop Laud writes to Traquair	116
Alexander Henderson summoned	116
The Privy Council makes a suggestion to Charles	118
Propaganda against the Liturgy	119
Lennox brings the King's reply to the Council	119
Petitions and the King's reply	120
The bishops blamed as the authors of all the troubles	121
Protests against the Service Book	122
Riot in Edinburgh	123
Flight of the bishops	124
Committees appointed	124
"The Tables"	124A
Montrose joins the anti-Court party	125
Instructions from the King	125
The petitioners and the Privy Council	126
Archbishop Spottiswood's letter to the King	127
Parties among the Presbyterians	128
Dangers of division	129
Henderson and a National Covenant	129
Traquair makes a proclamation at Stirling	130
Lords Lindsay and Home make a protest	130
The Privy Council break their promise	131
Meetings in Edinburgh: Covenant proposed	132
The National Covenant of 1638	133
Earlier Covenants in Scotland	134
Signing the Covenant	135
Opposition to the Covenant	139
Deputation of Covenanters to Aberdeen	141

## CHAPTER VII.

### Glasgow General Assembly, 1638.

The Privy Council send a representative to the King	143
The Covenanters demand a General Assembly	144
Traquair, Roxburgh and Lorne summoned to Court	145
The Marquis of Hamilton appointed Commissioner	146
His instructions	147
Hamilton arrives in Scotland	148
Negotiations between the Commissioner and the Covenanters	149
Charles prepares for war	152
Hamilton returns to Court to consult with the King	152
Conditions on which an Assembly might meet	153
Hamilton again sees the King	154
The rival Covenants	155
the Covenanters prepare for the Assembly	155
The office of bishop: attitude of Commissioner and Covenanters	156
Gathering of the Assembly	157
Constitution of the Assembly	158
20 November: the Assembly meets	160
Differences between the Commissioner and the Assembly	161
Alexander Henderson elected Moderator	162
Alex. Johnston of Warriston appointed Clerk	163
Dramatic restoration of the minutes of Church	163
27 November: the bishops decline the authority of the Assembly	163
The Commissioner leaves the Assembly	165
He issues a proclamation dissolving the Assembly	165

The Assembly continues its meetings	166
The six preceding "Assemblies" declared illegal	167
6 December: trials of bishops begin	167
13 December: Sentences on bishops pronounced	170
Sentences discussed	171
• Later proceedings of the Assembly	172
Episcopacy in Scotland	173
"The Second Reformation"	174

## CHAPTER VIII.

### The First Bishops' War.

War now inevitable	176
The King's preparations	176
The Covenanters also prepare.	177
Sympathy of the English Parliamentarians sought	178
Did Richelieu aid the Covenanters?	179
General Alexander Leslie	180
Capture of Edinburgh Castle by Leslie	182
Other fortresses seized by the Covenanters	182
Danger threatens from the north	183
The Covenanters despatch an army against the northern royalists	184
Aberdeen surrenders	184
Huntly entrapped	185
"The Trot of Turriff"	186
Montrose in the north	186
Aboyne re-takes Aberdeen	187
"The Raid of Stonehive"	187
21 May: the Covenanting army marches south	188
Rev. Robert Baillie at the war	188
Efforts for peace	189
The Covenanters' camp at Dunse Hill	189
Their army	190

Failure of the King's expeditions	191
Growing sympathy between the Scots and the English Parliament	192
The two armies	193
Peace proposals: how re-commenced	194
The King takes part in the negotiations	195
The bishops nearly spoil everything	195
The Covenanters threaten an advance	196
Charles publishes a declaration of the terms of peace	196
Peace nominally restored	197

## CHAPTER IX.

### The Second Bishops' War.

Prospects of further strife	198
Dissatisfaction of the Covenanters	199
The King's demand for delegates to go to Perwick	200
12 August: General Assembly meets at Edinburgh	200
31 August: The Estates assemble	202
Commissioners from the Estates sent to the King	203
Lord Loudon sent to the Tower	203
Charles compelled to summon a Parliament	204
"The Short Parliament" dissolved	204
Charles appoints an army to assemble at York	205
The Covenanters again prepare for war	205
2 June: Scottish Parliament meets, and defies the Crown	205
War begins	206
28 July: General Assembly at Aberdeen	207
The Covenanting army marches south	207

20 August: The army crosses the Tweed	209
27 August: Battle at Newburn	209
Newcastle surrenders. Other towns submit	211
Difficulties of the Covenanters	212
Their successes	212
Peace negotiations	213
1 October: Commissioners meet at Fipon	215
They continue their deliberations in London	216
The Scots army to remain in England	216
Scotch ministers in London	216
Strafford and Laud put on trial	217
7 August 1641: Peace finally concluded	218

## CHAPTER X.

### The Solemn League and Covenant.

The General Assembly of 1641	220
Confession of Faith, Catechisms and Directory suggested	220
Letter from London ministers	221
Independency in Scotland: Robert Brown	221
Trouble with non-Covenanters in the north	223
14 August: the King visits Scotland	224
Scottish Parliament meets	225
Party factions amongst the Covenanters	225
The Cumbernauld Bond	226
Mentrose and other "incendiaries" imprisoned	227
"The Incident"	227
News of the Irish massacre	229
The Grand Remonstrance	229
Both King and Parliament try to win the Scots	230
27 July 1642: Assembly at St Andrews	231
English Parliament and Covenanters draw closer	231
Dreams of Presbyterian Uniformity	232

22 August 1642: Royal standard raised at Nottingham	233
"The Cross Petition"	234
Efforts at peace and uniformity	235
2 August 1643: General Assembly at Edinburgh	235
Both King and Parliament represented	235
Invitation to the Assembly at Westminster	236
The English Parliament seeks the help of the Scots	236
"The example of the best Reformed Churches"	237
17 August: The proposed Covenant passed by the General Assembly and Convention of Estates	238
25 September: The Solemn League and Covenant received by English Parliament, Assembly of Divines and Scotch Commissioners	239
The Westminster Assembly of Divines	240
Baillie's account of the Westminster Assembly	242
Scottish Commissioners decline to become members of the Assembly	244
They attend its meetings, and debate	244
The Directory and Act of Assembly accepted by the General Assembly and Scots Parliament.	245
The Confession and Catechisms accepted by the English	246

## CHAPTER XI.

### The Civil War.

The Civil War begins	247
The King's plan of campaign	249
Parliament coming to terms with the Scots	250
The Scots to provide an army	251
Newcastle captured by the Scots	251
Battle of Marston Moor	252



Montrose in arms for the King	252
He is forced to retreat	252
He raises an army of Highlanders and Irish	253
Battle of Tippermuir	253
Aberdeen captured and sacked	254
Conflict at Fyvie Castle	255
Montrose ravages the Argyle country	255
Battle at Inverlochy	256
Capture and pillage of Dundee	256
Montrose's victory at Kilsyth	257
David Leslie defeats Montrose at Philiphaugh	258
Montrose disbands his army	259
English Parliament's plan of campaign	260
Defeat of the King at Newbury	260
Negotiations at Uxbridge	261
14 June 1645: Battle of Naseby: defeat of King	261
Probability of differences between the army and Parliament	262
Flight of the King to Scots Army at Newark	263
Continued negotiations for peace	263
English Parliament wishes to get rid of Scots	264
The Scots hand over the King to the English Parliament and Army becoming estranged	264 265
In fear of the Levellers, Charles escapes to Carisbrooke Castle	266
"The Engagement"	266
The Scottish Parliament prepares for war	269
Hamilton's army	270
The General Assembly denounces Hamilton	270
Engagers defeated at Preston	271
"The Whiggamore Raid"	271
Lanark holds Stirling for the King	272
Cromwell visits Edinburgh, and comes to an understanding with the Whiggamores	272
The English Army refuse dealings with the King	273
Trial and Execution of Charles I.	274

CHAPTER XII.The Commonwealth in Scotland.

The situation in England after the death of Charles the First	275
Affairs in Scotland. "Act of Classes" 1649	276
The Covenanters and the English Parliament	276
Proclamation of Charles II at Edinburgh	277
Negotiations opened with the King at La Hague	278
Alternatives open to Charles	278
He grants a commission to Montrose	278
Negotiations continued with the King	279
Cromwell's subjugation of Ireland	280
The fate of Hamilton and Huntly	280
Charles dallies with the Scottish Commissnrs.	281
He is invited to Scotland	282
Charles and Montrose	283
Defeat and capture of Montrose	284
Montrose under sentence of death	285
Scottish Commissioners firm in their demands	286
Charles yields and comes to Scotland	287
The English Government prepares for war	288
The Scots also prepare	288
The Scottish army "purged"	289
Leslie's plan of defence	289
Charles comes to Leith, but is asked to retire	290
Operations of the English army in Scotland	290
Correspondence between Cromwell and Covenanters	291
Charles and the extreme Presbyterians	291
Cromwell retreats to Dunbar	292
The Battle of Dunbar	293
Divisions among the Scots	294
"The Start"	294
The Remonstrance	295
Repeal of the "Act of Classes"	297

the Resolutioners and the Protesters	297
1 January 1651: Coronation of Charles II	297
Suggestion to divide Britain between the King and the Commonwealth	298
Another Scottish army raised for the King	298
Cromwell attacks Leslie	299
The Scots army marches on England	299
The Battle of Worcester	300
Charles escapes to France	301
General Monk in Scotland	301
Treatment of Scotland by Commonwealth Govmt.	301
The Resolutioners and Protesters	304
1653: General Assemblies forbidden	304
A royalist outbreak in the Highlands	305
The Protectorate proclaimed in Edinburgh	306
Monk subdues Scotland	307

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### The Social Conditions.

Number of the population	309
Differences in the people	309
Physical aspect of the country	310
Dwellings of the people	310
The towns	311
The roads	312
Posts	313
The food of the people	314
Drunkenness	314
Disease common	315
Poverty of the country	315
Scottish Trade	316
Violence and crime in the country	317
Justice corrupt	318

The ministers	319
Depression in the country	319
Schools	320
Literature	321
Libraries	321
A function of the pulpit	322
Church buildings	322
Clergy of the Covenanting period	323
Church services	323
Family worship	325
Enforced attendance at church	325
Baptisms	325
Marriages	325
Burials	326
Sabbath observance	327
Decorum preserved	328
Communion services	328
Christmas holidays forbidden	329
Strict ecclesiastical discipline follows the "Second Reformation"	329
Lingering superstitions	330
Belief in witchcraft	331
Punishment of witches	332
Moral and spiritual condition of the people - differing estimates	332

### III. THE END OF THE COVENANTS.

#### CHAPTER XIV.

##### The Restoration.

Popular dissatisfaction with the Protectorate	335
Death of Cliver Cromwell	336
Richard Cromwell succeeds him	336
His abdication	336
Monk summons a Convention at Edinburgh	336
He marches on London	337
The English Parliament reassembles	337
Charles II invited to return	337
His welcome to England	338
Rejoicings in Scotland	338
The Scottish nobles hasten to London	339
Arrest of Argyle	339
Sharp sent to London in the interests of the Scottish Church	341
His intentions in carrying on the negotiations	341
The Protesters' address of welcome to the King	343
Some of them are arrested	343
Proclamations	345
Sharp brings the King's letter to Edinburgh	346
Preparations for the meeting of the Scottish Parliament	347
Parliament meets. Their Acts	349
The Recissory Acts	351
Argyle - Trial, condemnation, and execution	354
James Cuthrie	356
Death of Samuel Rutherford	358
Other victims	358

## C H A P T E R XV.

### The Killing Time.

The Royal Prerogative	359
Oppression of the English Puritans	359
The Scottish Covenanters	360
"Act Concerning Religion and Church Government"	360
Middleton and Lauderdale	361
The King declares for Episcopal government	361
Appointment and consecration of bishops	362
Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions forbidden	363
Bishops restored to Parliament	364
the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant declared unlawful oaths	364
Ministers ordained after 1649 to receive collation from bishop	364
The Act of Indemnity passed	365
The Privy Council pass Ejectment Act at Glasgow	366
Nearly 300 ministers leave their parishes	366
"The curates"- Burnet's opinion of them	367
Fines for absence from church	368
"The Bishops' Drag Net"	369
Execution of Johnston of Warriston	370
Persecution of Covenanters	371
Sir James Turner	371
Court of High Commission established	372
This Court ceases to function	373
The soldiers and the roll calls	374
Calvin's teaching as to revolt	375
Abduction of Turner	375
Battle of Rullion Green	376
Attempt on life of Archbishop Sharp	377
The First Indulgence	377

The Assertory Act, 1669	378
Archbishop Leighton's effort at accommodation	378
Attempt to suppress conventicles	379
The Second Indulgence	380
Enormous fines	380
Letters of intercommuning	380
The "Highland Host"	381
Assassination of Archbishop Sharp	382
The Rutherglen Declaration	382
Graham of Claverhouse	382
Battle of Drumclog	382
Battle of Bothwell Bridge	383
Intercession of the Duke of Monmouth	385
The Third Indulgence	385
The Society People	385
The Queensferry Paper	386
The Sanquhar Declaration	387
Rewards offered for apprehension of Whigs	387
The Two Kingdoms	387
Death of Richard Cameron at Ayrsmoss	387
Cargill excommunicates the King	388
The Duke of York. The Two Acts	388
Roman Catholic agents at work	389
Argyle and the Test Act. His escape	389
Persecution of the Covenanters	390
William Carstares tortured	391
The "Apologetical Declaration"	391
Imposing the Abjuration Oath	392
Summary executions	392
Death of Charles II	393
Daniel Defoe on Scottish Persecution	393
Why the Covenanters resisted the Government	394
Estimate of the number of sufferers	395
King's illegal proclamation of toleration	396
James Penwick	395

## CHAPTER XVI.

The Revolution of 1688.

The Protestants resent actions of James	397
William of Orange lands at Torbay	397
Flight of James	398
William and Mary to be King and Queen	398
The Scottish bishops	398
Reception of William's Declaration in Scotland	399
Riots in Edinburgh	400
"Fabbling the curates"	400
Hopes of the Presbyterians	401
Bishop Rose goes to London	401
William's desire for uniformity	402
Bishop Rose and the King	402
William Carstairs at Court	403
Prominent Scotsmen ask William to call a Convention at Edinburgh	404
This assembly strictly considered, illegal	404
Duke of Hamilton elected president	405
Letters from James and William to Convention	405
Dundee leaves Edinburgh	406
Failure of the royalist plot	407
Convention deposes James, and chooses William and Mary to be King & Queen	407
The Claim of Right	407
Deputation goes to London to administer the Coronation Oath	408
William refuses to be a persecutor	409
The Covenanters are disappointed	409
The Jacobites	410
Covenanters enlist in support of King	412
The Battle of Killiecrankie	412
Heroic defence of Dunkeld.	413



Parliament meets	414
Repeal of the Assertory Act of 1669	414
Confession of Faith accepted	415
Patronage abolished	415
General Assembly meets	415
Three Covenanting ministers join the National Church	416
Condition of acceptance for Episcopalians	416
The Covenants tacitly ignored	416
The Covenanters stand aloof from the National Church	417.
The Remnant who hold to the original principles	417
Was the devotion to the Covenants worth while?	418

BOOKS CONSULTED.

- AITON. Life and Times of Alexander Henderson, by the Rev. John Aiton, Dolphinton. Edin. Fraser, 1836.
- BAILLIE. Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, Ed. by David Laing. Edin. Robt. Cogle 1841. 3 Vols.
- BALFOUR. Historical Works of Sir James Balfour. Lond. 4 Vols. 1825.
- BARBÉ. Sidelights on the History, Industries, and Social Life of Scotland. by Louis A. Barbé. Lond. Plackie. 1919.
- BARRETT. Sidelights on Scottish History. Michael Barrett O.S.P. Sands. Edin. 1918.
- BAYNE. Actors in the Puritan Revolution. by Peter Payne M.A. Lond. Clarke, 1878.
- BISSET. History of the Struggle for Parliamentary Government in England. by Andrew Bisset. 2 Vols. Lond. Henry S. King.
- BLAIR. Life of Mr. Robert Blair, Ed. McCrie. Wodrow Society, 1848.
- BOOKE of the UNIVERSALL KIRK. ed. Alex. Peterkin. Edin. 1839.
- BROWN. History of Scotland, Vol. II, P. Hume Brown. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1905.
- do. Surveys of Scottish History. Glas. 1919.
- do. Scotland before 1700. Edin. Douglas, 1893.
- BURNET. History of his Own Times. Lond. Smith. 1838.
- CALDERWOOD. The History of the Kirk of Scotland. David Calderwood. 8 Volumes. Wodrow Society.
- CARLYLE. Historical Sketches of Notable Persons and Events in the Reigns of James I and Charles I, by Thomas Carlyle. Chapman & Hall. Lond. 1898.
- CLARENDON. Hist. of the Rebellion. 6 Vols. Vol. I. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1888.

- CLOUD OF WITNESSES. Glasgow. McPhun, 1862.
- CROMWELL. Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, Ed. Thomas Carlyle. 4 Vols. Lond. Chapman, 1850.
- CUNNINGHAM. The Church History of Scotland, by John Cunningham D.D., Edin. Thin, 2nd edn. 1882.
- DAVIDSON and GRAY. The Scottish Staple at Vere. by J. Davidson and Alex. Gray. Lond. Longmans, 1909.
- DICEY and RAIT. Thoughts on the Union between England and Scotland. Albert V. Dicey and Robert S. Rait. Lond. Macmillan, 1920.
- D'ISRAELI. Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First, by Isaac D'Israeli. 5 Volumes. Lond. Colburn, 1830.
- DE FOE. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland, by Daniel De Foe.
- FAITHFUL CONTENDINGS DISPLAYED. ed. John Howie, Lochgoil Glasgow, Bryce, 1780.
- FIGGIS. The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings, by J. Neville Figgis. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1896.
- GARDINER. History of England, by S. P. Gardiner, 10 Vols. Lond. Longmans  
 do. History of the Great Civil War, 4 vols. 1905.  
 do. Commonwealth, Vols.  
 do. The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution. Lond. Longmans, 1890.
- GILLESPIE. Notes of Debates etc. Westminster Assembly of Divines. Feb. 1644 - Jan. 1645. ed. D. Meek. Edin. Ogle, 1846.
- GRANT. History of the Burgh Schools of Scotland, by James Grant M.A., Lond. Collins 1876.
- GREEN. History of the English People, by J.R. Green. 4 Vols - Vol. III. Lond. Macmillan 1879.
- HETHERINGTON. History of the Church of Scotland, by Wm. Hetherington M.A.

- HEWISON. *The Covenanters, etc.* by J. King Hewison. Glasgow, Smith, 1908.
- HUGHES. *Boscobel Tracts.* ed. Hughes Blackwood, 1830.
- INNES. *Scotland in the Middle Ages.* Cosmo Innes. Edin. 1860.
- KIRKTON. *History of the Church of Scotland,* by Kirkton. Edin. Ballantyne. 1817.
- KNOX. *The History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland,* by John Knox. Ed. by David Laing.
- LAING. *History of Scotland.* Malcolm Laing. 4 Vols. Volume III.
- LEE. *Lects. on the Histy. of the Church of Scotland.* John Lee D.d., LL.D., 2 Vols. Edin. Blackwood, 1860.
- LIGHTFOOT. *Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines, 1st Jan. 1643 g 31 Dec. 1644.* J. Lightfoot D. Lond. 1824. Vol. XIII of Works.
- MELVILLE. *Autobiography and Diary.* Jas. Melville. Edin. Wodrow Society, 1842.
- MACAULAY. *History of England.* 5 Vols. T. B. Macaulay. New York. Harper, 1849.
- MCCRIE. *Life of Andrew Melville,* by Thomas McCrie D.D. Edin. Blackwood, 1819.
- do. *Life of Alex. Henderson,*
- do. *Life of John Knox.*
- MACKINNON. *Social and Industrial History of Scotland,* by James MacInnon Ph.D., D.D. Lond. Blackie, 1920.
- MACPHERSON. *The Intellectual Development of Scotland.* Hector Macpherson. London. Hodder, N.D.
- MATHIESON. *Politics and Religion in Scotland, 1550 - 1695.* W. L. Mathieson, 2 vols. 1905.
- REFORMERS, *the Lectures by U. P. Ministers.* Glasgow. Maclehose, 1885.

- NAPHTALI. Naphtali: Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland. Edin. Paterson, 1761.
- NAPIER. Montrose and the Covenanters. Mark. S. Napier. 2 vols. Lond. Duncan, 1838.
- ORR. Alexander Henderson: Churchman and Statesman. by Sheriff Robert Low Orr. Lond. Hodder, N.D.
- PETERKIN. Records of the Kirk of Scotland. Alex. Peterkin. Edin. Sutherland, 1838.
- do. Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland. 1839.
- PROVAND. Puritanism in the Scottish Church. W. S. Provand M.A. Paisley. Gardner, 1923.
- RAIT. Scottish Parliament before the Union of the Crowns. P. S. Rait. Lond. Blackie, 1901.
- do. The Parliaments of Scotland. Glasgow. Maclehose, 1924.
- do. Making of the Nations Series. Scotland. N.D.
- ROBERTSON. The History of Scotland during the Reigns of Queen Mary and of King James VI. Wm. Robertson D.d. 2 vols. Edin. 1820.
- ROGERS. Social Life in Scotland. Chas. Rogers LL.D. 3 vols. Edin. 1884.
- ROSS. Kingcraft in Scotland. Peter Ross LL. D. N.D. Paisley, Alex. Gardner.
- ROSS. History of Congregational Independency in Scotland. James Ross. Glasgow, Maclehose, 1900.
- ROW. History of the Kirk of Scotland, by John Row. Edin. 1842. Wodrow Society.
- St. GILES LECTURES, 1881. Lect. VI by Dr. Cunningham, and Lect. VII by Professor Flint.
- SPALDING. The History of the Troubles, etc. 2 Vols. by John Spalding. Aberdeen, 1792. Edin. 1823.
- SELECT BIOGRAPHIES. Edited for the Wodrow Society by W. K. Tweedie. 2 Vols. Edin. 1845.
- SKEATS and MIALI. History of the Free Churches of England. Lond. Alexander & Shephard N.D.

SPOTTISWOODE MISCELLANY. Spottiswoode Society.

2 Vols. Edin. 1847.

STORY. The Church of Scotland, Past and Present. N.D.

Ed. by R. H. Story D.D. 5 Vols.

do. William Carstares. by Robert Herbert Story.  
Lond. Macmillan, 1874.

A SURVEY of the INSOLENT and INFAMOUS LIBEL ENTITLED  
NAPHTALI, etc. (9 by Bishop Honeyman) Part I, 1668.  
Edin. 1669.

THOMSON. The Public Records of Scotland, by ..

Maitland Thomson LL.D. Glas. Maclehose, 1922.

WODROW. History of the Sufferings of the Church of  
Scotland. Robert Wodrow. Glas. Blackie, 1828. 4 vols.

PRIVY COUNCIL REGISTERS.

CARTE, An History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde.  
by Thomas Carte M.A. London, 1736. 3 Volumes.

Buckle. History of Civilization.

TURNER. Memoirs of his own Life and Times, by Sir  
James Turner. Edinr. 1829. From original MS.

DEFCE. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland.

LEVEN and Melville Papers.

## CHAPTER I.

### The Establishment of Protestantism.

For a long time prior to the Reformation the state of the Romish Church in Scotland had been very corrupt. The doctrines held and taught were in many respects erroneous. Practical abuses of every kind abounded. The most flagrant simony, the holding of pluralities, the sale of indulgences, avarice and oppression, were common offences. Many of the clergy were grossly ignorant, and some were openly licentious. Most unsuitable persons were appointed to bishoprics and rich benefices. High and lucrative offices in the Church were often made a provision for the illegitimate sons of kings and clerics, and the younger sons of nobles. Amongst all ranks of the clergy there was a grievous neglect of duty, but while the priestly functions might be carelessly performed, the priest was usually strict, and sometimes harsh, in exacting his dues. Some no doubt, even from Celtic times, had been witnesses for holy living and simple faith, but they were now few.

Causes, however, which tended in the direction of reform were already at work. Some of them were base indeed. Many of the nobility were of long lineage and great pride, and bitterly resented the usurpation by the clergy of high posts in the State, which they regarded as their own by hereditary right. They were galled, too, by the haughtiness of those whom they regarded as in many cases as mere upstarts of base or low birth. In the frequent quarrels between the Scottish kings and their nobles the monarchs had usually relied on the support of the Church, and this intensified the hostility of the lords. The aristo-

cracy, too, were as a Yule as poor as they were proud, and they looked with envious eyes upon the wealth of the clergy, which was about half that of the whole nation. It was an ever-present recollection to some of them that fair domains, now the fiefs of the Church, had been gifted by some lavish ancestor as a salve for a guilty conscience or in token of his gratitude to heaven for some benefit received, and they now regretted the prodigality, as they deemed it, and longed for the restoration of the lands. Some of the nobles were conscientious and patriotic men, and were sincerely in sympathy with the teaching of the Reformers, but others were ready to support the new doctrines for the sake of the plunder they hoped to gain. Pride was thus arrayed against pride, and greed against wealth. Caring nothing in their hearts for truths which they were ready to desert as soon as they had served their purpose, nobles came to swell the ranks of those who honestly strove for the reform<sup>3</sup> of the Church and the propagation of the Gospel.

But there was also a nobler element in the Reformation movement: it had a spiritual as well as a secular side: true religion entered into it as well as pure greed.

There were "Reformers before the Reformation" in Scotland as elsewhere. One of the earliest of these, James Resby(1), is still remembered, though our knowledge of him is limited. That he was an Englishman is certain; that he was one of Wicliffe's "Poor Priests", who had fled to Scotland to escape persecution under the "De Haeretico Comburendo" clause of the English Act of 1401, is very probable. Once safely across the border, he began to preach the Lollard doctrines, and with considerable success. His message was acceptable to many, and converts

(1) cp. Knox, Hist. Vol. 1 (Laing). p.495.



were made. This alarmed and angered the Churchmen, and he was condemned, and burnt in Perth in 1407. But the work of the martyr did not die with him. One evidence of this is that all Masters of Arts in the new University of St. Andrews were made to swear(1) that they would defend the Church against the assaults of the Lollards. That the new doctrines continued to find acceptance is seen in the martyrdom of one unnamed in Glasgow in 1422(2) and of Paul Craw or Crawar at St Andrews in 1435. Even as late as 1494 thirty persons from the district of Kyle - styled by Knox "an old receptacle to the servants of God"?? were summoned on a charge of adhering to similar doctrines. King James IV himself presided at the trial, and gave a kindly response to the stout and humourous defence of the accused, who were dismissed with a warning to beware of new doctrines and to content themselves with the faith of the Church(3). From this trial we see how the more spiritual elements in the teaching of Wicliffe lingered on in the country till the very eve of the Reformation, and prepared a way for it.

While the leaven of Lollardism still continued to work, the cause of reformation in Scotland as elsewhere, received a tremendous quickening through the work of Martin Luther in Germany. His teaching may be regarded as a natural consequence on the spiritual side of the Renaissance movement, which had been operating so powerfully on the intellectual and aesthetic

(1) Knox, Hist. (Laing) Appendix to Vol. 1, p. 496.

(2) D. Hay Fleming is doubtful as to this martyrdom. "The Reformation in Scotland",  
pp. 16-17.

(3) Persecution of the Lollards: cp. Knox, History.  
(Laing) Vol. 1, p. 67ff

side in so many quarters in Europe, and was no less effectual in its own sphere. The impetus probably reached Scotland in the first instance through literature. The works of Luther and others exposing the errors of popery and advocating the reformed doctrines, had been smuggled into the country in large numbers in spite of the Act of Parliament of 1525 (1). The New Testament was first translated into modern English, printed on the Continent, and shipped into Britain in 1525, and though most of the copies were seized and destroyed by the English authorities, another edition was published in 1530 which escaped this fate, and was extensively circulated. Though permission to read the Scriptures had never been legally denied in Scotland, Parliament in 1543 passed what we may consider as a Declaratory Act, granting leave to everybody. But while it was thus legally permissible for men to read their Bibles, the clergy continued to regard it as a sin to do so. We see this from Sir David Lyndsay's "Kittes Confession", which George Chalmers supposes to have been written in 1544, and in which the priest, from whom she seeks absolution, asks her: "Hard ye na Inglis bukis?" This appears to indicate the English Bible, though possibly the use of the plural "Bukis" may imply that other so-called heretical works are also intended. Certain it is that other writings, both of home and foreign production, and not all of them theological, were strongly working in the direction of popular enlightenment, and none of them more potently than those of Lyndsay himself. His coarse, strong satire appealed powerfully to the experience of his countrymen, many of whom had suffered in purse from the greed of the clergy, and in honour from their lust.

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. vol. II, page 295.

We must not suppose that the number of readers, even in pre-Reformation Scotland, was very small. Says Mr. Cosmo Innes(1) "I am one of those who believe that the ignorance of the people, even in the middle ages, has been a good deal exaggerated." and since the period to which he refers education had been advancing in the country. The fifteenth century was one rather noted for the foundation of schools than of churches. Three universities had their birth in it, and grammar-schools were established in at least every considerable town. In the fifth Parliament of James IV an Act(2)-was passed compelling all barons and freeholders whose fortunes permitted it to secure for their sons what was at the time a very liberal education. Many of the burgesses of the towns, some of whom were growing wealthy, would no doubt be eager to provide the like privilege of a good education for their sons. Readers therefore must have been numerous, and those who could not read could hear.

Potent as had been the printed page in stirring the minds and spirits of the people, it is most probable that a still greater influence was the word spoken by the preachers who now began to appear in the country, and to their labours it is largely due that the Reformation movement in Scotland assumed from the first such a popular and religious cast.

Of only some of those preachers do we know even the names, but judging from the life-stories of those of whom we do know something, some of them were ecclesiastics brought up in the Church of Rome who had been led to embrace the new doctrines, some were Scotsmen

(1) "Scotland in the Middle Ages", p.266.

(2) James 3\*, 5th Parliament, 1494. "Laws and Acts of Parliament collected by Sir Thomas Murray, edn. 1681, p.96.

who had imbibed those opinions while studying or travelling on the Continent (1). They not only attacked the errors and abuses of Popery, but preached the Evangel. Their preaching was very different from that of the friars. They spoke as men who knew of the eternal realities, and so ministered to the deep spiritual needs of souls. They appealed to all classes of society. When a church was opened to them they gladly preached from its pulpit, but when the privilege was denied they spoke as cheerfully in the open field or at the fireside of some welcoming home. Nor did they speak in vain; their converts were many among the smaller gentry and farmers, among the burghesses of the towns and the tillers of the fields.

As might be expected, this work was not suffered to proceed without opposition. It was not so much the attacks on the practical abuses of the clergy that provoked the opposition of the Church. Such scandals were patent to all, were admitted by the higher clergy themselves, and men like Archbishop Hamilton made efforts, more or less futile, to secure their reform. Poets and pamphleteers might utter their bitterest jibes at the vices of priests and nuns, and yet find protection from the highest quarters. It was only when the preacher attacked what were deemed the essential doctrines of the Church that any real danger confronted him. Under James I, as we have seen, some were sent to the stake. In the troubled reigns of his two successors religious persecution appears to have slumbered, but it was again aroused in those of James IV and his son - especially in that of the latter. James V was not himself merciless, but he had in most cases to submit to the pressure of the Church authorities. The number who suffered for this cause

(1) Calderwood, Hist. Vol.1, page 109.

is variously estimated. Dr. Cunningham doubts if more, "at least many more"(1) than a score of persons suffered death in Scotland during the long conflict between Papacy and Protestantism; Dr. Hay Fleming's calculation(2) is very similar; while Dr. McCrie holds that the number of victims was much larger(3). Of course, many more were driven to take refuge in England and on the Continent, and suffered the confiscation of their goods.

The most distinguished victims were Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart(4). Of old time it was said that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church, and now it was declared that the reek of Patrick Hamilton infected all upon whom it did blow. Both sayings had much truth. A great sensation was caused all over the country by the martyrdom of Hamilton. Men asked why a young man of noble parentage, of brilliant talents, and gracious manners should be burned in front of Savior's College in St. Andrews. What had he done? What did he teach? were eagerly asked and discussed everywhere(5). The death of every succeeding martyr excited similar enquiries and discussions, and we have evidence that so far from crushing the rising heresy in the country the publicity thus given to its teaching increased the number of its adherents.

Political events did not cause the Reformation in Scotland, but it may be admitted that they hastened it. Apart from them a religion that was so gradually and

(1) Cunningham, Hist. 1, 247 n. 2

(2) D. Hay Fleming. "Reformation", p. 194

(3) Dr. McCrie in Notes says sixty.

(4) Kirkton styles Wishart "the Scottish John Baptist", p. 5.

(5) Knox (Laing), Vol. 1, p. 36.

so surely permeating all classes of society was bound, sooner or later, to become the dominating spiritual power in the land. Left to its own inherent force, it might take a longer time to effect a complete reformation, but its triumph would probably be all the more complete. In Scotland the spiritual was assisted by the political.

After the death of James V such political events moved apace. Many thinking men in both countries had come to consider that a union between England and Scotland was essential to their peace and prosperity. The question was on what terms this could be effected. In the War of Independence the Scotch had made it perfectly clear that this would never be secured by conquest. Scotland would never become, like Wales, a mere province of England. A union of the crowns through a royal matrimonial alliance seemed the likeliest beginning of a union of the peoples, and this had for years been hoped and planned for. When James the Fifth died Henry the Eighth at once renewed his favourite plan for union by proposing a marriage between his son Edward and the infant Queen of Scotland. He would thus at once secure the friendship of the Scots and break off their alliance with his enemies, the French. He was supported by a number of the Scottish nobility. The long-banished Douglasses, now suffered to return to their home, and the liberated captives of the Solway Rout (the "English Lords"), were all in his interests, bound to him by the gift of freedom and liberal pensions, and had returned to Scotland pledged to further his schemes. Henry's proposal for the marriage was politic and wise, but the conditions attached, that the young bride should be at once transferred to his care, together with the chief fortresses of her country, and other equally unwelcome demands, were

such that no high-spirited nation could accept. Parliament agreed to ~~the proposed~~ matrimonial alliance, but refused to give up the young bride till she was ten years of age, or to hand over a single fortress to the English King. A treaty on such lines was drawn up, but in December 1543 it was finally repudiated.

In this year there was some approach to a Reformation in Scotland, but the action of Henry aroused the national spirit, and the reformed doctrines, which he and his supporters represented, had a serious setback, and Cardinal Beaton was once more in power. Enraged at the position thus taken up by the Scots, Henry sent a fleet to the Forth, and landed an army under the Earl of Hertford, which burned Edinburgh for three days and worked havoc in Fife. This force, however, sustained a sharp reverse at Ancrum Moor, and had to retreat. But in the May of the following year Hertford crossed the border, and wrought cruel destruction of life and property. In 1547, in continuance of this policy, the Protector Somerset invaded the country, and after inflicting a severe defeat on the Scottish army at Pinkie, ravaged the country round Edinburgh, but with no permanent advantage. Somerset, having failed with the sword, now tried with the pen. In an address to the Scottish nation, he assured them that the English wished union not conquest, and sought to show how strong a united Britain would be. It was too late. Smarting from the defeat of Pinkie, the Scots were open to other influences.

From the accession of the House of York there had always been a faction in Scotland favourable to an English alliance, but the French party was now predominant. In June 1548 an army of French troops,

well equipped with artillery, landed at Leith for the support of the Scots against the English. Meanwhile it had been proposed that the young Queen should marry the son of the Earl of Arran, but the French ambassador, who accompanied the army to Leith, bore an offer of marriage on behalf of the Dauphin, which was accepted. So Mary, now a lovely child of six years old, sailed for France, to complete her education there. With the help of the French troops the Scots carried on the war, but in 1550 peace was concluded between England and France, and in this Scotland, as the ally of France, shared.

In 1552 a Provincial Assembly was held in Edinburgh, by which attempts were made to remedy certain acknowledged evils in the Church. Its proceedings give a revelation of the state of affairs at the time. They show that the Church was falling from its own corrupt condition as well as from the attacks of heresy. Indifference to all religion prevailed to a large extent. Public worship on Sundays and holy days was almost neglected. Those who did attend were frequently most irreverent, indulging in noisy jesting or bargaining in the porch. Ecclesiastical censures had largely fallen into contempt. The ignorance of religious truth was so great that it was deemed necessary to prepare and put into use a catechism in the vernacular. While strongly asserting some of the more distinctive Romish doctrines, it accepts the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith and some of the permanent doctrines of Christianity. This, however, did little to arrest the downfall of the Church, and a reaction in favour of Protestantism afterwards set in.

In 1554 Arran retired from the Regency, and the Queen Mother, who had long coveted the post, succeeded him. The new Regent was a woman of intelligence and



some force of character, but she never understood the people over whom she ruled and never mastered their language. As a ruler she made serious mistakes, which irritated and alienated her subjects. In matters of religion she played a double part. As might be expected from her family connection with the House of Guise, she was a devoted Catholic, and strove subtly to advance the interests of her Church. While she was eager for the support of the Protestant party in her negotiations connected with the marriage of her daughter and the securing of the crown matrimonial for the Dauphin, she treated them with fair words and promises, but as soon as this was accomplished her tone and actions changed.

Through the troubles of the time Protestantism continued to recover, and its advocates were becoming not only more numerous, but bolder in the attitude they took up. John Knox was in Scotland from 1555 to 1556, and his preaching in various parts of the country and his conferences with the leaders did much to help in both respects.

In December 1557 what is known as the "First Covenant" was signed by a number of influential noblemen and gentry(1). In this deed they promised to apply their whole power, substance, and their very lives "to mainteane, sett forward, and establishe the most blessed Word of God and His congregation", and further that they would labour at their "possibilitie" to have faithful ministers purely and truly to minister the Gospel and Sacraments, and to maintain, nourish and defend them and the whole congregation of Christ. From their frequent use of this word they now became known as "the Lords of the Congregation."

Soon after they agreed that in all parishes where

(1) Calderwood, History 1, 326.

Knox (Laing) History I, 251 and note.

it was possible the common prayers and Scripture lessons should be read publicly every Sunday, and that preaching and interpretation of Scripture should be confined to private houses till permission for public preaching be granted(1). It was also decided that "professours" should refrain from attendance at Mass and from having their children baptized with Roman rites(2). The existence of Protestantism in Scotland as a separate communion may be regarded as beginning at this point. Within a few months afterwards churches for Protestant worship were opened in "sundrie places" and elders appointed to manage their affairs(3).

On the 24th of April 1558 the young Queen Mary was married to the Dauphin in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris. Certain circumstances connected with the negotiations for this marriage, in combination with various acts of the Queen Mother, caused great suspicion in Scotland of a design to subordinate the country to the condition of a mere province of France, and this made the Protestants the more willing to apply for English aid, as they soon did.

A few days after the marriage of the Queen a very different scene presented itself in her own country, when Walter Mill, a "decrepid" priest of over eighty years of age, was burned for heresy at St Andrews(4). This martyrdom aroused great indignation, and led to a strong reaction in favour of Protestantism throughout Scotland.

Conscious of their growing strength, the Congregation addressed a petition to the Regent, craving (1) That it might be lawful for them to meet in public or

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 1, 328.

(2) Ibid 1, 332.

(3) Ibid 1, 333.

(4) Spottiswood Book 11, 98-91. Calderwood, 1, 337  
Knox (Laing) Appendix XIII, Vol. I, p. 550.

private for prayer in the vulgar tongue; (2) That it might be lawful for any one of sufficient knowledge to expound the hard places of any Scripture that might be read at their meetings; (3) That Baptism; and (4) the Lord's Supper should be administered in the vernacular, and the latter in both kinds; and lastly that wicked and scandalous clergy should be reformed according to the New Testament and the Fathers and the laws of Justinian(1). This was presented by Sir James Sandilands, and the Regent granted permission for the Gospel to be preached and the Sacraments administered in the common tongue, but requested that in the meantime there should be no public preaching in Edinburgh or Leith; and to this they agreed.

There had evidently been outbreaks of bigotry, and images were "stollin in all parts of the countrie.(2) This led to an appeal by the Bishops to the Regent, but she, though fearing to offend such "such a multitude as took upon them the defence of the Gospell", yet consented to summon the preachers to appear for trial on 19th July 1558. They decided to accept the summons, and as was customary in Scotland at the time, they were attended by a large body of their supporters. Some alarm was caused by this great assembly, and a proclamation was issued that all who came to the town without authority should straightway repair to the borders, and remain there for fifteen days, but a number who had

(1) Calderwood. Hist. 1, 333-7.

Knox Book II, Vol. I 301.

(2) Calderwood Hist. 1, 344.

~~(3) Knox XLaing)~~

that same day returned from the border, angry at the malice of the priests, forced their way into the privy chamber where the Regent and bishops were, and lodged their complaint. James Chalmers of Gadsirth was the spokesman. He boldly attacked the priests: "they oppress us and our tenants, for feeding of their idle bellies, they trouble our preachers, and would murder them and us; shall we suffer this any longer? No, Madam, it shall not be." and therewith every man put on his steel bonnet(1). At once intimidated by language so different from any she had been accustomed to, and dreading the antagonism of the Protestants to her scheme for obtaining the crown matrimonial for the Dauphin, she had nothing but honied words for her unwelcome visitors, and warnings to the bishops not to trouble the lords or their preachers.(2)

By the Parliament which met at the end of November 1558 it was agreed that the Dauphin should have the title of King of Scotland during his wife's life (3). Mary of Lorraine had never felt otherwise than hostile to the Reformers, but circumstances had compelled her to remain so far on apparently amicable relations with them. Now these were changed. Having got her wish, she was free to other influences, and no longer even affected to be their friend. Very soon indeed she was at open war with them.

After a short and inglorious reign Mary Tudor died on the 17th of November 1558, and was succeeded by Elizabeth, who was regarded as illegitimate by Catholics. Mary of Scotland was the next heir, and was eager for

(1) Calderwood. Hist. 1. 344. Knox I 258.

(2) Ibid 1, 345.

(3) Act. Parl. Scot. 11. p. 507.7

the crown, in which desire she was strongly supported by her husband, who went so far as to assume the royal arms and sign himself king of England. To make himself so de facto he was anxious to extirpate Protestantism in Scotland that he might use the country as a base for an invasion of England, and in this scheme the Queen Mother was now ready to assist him.

Early in March 1559 a Provincial Council (the last held in Scotland) met in Edinburgh, and its Acts afford clear evidence of the state of the Church just prior to the Reformation(1). A petition drawn up in moderate terms by some who evidently rather desired the reformation than the destruction of the Church, was presented and considered. Thirty-four canons were adopted - some of them wise and good - but they did not go far enough, and they were unacceptable to the Reformers. The Regent was known to be in sympathy with this Council, and ordered several of the statutes to be proclaimed at the market crosses.

Fearing that danger to their preachers might result from this proclamation, a deputation from the Congregation waited upon the Regent, and asked that they might be protected as long as they preached sound doctrine, but were told that she would have them banished even though they preached as soundly as Paul. She was reminded of her promises. "The promises of princes", she replied, "are no further to be urged than it suits their convenience to keep them." To this dangerous doctrine came the bold and fitting answer, "If you renounce your promises, we must renounce our allegiance" (2).

Notwithstanding this warning, the Regent soon proved herself to be in earnest in support of the

(1) Knox 1, 291.

(2) Keith, Vol. 1, p. 126.

Church. Perth, as a community, had received the new doctrines, to her great wrath, and she sent those whom she thought best fitted to that city and to Montrose and Dundee, to endeavour to persuade the people to return to the old faith and to receive the Sacrament after the Romish fashion at Easter, but those efforts were vain. She was the "more highlie conmoved"(1) at this failure, and had all the preachers summoned to appear at Stirling on the 10th of May 1559. In spite of the appeals of the Reformers she insisted on this, and they arranged that the gentlemen of every shire should accompany the preachers to the place appointed - though all unarmed. The laird of Dun was sent in advance to Stirling to assure the Regent of their peaceable intentions, and was besought by her to hold back the multitude, with the promise "to take some better order." This was naturally interpreted to mean that the trial was not to go on, and the preachers did not appear, and were straightway "put to the horn".

This was bringing matters to a head, but the Reformers at this very point received a most powerful ally in the person of John Knox, who returned to Scotland on the second of this critical month of May. He had had an adventurous career. Trained as a Roman cleric, he later embraced and taught the reformed doctrines, joined those who had murdered Cardinal Beaton in the Castle of St Andrews, was by that garrison called to the office of the ministry, and when they surrendered, was sent to France to serve as a galley slave. Liberated after nineteen months, he preached for a time in England, and filled ministerial posts on the Continent. His heart, however, was in his native country, and he returned in 1558 at the invitation of the leading reformers,

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 1,439.

but soon had to escape for his life. Again invited to Scotland, he returned, to prove himself the leading spirit of the whole movement, and to secure the establishment of Protestantism as the religion of the land.

After a stay of only two nights in Edinburgh - but long enough to allow his name to be added to the list of accused preachers(1), Knox proceeded to Dundee and Perth to join the assembled Protestants. On hearing Erskine's report of his interview with the Regent, many of them returned to their homes, but others, doubting her sincerity, still remained at Perth.

On May 11th Knox preached a stirring sermon in denunciation of idolatry in St John's Church, Perth,(2) and on the dismissal of the congregation an outbreak, provoked by the thoughtlessness or bravado of a priest, followed, in the course of which the Charterhouse and the monasteries of the black and grey friars were destroyed. But this, as Knox is careful to inform us, was not the work of gentlemen, nor of "earnest professors", but of the "rascall multitude". The Regent was not unnaturally infuriated at the news, and vowing she would utterly destroy the city, in a few days appeared before its gates with a considerable army. The citizens stood on their defence. The Queen was at first unwilling to treat, but the arrival of Glencairn with large reinforcements made her willing to negotiate. It was finally agreed that both armies should be disbanded; that no one should be molested on account of his religion; and that no French troops should enter the town. The Congregation then dis-

(1) Mitchell, Reformation, p.93.

(2) Kirkton. History p. 8.

missed their forces, after signing another bond for their mutual support and defence. But no sooner had they done so than the Regent violated all the terms of the treaty just made.

As a result of her treachery, Argyle, the Lord James Stewart and others withdrew from her cause(1). St Andrews was now chosen as the gathering-place of the Congregation, and here, in spite of threats against his life, Knox preached, and his sermon was followed by the destruction of the monasteries and the defacement of the churches of the town.

Again the Regent was in arms, but the men of the Congregation assembled in great numbers on Cupar Moor, for the preaching of Paul Methuen, Knox and others had not been in vain, and the Queen Regent was again compelled to treat. Her plan was to provoke delay, and so cause the army of the Congregation to break up, but they, moving via Stirling, advanced on the Capital, and the Regent retreated to Dunbar. Now followed proclamations and counter-proclamations and much wordy correspondence, and time was wasted which the Lords ought to have devoted to the strengthening of their position. Jealousies and suspicions broke out amongst the leaders, which Mary did all she could to foster. And at the end of July she was able to lead her forces back to Leith and to impose terms which, though in some respects favourable, involved the evacuation of the City. By this time the French troops were engaged, in spite of protests, in fortifying Leith, which they made a position of great strength. On the 21st of October the Lords felt themselves strong enough to return to Edinburgh, where a Convention was held, and in name of the "Nobilitie and Commouns of the Protestants of the Church of Scotland," suspended the Regent from all authority till the next Parliament, to be called by

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 1, 461.



their consent. And proclamation of this was duly made.

On the 28th Leith was summoned to surrender, and after very inefficient preparation an assault was made and repulsed, the burgesses being deserted by the "ungodly" soldiers, who probably resented the lack of that pay which the Congregation found it so difficult to provide. A second defeat followed on the 5th of November, and the majority of the Lords losing heart, they determined to leave the city, which they did amid the lamentations of the "godlie" and the jeers of the "wicked."

After this victory the Frenchmen began to treat Scotland as though it were a conquered country. In Edinburgh they conducted themselves so outrageously that people were afraid to show themselves in the streets. Bands of them also crossed over to Fife - odious for its Protestantism - and here there was some fighting and much plundering and outrage, in which neither Papist nor Protestant was spared.

During the summer, on the advice of Knox, application had been made to Queen Elizabeth for help, and some monetary assistance had been received, but the disheartened Congregation now felt that unless more powerful aid were given their cause was lost. In the more populous parts of the country the majority of the people were favourable to the new religion, and as Scotland at this period was "a country in which the old feudal organization continued, as far as it generally affected the people, more vigorous than in any other part of civilized Europe(1)", there was a hearty co-operation between superiors and tenants in the cause of reformation. But both were poor, and it was found impossible to maintain an army in the

(1) J.A.Froude - "Short Studies", Vol. 1, p.157.

field for any length of time. Besides, the Frenchmen were well-trained and well-equipped veterans, against whose fortifications they had no effectual weapons of assault. In England there were both money and arms, and to England they again applied. Elizabeth's view of Protestantism was probably very much the same as that of her father, but she was at any rate anti-papal, and it was clearly very much in her interest to have a Protestant power on her north. Of course, as a Tudor she had no love for rebels, but this difficulty was got over by accepting the assurance of the Lords that they bore arms in the name of their King and Queen. So sufficient help was sent, and after much difficulty and sustaining much loss, Leith was compelled to surrender. Towards the end of the siege the Regent died after a long illness. On the 7th of July 1560 a treaty of peace was signed in Edinburgh, and on the 16th the French embarked for home in English vessels and a few days later the English left by land.

Only in seasons of emergency did the lesser barons and burgesses attend Parliament (1) in any number, in times of tranquillity they left its affairs almost entirely in the hands of the king and his leading nobles. The importance they attached to this assembly is seen from the very exceptionally large attendance of the gentry and commons who incurred the trouble and expense of being present, and their claiming their right to vote under the Act of 1427(2). So their decisions clearly show that the real heart and brain of the country was entirely Protestant. A petition was presented in the name of "the Barons, Gentlemen, Burgesses, and others, true subjects of this realme, professing the Lord Jesus

(1) Scott. Parl. Before the Union - Rait. p.21.

(2) Ibid p. 20f.

within the same"(1), craving that idolatry should be abolished, the Sacraments administered in their original purity, the discipline of the primitive Church restored, and the funds of the Church applied to the maintenance of a true ministry, education, and the support of the poor. After some debate those who presented the supplication were called, and "commandement givin to them, to draw, in plaine and severall heads, the summe of that doctrine which they would mainteane, and desire the parliament to establishe."(2) This was gladly undertaken, and in four days was presented a Confession of Faith in twenty-five sections. Dr. Cunningham sums up in a single sentence the opinion entertained at present concerning this document by the majority of Scottish divines when he says: " It is a clear and logical summary of Calvinistic doctrine, more concise and less definite than the Westminster Confession, but agreeing with it in every essential respect." (3) This Confession was submitted to Parliament on the 17th of August, and duly ratified. On the 24th Acts were passed abolishing the jurisdiction of the Pope, annulling all previous legislation not agreeing with God's Word and contrary to the Confession of Faith, and making penal the celebration or attendance at Mass. (4)

Protestantism, majority of the population or no majority, was now the established religion of the country, but the long battle for Presbyterianism had yet to be fought and won.

(1) Calderwood, History II, 12.

(2) Ibid, II, 14.

3) History, I, 275.

(4) Act. Parl. Scot. II, 534 - 5.

The Reformation in Scotland was more than the change of one form of religion for another; it was the beginning of a great liberation of spirit and of intellect. Through it men began to realize that religion was not simply a matter for priests, and friars and nuns - "the religious" - but that it involved a direct personal relation between every man and his God. And more than this, it inaugurated a great intellectual advance: men came to know that it was their duty to think for themselves. Politically, too, men began to understand that they had a responsibility for the welfare of their nation. The guiding of its destinies was not only the affair of kings, nobles, and chiefs, but of every citizen. And thus it was made possible for the nation to become what it is, and may yet be.

## CHAPTER 11.

### The Establishment of Presbyterianism.

The Reformers had thus achieved their first and main object. They had had their Protestant Confession ratified by Parliament as the true religion of the land; but the question still remained, what was to be the polity of the Church that was to maintain and teach the truths of that Confession? The Acts of 1560 had abrogated the Papal jurisdiction, but had set up nothing in its stead. That was left to the Reformers themselves to do, and they did it by producing what is known as "The First Book of Discipline". No doubt John Knox and the other compilers of the Book were to some extent, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by the example of other Reformed Churches, but they felt bound to none. As Row maintains, "they took not their pattern from any kirk in the world, no, not from Geneva itself; but, laying God's Word before them, made Reformation thereunto, both in doctrine first, and then in discipline, when and as they might get it overtaken"(1).

The system of government proposed is admittedly provisional. The Book provided for four orders of office-bearers - Superintendent, Minister, Elder, and Deacon. The wording of the Book appears to indicate that the office of Superintendent was not intended to be a permanent institution in the Kirk. He was not a bishop, but it must be allowed that he had a certain superiority over his brother-ministers, though himself subject to the General Assembly. It was a most useful, and indeed a necessary office in

(1) History, page 12.

the then condition of the Church. Ministers were few, even whole districts were not supplied with preachers, and the superintendents by their itineracy and oversight were able in some measure to remedy the deficiency. They at length were felt to be no longer necessary, and in the course of some thirty years the office was allowed to lapse. The Minister and Elder, and in some instances, the Deacon, were continued, and exercised their functions much as at present. In view of the scarcity of properly qualified ministers, two other temporary offices were set up in the Church, "Exhorters" and "Readers". Their duties are set forth in the "Book of Discipline". "To the Churches where no minister can be had presentlie must be appointed the most apt men that distinctlie can read the Common Prayers and the Scriptures, to exercise both themselves and the Church till they grow to greater perfection, and in the process of time he that is but a reader may attain to a further degree, and by consent of the Church and discreet ministers may be permitted to minister Sacraments, but not before that he is able somewhat to persuade by wholesome doctrine, beside his reading, and be admitted to the ministrie, as before is said." Oecumenical Councils, General Assemblies, and District Synods are anticipated, but Presbyteries are not actually mentioned, though a germ of them may be traced in the Weekly District Meetings. We have thus a system of Church Government well fitted to meet the needs of the times. It was certainly not Episcopal, nor yet was it strictly Presbyterian.

Ample provision was made for public worship. It is recommended that there be daily prayers or sermon in the large towns and a midweek service in the smaller towns. Sunday, of course, was to be devoted specially to worship: preaching of the Word, administration of the Sacraments, public catechising of

children were the chief duties of the day. All holy days, all vows, ritual and apparel savouring of Popery were to be abolished. The form of Divine service was of the simplest. The Scriptures were to be read, common prayer offered, the sermon preached, and it was considered profitable though not necessary that Psalms should be sung. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI was originally used by the Scottish Reformers, but it was gradually superseded by what is known as Knox's Liturgy, which was more and more employed as a guide rather than as a binding form of service.

The discipline of the Church was extremely strict, even stern. Every form of immorality - sexual impurity, drunkenness, gluttony, injustice and oppression, everything that fell short of the perfect law - was accounted punishable, and was punished by the infliction of a public rebuke, or in graver cases by imprisonment. Serious offences, such as heresy, idolatry, and adultery, were deemed worthy of death, and it was regarded as the duty of the civil magistrate to carry the sentence into execution. In the case of obstinate and impenitent offenders the dreadful doom of excommunication might be pronounced. Only on public confession of repentance for his fault could he be absolved, and restored to the fellowship of the community.

We are apt in these laxer days to think this discipline too severe, but we have to bear in mind the condition of the people at the Reformation. The Protestant clergy had received a legacy of evil from their predecessors of the Romish Church. Amongst the lower classes of the population there was a lamentable amount of ignorance, gross superstition was almost universal, manners were rude, language was coarse, and shameful immorality was prevalent

almost everywhere. Most of the preachers of the new faith were horrified at such a state of affairs, and in dead earnest to remedy it, displayed a vigorous and self-denying activity in their pastoral work. If we think their methods harsh, and the coarseness with which they rebuked the sins of their age is an offence to modern taste, we must allow that the means they took were such as would not only be best understood, but would be most effective at the time. They sincerely sought to effect a reformation not only of doctrine but of morals.

In dealing with the patrimony of the Church, with a rare wisdom and unselfishness, it was provided that one-third of the revenue of the old Church should be devoted to the support of the ministry, another third for education on a liberal scale, and the remaining portion for the maintenance of the poor. Scotland benefited much in manners and in morals from the Reformation, and if this scheme of division had been carried through, it would have benefited much more and more speedily. If it had not been hindered by the nobles, it "would have placed Scotland within a generation in front of all the nations of Europe".(1) But this was too high doctrine for a greedy aristocracy, and though some affected to favour it, it never received the ratification of Council or Parliament. As we shall find from a later chapter, various faint approaches were afterwards made to a partial realization, but most continued to agree with Lethington's sneering remark, "We may now forget ourselves, to bear the barrow to build the house of God."(2)

But though the provisions of the Book of Discipline were sneered at as a "devout imagination", by the

(1) "Kingcraft in Scotland etc." Ross, p.54.

(2) Knox, Hist. Book III. *Calderwood II p.12.*



Estates, the Church acted up to its teaching as well as its circumstances would allow, and went on with the great work which lay before it. It held Assemblies, planted churches, tried and appointed ministers to preach in them, and exercised its discipline.

Immediately after the dissolution of the Parliament of 1560 Sir James Sandilands was sent to inform the King and Queen what had been done, and to obtain their ratification of the Acts that had been passed. He was coldly received and ratification was refused. Indeed, both Francis and Mary were so highly incensed that it was feared that another French invasion would follow and Popery be again forced upon the people, but the death of the young King on 4th December 1560 removed this apprehension. Under the Salique law Mary had no longer any control in French affairs, and was unable to bring the resources of that country to bear in Scotland. Conditions were not too pleasant for her in France, and on the invitation of Parliament, she returned to her native country on 19th August 1561, and was received by the citizens of Edinburgh with every token of loyalty.

Mary was a bigoted Catholic, and, as she had promised the Pope and her kinsmen of Lorraine, was determined to restore Scotland to the Church of Rome. She began her reign by dissembling her hatred of the Reformation, and appointed Protestants to high positions in the State. Many were thus blinded to her real designs, and upon such as frequented the Court she exerted her blandishments. Her beauty and gracious manner charmed those who rejoiced to see Scotland with a sovereign once more. They were, as some one put it, being sprinkled with the "holy water of the Court", and so came to look more kindly on the Popish faith and ceremonies. Some, however, were proof against all her wiles. One of those was John Knox,

who boldly preached Protestant doctrine and denounced the Mass, and when summoned to the royal presence, as he several times was, defended himself in terms more forcible than courtly, on one occasion reducing her Majesty to tears of anger and vexation.

Protestantism continued to be, though poorly provided for, the established religion of the Land, but its position was by no means secure. Abroad, the Counter-reformation was running its course: Popery had won back much of what it had lost, and was becoming more threatening to Protestantism everywhere. At home, the number of Catholics was large. Professor F. Hume Brown, while admitting that we have not the materials for determining the exact proportions of Catholics and Protestants, considers that we should not be far wrong in conjecturing that the Catholics numbered three to one of the entire population. (1) Dr. Cunningham (2), Professor Mitchell, and others incline to think that in 1560 Protestantism had already become the creed of the majority of the nation. But we have to remember what Professor Hume Brown points out in another paper:—"The nation of any country is that section of the population which by its capacity of thought and feeling, the strength of its convictions and the strenuousness of its action, determines the main current of the general life. . . . . Understood in this sense, the Scottish nation in the reign of Mary consisted of a few thousands, mainly to be found in the chief towns of the kingdom". (3) Many of the nobles were still openly or secretly Catholics, and where the clan system prevailed, their followers were Catholics too. The support of the Queen and a reactionary movement guided by the Jesuits

(1) "Surveys of Scottish History," pp. 52-53.

(2) History, Vol. I, 218

(3) Surveys. page 29.

and subsidised by Papal gold, gave the Romanists good hopes of a restoration of their faith. There were many districts in which there was no provision for Protestant worship. In some places the Mass was still celebrated, and where indeed the entrance of Protestant ministers was opposed. But the Reformers were doing their utmost to remedy this state of affairs. The number of preachers was increasing. Many of the inferior Catholic clergy, either from conviction or necessity, entered the ranks of the Reformed ministry, a few preachers from England and some students from Geneva also joined them, and so men, more or less intellectually, morally, and spiritually qualified, continued the work, and with success.

The reign of Mary was running its brief course. If she had rapidly won the affection of many of her subjects by her charm of manner, by her conduct she as rapidly lost the support of many of her friends. Her gay and Frenchified way of life offended the rigid Puritanism of the Reformed ministers; her marriage to the Catholic Darnley led to an unsuccessful rebellion; a strong suspicion of complicity in his death shook the allegiance of many; her infatuation for Bothwell, and the indecent haste of her marriage to him, turned the heart of the nation against her, and even her own soldiers would not fight for her. Her misfortunes - her imprisonment in Lochleven Castle and enforced abdication - evoked the sympathy of some of her nobles, and she was once more at the head of an army; but the defeat at Langside quickly followed, and she was the prisoner of her enemy Elizabeth. Some of her adherents still maintained a fight for her against the Protestant lords who supported her infant son, but this hope failed in 1573 when Edinburgh Castle fell, and in 1587 the

block at Fotheringay ended all.

On the imprisonment of the Queen the Earl of Moray was appointed Regent. A Parliament met on 15th December 1567 (1), and the series of Acts affecting the Church passed in 1560, which Mary had steadfastly refused to ratify, were re-enacted. Further Acts were passed which declared the Church now established to be the only true Church of Christ, and only those who accepted the Confession now ratified and partook of the Sacraments as now administered could be members. All officials, notaries and procurators before acting as such, must profess the reformed faith. Still more important, it was made the law of the land that every future sovereign at his coronation should take an oath that he would maintain the true religion and the preaching of the Word, abolish all false religions, and rule his people according to the will of God, and the laws and constitution of the realm. (2)

Moray was not fated to act as Regent for long. On the 23rd of January 1570, while passing through Linlithgow, he was assassinated by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh. Opinions as to his character clash; some regarding him as a hypocritical, selfish Schemer, plotting for his own accession to the throne, and others looking upon him as a devoted, high-minded patriot and a truly Christian man; but whether attacking or lauding him, none can deny his great abilities, his undaunted courage, and his unfailing energy. His short rule was wise and strong, and he did much to restore good government to the country. Had he lived he would probably have done more. His private life was without reproach. In the epitaph written by George Buchanan, he is spoken of as the best man of

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. \*ol. 111, 36. (2) *Ib.* 37-39.

his age and the common father of his country.

The death of Moray was followed by a time of strife, and intrigue, and civil war. For a time the King's party and the Queen's party were pretty equally balanced, and it was not till the month of July that the Earl of Lennox, the father of Darnley, was chosen Regent, not on account of his abilities, for they were but mediocre, but because of his near kinship to the young King. His term of office was also brief. His Regency had never been acknowledged by the Queen's faction, and a bold attempt was made by them to end the war at a single blow. Edinburgh Castle was held for Mary by Kirkcaldy of Grange, an able soldier, and the city became untenable for the Parliament, who removed to Stirling. Here the effort was made. A body of troops was marched under cover of darkness and at great speed, on 3rd September 1571, and entering the town before any alarm could be given, seized on the nobles of the King's party and the Regent himself, and endeavoured to carry them off as prisoners to the Capital. The effort was sufficiently hindered by the Earl of Morton, but the Regent was killed in the melee, stabbed, it is said, by orders of Lord Claude Hamilton in revenge for the hanging of his kinsman, the Archbishop of St Andrews. Two days afterwards the Earl of Mar was elected successor to Lennox.

Though the Reformers had secured the adoption of their Confession of Faith, they had not yet had any particular form of church government acknowledged by the State. The "First Book of Discipline" had not been sanctioned by Parliament. The old Spiritual Estate still existed as one of the constituent Estates of the realm, and still had its voice in Parliament. Its members, however, were gradually dying out, and they had no successors. A considerable amount of their property was let on feu or heritage, and

entry could not be had for their tenants, for there was none to give it. To remedy this state of affairs Parliament passed an Act in 1571 (1) declaring that all ecclesiastical feuars and tenants should henceforth hold their possessions from the Crown. Of the considerable lands and titles not yet disposed of, the Reformed Church demanded its share, but there were other claimants. The warring factions in the country had their supporters to reward, and much went in this way. On what terms were the benefices thus bestowed to be held? The nation was not prepared for so sudden a realization of Church property. Was it ready for such a revolution in its constitution? Was the Spiritual Estate to go, and the nation to be ruled by barons and burgesses alone? Then as to the College of Justice - in which James V had given eight of the Lords Spiritual seats - who were to replace those senators? Such considerations made a number of the leading men of the country desirous of some means of perpetuating the Spiritual Estate, fearing that if it ceased to exist during the reign of a minor, their proceedings would afterwards be declared illegal.

Steps were now taken to legalize its constitution. On the 12th of January 1572, how convened we know not, a gathering of prominent men of the Church was held in Leith. It was not a regular General Assembly, but it took upon itself to act much as if it had been one. It appointed a Committee to meet with a similar Committee of the Privy Council, to confer on matters affecting the Church. On 1st February there was ratified by Regent Mar what is known as the "Concordat of Leith", in which it was agreed that the names and titles of archbishops and bishops were to continue as they did before the Reformation, at

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. 111, 59.

least till the King's majority or consent of Parliament: that such persons were to have Scriptural qualifications; that a Chapter or Council be appointed to advise the bishops; that the bishops have no further jurisdiction than the Superintendent presently has in spiritual things; and all shall be subject to the Kirk and General Assembly. Somewhat similar arrangements were made as to abbacies, priories, etc., the holders of which were under the jurisdiction of the bishops, and who were also eligible to sit in Parliament and to act as judges of the Court of Session. Provision was also made to supply vacant churches with ministers, and to pay a minimum stipend, and to dispose of certain church revenues for the benefit of students and bursars.

By this curious mixture of Prelacy and Presbyterianism a way was opened up for the greedy nobles to grasp a large share of the wealth of the Church. The plan adopted was that which came afterwards to be known as the appointment of Tulchan bishops, from a custom then prevailing in the Highlands of placing a calf skin stuffed with straw beside a cow to induce it to yield its milk. Some spiritless cleric was nominated to a rich benefice or bishopric, and while he bore the title, he received but a fraction of its revenue, while the bulk of it went to his patron. Before, it was illegal to give a grant of a benefice to an unqualified person, but now it was regarded as legal if a consenting clergyman could be found. Adamson, not yet bishop or archbishop, probably as yet a disappointed man, is said to have declared in a sermon, that there were three kinds of bishops: "My lord bishop", "My Lord's bishop", and "the Lord's bishop". "My lord bishop was in the time of Papistry; my lord's bishop is now, when my lord getteth the benefice, and the bishop serveth for a portion out of the benefice to make my lord's title sure; and the Lord's

bishop is the true minister of the Gospel." (1) A piece of bitter satire that had a strong popular appeal.

There is no record of the General Assembly, held at St. Andrews on 6th of March 1572 having done anything in connection with this Leith Concordat, but in that which met at Perth on 6th August a minute was recorded in which it was asserted - "the whole Assemblie, in one voice, als weill these that were in commissoun at Leith, as others, solemnlie protest, that they meane not, by using of anie suche names, to ratifie, consent, and agree to anie kinde of Papistrie or superstitoun, and wishe rather the saide names to be changed into others that are not slanderous nor offensive. And in like manner protest, that the saids heeds and articles agreed upon be onlie receaved as an interim, till further and more perfyte order may be obtained at the hands of the King's Majestie's regent and nobilitie, for which they will preasse, as occasioun sall serve." (2)

The Assembly thus accepted the Concordat, but there are traces of its reluctance, even of compunction, in the minute quoted. And indeed it is hard to explain why a Church which for twelve years past had professed the high doctrine of the First Book of Discipline should give it up. But we have to remember the terrible times through which the country was passing and the natural longing after anything that might bring peace, the impoverished condition of the clergy and the irregular payment of their poor stipends, and the hopes the Concordat held out of better things. The teaching of the Reformed Church was not that Episcopacy was sinful but that it was

(1) Calderwood, Hist. III, 206.

(2) Js. Melville's Diary, p. 32. (2) Cald. III, 221.



not expedient, and so its acceptance in a nominal form was not a severe strain upon their consciences. Many did not like the sort of Episcopacy which was forced upon them, but they hoped that in their present circumstances it might bring relief, and afterwards, perchance, it could be amended. Knox, like the others, submitted. But he foresaw the dangers of the system intended, and wrote a letter of warning to the Assembly of August 1572 (1), which he was physically unable to attend.

His health, sapped by the labours and cares of a most strenuous life, began to fail, and leaving St Andrews, where he had taken refuge during the civil troubles, he returned to Edinburgh, where he died in his own house, on the 24th of November 1572. And so passed the greatest Scotsman of his age. Of a remarkable force of character, brave, honest, hard and narrow; knowing what he wanted, and resolute in his efforts to secure it, he was able in spite of all difficulties to give to Scotland a reformed Church and the rudiments of an educational system which have moulded the national character on lines which made possible the signing and keeping of the Covenants in the seventeenth century, and which in measure still endure.

Mar died on the 29th of October, and on the day that Knox passed Morton was appointed Regent - the fourth of that tragic line. He was a strong and avaricious man. He began his reign with vigour, and soon reduced Edinburgh Castle, which had so long held out for the captive Queen. He was in close connection with Queen Elizabeth, who had done much to foster the troubles in Scotland, and is said to have adopted as far as possible her method of dealing with the Church. With the true Douglas spirit he

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 111, 221.

sought to subordinate both Church and State to his own authority. Though he did not fulfil his obligations under the Concordat of Leith, for the country was not planted with churches, and churches were grouped under one minister for his own profit, he exacted conformity of worship, denied the right of assembly, and attempted to govern the Church as a mere branch of the State.

Early in July 1574 Andrew Melville returned to his native country. Born on the paternal estate of Bal-dovie, near Montrose, in 1545, he received the rudiments of his education in that town, afterwards proceeding to St Andrews University, and thence to Paris. Later he was a Regent at Poitiers, from which he had to flee to Geneva on account of the civil wars. Here he was the student and friend of Beza and the associate of the many Protestant ministers who had found there a refuge from the horrors of St Bartholomew's Day. He soon became noted for his learning and ability, and when he thought fit to return to Scotland, he was warmly commended by Beza. On his return, Morton endeavoured to enlist his support by the promise of an early appointment, but he declined his patronage,<sup>(1)</sup> and accepted the Principalship of Glasgow University, which was then in a moribund condition. His labours here were attended with great success, and the institution was restored to a state of great efficiency. Later Melville accepted the Principalship of St. Andrews University - St Mary's College. He was an earnest follower of the Genevan doctrine and church polity. Episcopacy was not in his eyes simply inexpedient, but altogether wrong. Presbyterianism alone in his view was in accordance with Scripture, and he soon showed himself an eager and able

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 111, 329.

advocate of this opinion.

But even before his return the Church had begun to recover from the weakness it had displayed in the Concordat of Leith. Evidently Episcopacy was not working very well, and in March 1573-4 a joint committee of Members of Parliament and Ministers was appointed to "convene, confer, reason, and put in form the ecclesiastical policy and order of the governing of the Kirk, as they shall find most agreeable to the truth of God's word, and most convenient for the state and people of the realm". No record, however, remains of anything having been done in connection with this matter. But the Church was strenuous in its annual trial of bishops, and in instituting proceedings against those whom it found in fault. (1)

Matters gradually worked to a head. In the Edinburgh Assembly of August 1575, when they came to their annual examination of the lives and doctrine of the bishops, John Durie, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, protested: "That any triyell of the bishops now past doe not preiudge the opinions and reassons whilk he and other brethren of his mynde purposes to propone in opposition to the name and office of a Bishop, as now it is used." (2) Here we have an indication of how feeling was going in the country. At a later meeting of the same Assembly, the question was raised: "Whither the Bishops, as they are now, in Scotland, hes their function of the word of God, yea or not? or, if the Chapters appoynted for creating of Bishops ought to be tolerated in this reformed Kirk?" (3) Following the old scholastic way the Assembly appointed six of its members, three on each side, to discuss the matter and to give in a report,

(1) e.g. Calderwood, Hist. 111, 272, etc.

(2) Row, Hist. page 55 (3) Ibid p. 56.

which they did before the close of the Assembly. They did not consider it expedient as yet to give an answer directly to the main question, but agreed that the name of a Bishop in Scripture is common to all ministers that have a particular flock, but out of this number might be chosen some who may have power to oversee such districts as might be appointed to them and to make appointments and exercise discipline with consent of the ministers and people. Whatever part Melville may have taken in private to stir up Presbyterian sentiments is not clear, but the prominent part he took in the proceedings of this Assembly, in which he had a seat in respect of his Principalship, and the learning and force he displayed in his arguments, greatly impressed the members and marked him out as a leader of the Church. An effort was made to silence him by the offer of the rich living of Govan, provided he would not persist in his course against the bishops, but he declined. (1)

On the 12th of March 1578, Morton, finding his hold on the Regency no longer secure, resigned, and James the Sixth, a boy in his twelfth year, nominally took the reins of government into his own hands. Though ever a staunch friend of the Reformation, Morton had no love for Presbyterianism, which received a great increase of strength by his resignation. This is seen from the proceedings of the Assembly held at Edinburgh in 1578 under the moderatorship of Andrew Melville. For several years past a Committee of the Assembly had been engaged in formulating a Statement of the Policy of the Church - now known as the "Second Book of Discipline". The book being "now some way perfyted, (2) it was agreed <sup>to</sup> by the Assembly of April of this year, with the exception of ~~the~~ Chapter dealing with the

(1) Calderwood, 111, 369. (2) Row, page 63.

Diaconate, on which there was some difference of opinion. One copy was presented to the King and another to the Council, and a number of ministers were appointed to give them all needful explanations. The Assembly took a further step in the direction of Presbyterianism by declaring that bishops be called by their own personal names and not by their official titles(1), and by prohibiting Chapters from proceeding to any election before their next meeting (2). In the next Assembly, held at Stirling in June of the same year, this order was made perpetual - "ay and whil (until) the estate of bishops be root and branch taken away."(3)

The first Parliament of James after his assumption of government was held at Stirling on 25th July 1578, and the titular bishops took their places in it as spiritual peers. Several Acts in connection with ecclesiastical affairs were passed, but no reference was made to the Acts of the two previous Assemblies in relation to the bishops. The third Act of this Parliament, entitled the "Ratification of the Libertie of the true Kirk of God and religion,"(4) is very brief, and approves "all and whatsoever Acts of Parliament, Statutes and Constitutions passed and made before, agreeable to God's Word, for the maintenance of the liberty of the true Kirk of God and religion now presently professed within this realm, and purity thereof."

Another important Act was that passed in reference to the Second Book of Discipline, which the June Assembly had sent for confirmation by Act of Parliament, and asking that it have "the strength of a law, perpetually in all time coming". As it involved so

(1) Row, Hist. p.61. (2) Ibid p.62.

(3) Ib. 63. (4) Act. Parl. Scot. 111, 95.

many weighty points, it was felt that it could not be fully considered within the limits of the present Parliament, and a committee was appointed, of which Andrew Melville was not a member, to consider the matter in detail, and to convene another meeting at Stirling on the 18th of August. We know that the subject was brought up at the October Assembly - the third of that year - and that a meeting was held with the Chancellor and several of the Lords, but the ministers had to be content that the details should be referred to the King and Privy Council. Another meeting was held at Stirling in December, but though a number of points were agreed to, the whole was referred to the next Parliament. (1) At the same General Assembly a number of enactments were passed, greatly limiting the power of the bishops, and seeking to reduce them practically to the status of parochial clergy. (2)

After his resignation Morton was for a time without influence, but in a little over a year he was again in possession of a measure of power, not as Regent, but as adviser of the youthful King. He had set up the Tulchan Episcopacy, and was at open enmity with Melville and the Presbyterians for attempting to abolish it. His influence on James may be traced in a letter sent by the King to the Assembly of July 1579, exhorting them to make no innovations in the government of the Church in the meantime. (3) To this the Assembly paid no heed, and went on with the consideration of the matters they had before them.

The strong man of their number was Andrew Melville, and he it was who was guiding the Church to a victory for Presbyterianism.

(1) Calderwood, Hist. III, 433-442. (2) Ibid 431-2.

(3) Ibid 443.

Little more was done till the Assembly held at Dundee on 12<sup>th</sup> July 1580, when a bold step was taken.

Realizing that their efforts to have the prevailing form of Episcopacy abolished and their Book of Policy ratified were being deliberately hindered by the State, they determined to put forth their own inherent power to remove abuses and to establish their own scheme of government. They therefore, "with one voice", (1) passed an Act declaring that the office of bishop, as then commonly used and understood, was destitute of authority from the word of God, and ordaining that all such persons as held such an office should be charged simpliciter to demit it and to cease from acting as pastors till they have received admission de novo from the General Assembly. (2)

Several of the provisions of the Second Book of Discipline were already in use by the Church, but finding that their endeavours to obtain confirmation of the whole Book were still being thwarted by some in authority, the General Assembly meeting in Glasgow in April 1581, in confirmation of what had been done by the Dundee Assembly in the previous year, ordered it to be recorded in their registers in the Acts of the Kirk, and to remain therein ad perpetuam rei memoriam, and copies to be taken by every Presbytery. (3)

The Second Book of Discipline is divided into 13 chapters, each containing a number of sections. It teaches clearly the doctrine of the "Two Kingdoms" - the spiritual and the civil. The Magistrate handles external things only, but the spiritual ruler judges both external acts and inward affections according to the Word of God. The magistrate is not to perform

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 111, 469.

(2) Booke of the Universall Kirk, p. 194.

(3) do. April 1581, p. 219.

any spiritual actions; nor is the minister to exercise any civil jurisdiction, but he is to teach the magistrate how civil jurisdiction should be administered. It is the duty of the civil ruler to protect the Church, to assist to maintain its discipline, and to provide for the support of its ordinances, and that of the schools and of the poor. It is his further duty to legislate according to God's Word. There is an apparent balance of the two throughout the Book, but the impression is left that the Church, in virtue of the spiritual power bestowed upon it by God through Christ, is to impose the Divine law upon the State, whose duty is to obey.

The government of the Church consists in doctrine, discipline, and distribution, and corresponding to this there are three kinds of church officials - ministers, pastors or bishops, - for these are but different names for the same office - and elders and deacons. Besides these there are the doctors, who are to teach in school, college or University. The offices of superintendents and readers are not mentioned. The office-bearers of the Church are to be admitted by election and ordination, the last a rite not imposed by the First Book. Church Assemblies are of four kinds - Kirk Sessions, Synods, Assemblies, and Oecumenical Councils. Presbyteries are not yet mentioned, though their institution was so near. It was understood that the weekly exercise served the same purpose.

By this Glasgow Assembly of 1581 the Presbyterian system was first developed in Scotland, though the name Presbytery is not actually mentioned in the Book of Discipline. Even in 1579 some steps had been taken towards setting up Presbyteries in the country; and in response to a petition to this effect, the General Assembly replied that the Weekly Exercise



advance

might be judged a Presbytery. But now a very distinct<sup>x</sup> was made. Presbyteries were about to take the place of superintendents, who were becoming unpopular. At this Assembly the King's Commissioner consulted with the members as to the setting up of Presbyteries throughout the country. The number of parish Churches was reduced to 600, stipends on a fixed programme were arranged, and it was resolved that a number of Presbyteries should be set up at once as exemplars to th<sup>p</sup> others that were to follow. Scotland had now for the first time a complete Presbyterian polity and machinery.

### CHAPTER III.

#### James VI. Prelacy and Presbyterianism.

James VI of Scotland had an unfortunate heredity, and in the earlier part of his life at least, an unfortunate environment. He was born on the 19th of June 1566. His father was murdered on 10th February 1567, and in the course of the same year his mother was a prisoner in the hands of her own subjects. The boy while an infant of little<sup>over</sup> a year old was solemnly crowned king, and the country was ruled by the Regent Murray. The Protestant Lords, who were now in control, appointed George Buchanan as the chief instructor of the young monarch. But Buchanan, able scholar though he was, proved no fitting tutor for a hysterical child. No doubt he did his best for him, he taught him many things, he made something of a scholar of him, but much more a scholarly prig. James was a very precocious youth, and responded to the tutoring which strained rather than cultivated his intellect. His whole early life was unnatural. An orphaned boy and a baby king, deprived of the natural guidance and affection of father or mother, or sister or brother, and surrounded by flatterers and time-servers, he might well have grown up much worse than he did - a meddling, self-conceited pedant.

But James inherited or imbibed ideas which Buchanan certainly never taught him. He early told his English Parliament that he had studied king-craft, and he had done so in the history of his own ancestors. His model was James IV, one of the ablest of the Stuarts, who, influenced by the examples of three contemporary kings, Henry VIII of England, Francis I of France, and Charles V of Spain, had tried to make himself an absolute king, and to impose his will on his subjects

through a Council which existed simply to register his commands (1), and he determined to follow it as soon as he might. His idea of the royal prerogative was high, and ever in his thoughts as a thing to be enforced through a Privy Council rather than through a Parliament.

Another factor which had a great influence on the character and conduct of James was the arrival at his Court in 1579 of his half-cousin, Esmé Stuart, known as Monsieur D'Aubigné, from his estate in France, and about the same time that of Captain James Stuart, the second son of Lord Ochiltree. Both of those men at once obtained a strong hold on the affection of the young King and encouraged him greatly in his autocratic ideas. High honours were lavished upon them. In a short time D'Aubigné was created a duke and Captain Stuart, Earl of Arran.

D'Aubigné's ostensible purpose in coming to Scotland was to demand the estate and title of Lennox, to which he claimed a legal right, but by the public he was generally believed to be an emissary of the Pope and the Guises, and his object to break off the friendly relations between England and Scotland, to renew the "Auld Alliance" between Scotland and France, and to bring back the Popish Queen. Along with such reports many rumours of Jesuit intrigues spread through the country, and much alarm was felt by the Protestants. The clergy especially were greatly disturbed, and, as their custom was, did not hesitate to proclaim their fears publicly from their pulpits. Though D'Aubigné avowed his conversion to Protestantism,<sup>(2)</sup> the alarm did not subside, and stories spread of Popish plots for the murder or perversion of the King - even that he had actually accepted the Romish faith. James, realizing the dangerous unsettlement so caused, instructed Craig,

(1) P. Hume Brown, "Surveys of Scottish History."

(2) P. O. Reg. III, 431.

his minister, to draw up such a Confession of Faith as would restore the public confidence.

This Confession is variously known as "Craig's Confession", the "King's Confession", and as the "Negative Confession", from the fact that it dealt with doctrines that were not accepted rather than with those that were, being in this respect different from the Confession of 1560. It is sometimes known as "The First National Covenant." It was accepted and ratified by the General Assembly held at Glasgow in April 1581. It was in the first place signed by the King himself and his household and many of the nobility; and then it was ordered by the Privy Council to be signed by all the subjects of the realm, and this was followed up by the Assembly, whose ministers pressed it upon their hearers.

As was to be expected, a strong rivalry at once sprang up between the new favourites and Earl Morton, which only ended by the execution of the ex-regent on 2nd June 1581, on the charge of complicity in the death of Darnley.

Lennox, amongst other things Scottish, was learning what Tulchan bishops were, and what was their pecuniary worth to patrons. When James Boyd, the titular Archbishop of Glasgow, died in June 1581, the patronage of the See was bestowed on Lennox by the King, and in Robert Montgomery, minister of Stirling, the favourite found one willing to part with the bulk of the income for the title and an annual allowance of a thousand pounds Scots with some poultry and horse corn in addition. The Glasgow Presbytery refused to sanction the arrangement, and the case was referred to the General Assembly, which met at Edinburgh on 17th October 1581. The Assembly sustained the decision of the Presbytery, and here they made a mistake at law. The Leith Concordat was agreed to by two parties, and it could

not be legally departed from without the consent of both. A different issue was raised when the Assembly proceeded to libel Montgomery for errors of doctrine and conduct, which were beyond dispute within their jurisdiction. From this state of affairs originated a long and weary course of legislation and violence.

When the Church would not implement the terms of the Leith Concordat applicable to this case, the King claimed the right to appoint a bishop, and nominated Montgomery. The Assembly ordered him to remain at Stirling on pain of excommunication. Montgomery continued to officiate as Archbishop, and was summoned before the General Assembly in St Andrews in April 1582, but he was defiant. A messenger-at-arms entered the Assembly, and forbade its members under pain of being declared rebels from further interference. Their reply was that unless Montgomery submitted he would be deposed and excommunicated, and he did submit. Later he resumed his archiepiscopal duties in Glasgow, and when the Presbytery was about to give decret against him for this offence they were ordered by the Provost to desist in the King's name. The moderator refused to give way, was dragged violently out of his chair, and this was followed by something like a riot, in which several persons were injured. (1) Following this the Archbishop was excommunicated, but in 1588 made application to the Assembly, and was received as a pastor of the Church. (2)

Next, the Edinburgh ministers were involved on account of their outspoken comments on the case, and John Durie was ordered to leave the city. The Edinburgh Assembly of June 1582 appointed a strong committee to approach the King and Council, and the reply was a proclamation made at Edinburgh Cross, instituting

(1) Calderwood, Hist. 111, p.621. (2) Ib. IV, 670.

Montgomery to the archbishopric, and declaring his ex-communication null.

The committee presented a paper which was practically a condemnation of their treatment of the Church to a Convention of the King and nobles held at Perth on 6th July 1582. Here we have one of the many instances given in the history of the period of the daring courage of the Presbyterian leaders. "Who dare subscribe these treasonable articles?" demanded the Earl of Arran. Andrew Melville at once stepped forward, and taking the pen from the clerk, wrote down his name, saying, "We dare!" And the other members of the committee immediately did the same.(1) Supposing men so bold to be supported by an armed force, the Convention put them off with a temporising reply.

The explanation of the King's part in this business is his attitude to ecclesiastical affairs. He had already conceived an intense dislike for Presbyterianism and a strong liking for Prelacy. His lofty opinion of himself and of his royal prerogative left no room in his realm for men of the character of the Presbyterian preachers. Their views of the dignity of the ministerial office were as lofty in their own sphere as his were in that of royalty. They had bold tongues, and their attacks on his mother, their inuendoes as to his father, their frank rebukes of himself in open church, and their criticisms in his absence, were hard for any one, especially for a conceited boy, to bear. There was a democratic tone in it all which the autocratic youth much disliked. A little later he discovered, as he put it, that "Presbyterianism agrees as well with monarchy as God with the devil"-meaning, as the devil with God. Already he had discovered that bishops were a more courtly class and

(1) Melville's Diary, p.133. Calderwood, III, 631.

much more to his mind.

At this point took place the revolutionary movement, known as the "Raid of Ruthven". James was now completely in the hands of his favourites, who were no wise counsellors, and by their mismanagement of the national affairs were fast alienating the hearts of the subjects from their sovereign. They were filling him with exaggerated notions of his own royal rights, and imposing grievous exactions both on landowners and burgesses. They were further seemingly doing what they could to exasperate Queen Elizabeth, who had so much influence in Scottish affairs during the time of the Regents, and who was looked upon by the Scottish Protestants as the security for their faith. The King, too, was in correspondence with his mother, and considerable progress had been made with a revival of Maitland's plan by which she would share authority with him - a dangerous proposal for all who had taken part against her in the late struggle. Suspicion was also rife as to the Protestantism of the Court. All these things roused distrust of Lennox and Arran, who were held responsible, and probably in some cases there was along with this a feeling of jealousy at the honours and rewards they received from the King, and so a conspiracy was formed and the usual band subscribed by a number of nobles, burgesses and others, with the connivance of Elizabeth, to kidnap the King and form a new Council. On 22nd August 1582 James was allured to Ruthven Castle by the Earl of Gowrie, and detained there a prisoner. This ended the power of the two favourites.

The conspirators, who were now in control of affairs, at once took steps to secure themselves. They compelled the King to issue <sup>a</sup> proclamation expressing his approval of what had been done in terms which everybody knew to be false. The Church strongly approved

of the action of the conspirators. The General Assembly formally approved of it, and ordered every minister to read the published statement from his own pulpit and to censure all who should oppose so laudable an enterprise.

The period of the King's captivity was not long. On 25th June 1583 he escaped to St Andrews, and in the Castle found refuge among his friends. At a conference between the two parties immunity was promised to those who had taken part in the Raid. James soon again placed himself under the influence of Arran, the pledge of safety was broken, and such as would not submit to be pardoned as rebels had to flee the country, while Cowrie himself was executed.

Bitterly incensed against the Church for the support it had given to the Raid, James determined to be avenged, and in punishing his enemies to advance his own views. The ministers still considered themselves entitled to denounce from the pulpit the evils of the times in such terms as they thought fit. With Arran in power this would not be tolerated, and John Durie and Andrew Melville were brought before the Privy Council. Durie retracted, but Melville would not, denying the right of the civil courts to judge in such a matter, holding that only to the Presbytery was he responsible for what he said in the pulpit. To offer such a plea, indefensible then or now, was to the Privy Council of the day an aggravation of the offence, and Melville was ordered to enter himself a prisoner at Blackness Castle within ten hours, instead of which he fled to Berwick,(1) whither he was followed by several other ministers who also feared the wrath of the King.

(1) J. Melville's Diary, page 144.



James now proceeded to attack Presbyterianism with vigour. In May 1584 a Parliament assembled, and on the 22nd passed 49 Acts, chiefly to this effect, and afterwards known as "The Black Acts"(1). A fear of the influence of the clergy, and in order to prevent their interference before the Acts were passed, caused the Lords of the Articles to be sworn to secrecy before every meeting(2). Something, however, was suspected, and when Lindsay went to declare their apprehensions to the King, he was seized at the Palace Gate, and sent to Blackness. The legislative effect of the Acts was most hostile to the Church. In the second Act the King was declared to be supreme in all cases and over all persons, and to decline his judgement was pronounced to be treason. The freedom of the pulpit was thus destroyed, and such preachers as Melville gagged. The third Act established the authority of the Three Estates, making it treasonable to impugn the dignity or diminish the authority of any estate, and so the bishops were restored and protected from their Presbyterian critics. By the fourth it was held that all convocations and judgements not approved by Parliament, and all meetings not convened with the royal license were illegal, and so the Church courts were shorn of their power. By another Act the chief jurisdiction of the Church was placed in the hands of the bishops instead of those of the Presbyteries and the Assembly. To bind the ministers even further a bond was submitted to them, to be subscribed within forty days, agreeing to submit to the King's control over all Estates, spiritual and temporal, and to the bishops, under penalty of losing their stipends.

As might be expected, great consternation was caused

(1) For the "Black Acts" see Act. Parl. Scot. 111, 292.

(2) Calderwood. Hist. IV, 62.

among the Presbyterian ministers by the passing of these Acts, as it was manifest how the law of the Church would be affected by them. When they were proclaimed at the Market Cross on the 25th. Pont. the minister of St Cuthbert's and a judge of the Court of Session, formally and legally protested, and then escaped to Berwick. (1) Other ministers refused to sign the Bond, and fled from the country, but the insertion of the clause "agreeably to the Word of God" and the persuasion of Craig induced many to subscribe, though with doubts and grudgings. The public, too, were much angered by the passing of the Acts. The bishops were greatly discredited, and could hardly appear in the streets without being mobbed. Worse followed at the Parliament held in August when an Act was passed ordering all ministers, readers, and masters of colleges to subscribe within forty days the Acts giving the King power over all cases, spiritual and temporal, and to submit themselves to their ordinary on pain of losing their stipends. (2) Here we have the beginning of the bitter conflict between the Crown and the Church that was to last for fully a century.

Arran, now a great power in the State, was rapidly becoming unpopular, and towards the end of the following year a number of the nobles who had been compelled to take refuge in England, entered into a confederacy with Lord Maxwell, who had quarrelled with Arran, marched northwards, and were hailed everywhere as the deliverers of the country. When they arrived before Stirling Arran fled, and as the town was not prepared for a siege, the King, who was evidently wearied of his Chancellor, at once received them into favour. The hopes of the Church from this revolutionary movement were radiant, as they expected much from their friends now in power, but neither King nor Parliament would do

(1) Calderwood IV, 65.

(2) Ibid — IV, 198.

anything for them. Full vent was given in the pulpit and elsewhere to their disappointment, and from the urgency of its demands it at length became clear that something must be done for the Church. At a conference between the Privy Council and some of the leading ministers a compromise was arrived at by which a very modified form of Episcopacy was again agreed to by the reluctant Presbyterians at the Assembly of May 1586, (1) and ecclesiastical peace for a time prevailed.

Late in this year it became known in the country that Elizabeth had determined to bring Mary to the block. James was in a difficult position. James was the next heir to the English Queen, and ardently longed to be her successor. He had never seen his mother since he was a baby. He could not therefore have had any recollection of her or any very strong natural affection for her. He had hitherto treated her with filial respect, and now he did all he safely could - perhaps all that could reasonably be expected of him. He wrote strongly to Elizabeth, using both supplications and threats, and sent ambassadors, by whom he was badly served, to plead his cause. He sought the help of other countries to the same end, but all in vain. Elizabeth had been provoked by Mary's plots, and felt that her own safety required the death of her rival. Some of the Scottish ministers refused to pray for the condemned Queen in such terms as the King demanded, declaring that this would be to imply a belief in her innocence or a condemnation of the conduct of Elizabeth; and this led to further irritation on both sides.

By an Act of 1587<sup>(2)</sup> all Church lands were annexed to the Crown, and the Church only retained her portion of the tithes. This Act was intended to enrich the Crown, which was usually in an impecunious condition,

(1) Calderwood, Hist. IV, 547, 4c.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. 111, page 431.

but it profited little, as James soon squandered all that remained upon his favourites. For the cause of Episcopacy in Scotland it was fatal. It influenced Charles I in his ill-advised Revocation of 1625 and stirred up the landed classes against the Crown, as shown in their adhesion to the Covenant.

In 1588 great alarm was felt at the preparations for the Spanish Armada and the possible co-operation of Catholics within the realm. For a time undecided, James at length joined in heartily with Elizabeth in the formation of a Protestant league. Soon the energy of the English mariners and the winds of heaven removed this Spanish threat. The home danger still remained, but James at the head of his troops for a time at least disposed of this also.

Peace thus established, the King determined to wed, and the lady of his choice was the Princess Anne of Denmark. Stormy weather hindering her voyage to Scotland, James gallantly set out for Norway to meet her, and there the royal pair were married by David Lindsay, a Presbyterian minister. After the wedding James tarried and spent a somewhat riotous winter in Norway. In May he brought his bride to Scotland, and the Queen was solemnly crowned by Bruce, another Presbyterian minister.

During the Sovereign's absence the country on the whole had been very peaceful, and for a share at least in this the clergy deserved credit. The King was naturally pleased at this and the hearty welcome he received on his return, and at the Assembly of August 1590 made the often quoted speech which Calderwood records for us. (1)

"He fell furth in-praising God that he was borne in such a tyme as the tyme of the light of the Gospell, to suche a place as to be king in suche a kirk, the

(1) Calderwood, Hist. Vol.V, page 106.

sincerest kirk in the world. 'The kirk of Geneva,' said he, 'keepeth Pasche and Yule; what have they for them? they have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of England, it is an evill said masse in English, wanting nothing but the liftings.\* I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your puritie, and to exhort the people to doe the same; and I, forsuith, so long as I bruike my life and crowne, sall mainteane the same against all deidlie.'" It is difficult to account for this harangue, so greatly at variance with the "Black Acts" and so opposed to many of the King's deliverances on Presbyterianism. Whatever the reason, it is clear that James was at the time highly pleased with the Kirk, and its leaders were astute enough to take advantage of the fact.

The General Assembly of 1592 petitioned the King for the repeal of the Acts of 1584; that the Act of Annexation should be abolished and the patrimony of the Church restored; that prelates should not sit in Parliament as representatives of the Spiritual Estate; and that the country should be purged of idolatry((i.e. Poperly).(1) On the 29th of May a Parliament which abrogated the 1584 Acts in so far as they interfered with ecclesiastical authority in matters of religion, and ordered that presentations to benefices should be delivered to the Presbyteries in which they were situated and not to the bishop as before. (2) But the patrimony of the Church was not restored. This legislation, however, meant the subversion of Episcopacy and the reestablishment of the Church on a Presbyterian basis. It was regarded by the Presbyterian element in the country as of such

\* Elevation of the Host.

(1) Row. History, p.143.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. 111, 541.

great importance that it was spoken of as the "Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland", and Calderwood declares that Presbyterianism had thus come to its perfection.

From a Presbyterian standpoint, however, there were defects. The Acts indeed embodied and ratified some of the leading propositions of the Second Book of Discipline and conceded other points for which the Presbyterians had contended, but they were evasive in their recognition of the Book as a whole. Another point which led to abuses was that which prohibited the General Assembly from meeting except at such place and time as might be appointed by the King or his Commissioner, thus denying the inherent right of the Church to summon such meetings.

A time of great upheaval in the national affairs followed. A number of the popish nobles plotted with the King of Spain, and zealous supporters of the Protestant cause were much agitated; and now, as they had done before, urged the King to take steps for the suppression of Popery and the punishment of Papists. Laws of the utmost severity were proposed, but the Council would not grant all that was asked. There were already stringent laws against Papists in existence, but James was reluctant to put even those into full force. In the country, especially in the north, the numbers of those, both among the nobles and the people, who leant to Popery were numerous, and to have pressed the law too harshly might have led to a bloody civil war. Besides, as we have seen, James desired as ardently as his mother had ever done to become the successor of Elizabeth on the English throne, and he had to walk warily. The Catholics were numerous and powerful in England, and he must not make them his enemies, as he certainly would if he became known as a persecutor of the

faith at home. On the other hand, if he favoured them he would alienate Elizabeth. So he had to steer a middle course as skilfully as he could.

But the extreme Presbyterian party under the leadership of Andrew Melville, now in power, abused that power. They would suffer no liberty of opinion, and continued to urge the King to persecute the Papists. The Synod of Fife on the pretext that several of the Popish lords had attended St Andrews University in their youth and had married in the province and had signed the articles of religion, and so come under the dominion of the Court, excommunicated them, and this the Assembly ratified. (1) The King was angry at the plots of the rebels and at the same time irritated at the action of the Assembly. But efforts at peace were made, and an Act of Oblivion was passed, but in May 1594 Parliament decided that this had not been complied with, and further steps for the punishment of the conspirators were taken. (2) Aigyle, the enemy of Huntly, was entrusted to pursue him with fire and sword, but at the Battle of Glenlivet was severely defeated. The King himself then led a force to the north, and Strathbogie Castle and other fortresses were destroyed. Later the Earl made another attempt, but with its failure the Catholic cause was lost.

James, however, had a secret liking for Huntly and Errol, and when they returned to the country, made submission, and sought to be restored to the royal favour, he was inclined to grant it. He consulted his chaplain Bruce, but neither he nor any of the ministers would hear of it. When a rumour of such a

(1) Calderwood, Hist. V, p. 263.

Melville, Diary, p. 309.

Spottiswood, lib. VI, p. 396.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. IV, pp. 55-56.

thing went abroad, a deputation of ministere was sent to Falkland to remonstrate with the King. James Melville, as being most acceptable to his majesty, was chosen as the spokesman, and he narrates the interview very vividly in his Diary. (1) He began, but his impetuous uncle was unable to restrain himself, and bore down the King, catching him by the sleeve, and calling him "God's sillie (weak) vassal," spoke to this effect: "Sir, we will humblie reverence your majestie in privat", but as King, country, and Church were likely to come to wreck, they must discharge their duty both to Christ and himself by giving him some faithful counsel. "And, thairfor, Sir, as divers tymes befor, sa now again, I mon tell yow, thair is twa kings and twa Kingdomes in Scotland. Thair is Chryst Jesus the King, and his Kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is, and of whase Kingdome nocht a king, nor a lord, nor a heid, bot a member! And they whome Chryst hes callit and commandit to watch over his Kirk, and governe his spirituall Kingdome, hes sufficient powar of him and autoritie sa to do, bathe togidder and severalie; the quhilk na Christian king nor Prince soula controll and discharge, but fortifie and assist, uther-ways nocht faithfull subjects nor members of Chryst." And he goes on "with grait libertie and vehemence" to say "manie uther things" of exhortation and warning, till the King appears to have been subdued, and dismissed the deputation pleasantly.

This shows exactly the position taken up by the High Church Presbyterians of the time. They were the divinely appointed executive of Christ's Kingdom on Earth, and as such they had a superiority to all earthly rulers, whom they had the right to instruct as

(1) Diary, September 1596, page 370.



to their duty and to command them to do it, under spiritual penalties. With such lofty views of their functions, the ministers did not hesitate to declare their opinions from the pulpit on all subjects - religious, political and social - in such terms as they thought fit - terms always plain and sometimes coarse. No one, neither king, queen, nor official, however highly placed, was exempt from their attacks, for attacks they often were, not mere comments. James chafed under these harangues, and awaited his opportunity for revenge.

This was found in the preaching of a sermon by David Black of St Andrews, in which he used seditious language regarding his own King and declared Queen Elizabeth an atheist. The English ambassador complained of this, and Black was summoned before the Council. Like Melville on a former occasion, he declined its judicature, in which he was supported by other ministers, who held that this was a spiritual matter and could only be dealt with by a spiritual court. The King was wroth, and an Act was passed by the Secret Council, ordering the Commission of the Church to leave the city within twenty-four hours. The ministers refused to obey, and besought all others to testify against the Proclamation. Knowing something of the power of the Church, James was anxious to make peace, and expressed himself willing to accept a merely nominal fine if Black would plead guilty. The accused, by advice of the Council of ministers appointed in October to reside in Edinburgh to look after the concerns of the Church, refused, but on 9th December (1) was found guilty and banished beyond the 'North Water'. This case continued to cause great excitement; the ministers denounced the king as a persecutor; and he banished them and a number of their lay supporters from the Capital.

(1) Calderwood, V, page 498. Spottiswood Lib. VI.

On 17th Decr., after the week-day service in St. Giles, a meeting was held, at which Bruce spoke on the present danger of the Church, and a riot followed. The King, who was present at a meeting held in the Tolbooth at the same time, was involved in the disturbance, but by the efforts of the Provost and ministers was enabled to reach Holyrood in safety. (1) Such an insult could not be overlooked, and next morning James removed to Linlithgow, and ordered the Courts to be ready to remove at his command. For a time things looked dangerous. Rumours of the King's intention to return and destroy his Capital spread abroad. Warrants were issued for the apprehension of the city ministers, and they fled to England. At length peace was made with the angry King, and on 1st January 1597 he returned in triumph.

Presbyterianism suffered from something of a reaction after this outburst, which James was keen enough to note, and he considered himself warranted to proceed in his plan to substitute Episcopacy. He went about it with some show of legality. He called an Assembly to meet at Perth on 1st March 1597. From his point of view the choice of place was wisely made. Presbyterianism north of the Tay had never been of such an extreme type as in the south; in the north it was still weak and popery strong. Perth meant a long journey for southland ministers, and many were unable to undertake it. It was more convenient for those resident in the north, and they crowded in to this Assembly as they had never done to one before. Everything was made pleasant for them. The King was pleased to be introduced to many of them and received them graciously. His courtiers, too, were lavish in their blandishments. Hints of their own importance to the Church and of the arrogance of the ministers of the south who sought to rule the whole Church in their own way were

freely dropped. Thus local influence and every adventitious aid he could devise were strongly in favour of the King's designs. (1) It having been decided that the gathering at Perth was a lawful extraordinary General Assembly (2), the King laid before it thirteen propositions based on 55 questions already circulated by himself. (3) The answers were ultimately so far agreeable to him that he called another Assembly to meet in May at Dundee. At Perth a commission was appointed to deal with the Popish earls, who were at last received into the Church at Aberdeen on 26th of June.

At the Dundee Assembly the northern ministers again gathered in force, prepared to support the King. Among the decisions arrived at was one that the royal sanction should be required to give full effect to the Acts of future Assemblies. At the ninth session James attended, and won the favour of those present by expressing his desire to have churches planted in every parish and stipends provided for all the ministers. (4)

The King's plan for the appointment of bishops now began to work out. At the Parliament of December the Commissioners of the Church craved that a limited number of ministers representing the Church and the Spiritual Estate of the realm should be entitled to vote in Parliament. This no doubt had been arranged with the King, and after a certain show of opposition it was agreed that as many ministers as the King should be pleased to appoint bishops, abbots, or other

(1) Melville's Diary. 403

Calderwood. Hist. Vol. V, 623.

(2) Book of the Universal Kirk 439.

(3) Calderwood. Hist. Vol. V, 610.

(4) Book of the Universal Kirk 460.

prelates, should have votes in Parliament as prelates had in time past, but not otherwise<sup>(1)</sup> The consent of the Church, however, was necessary, and this was obtained at the Dundee Assembly of March 1597-8 by a majority of ten after a speech in favour by the King. The Church had made a great surrender of principle, and those who may be termed the constitutional Presbyterians saw this clearly. They realized that the Church had consented to the reintroduction of Prelacy however the name might be disguised. But their fight against it was vain: the northern host enabled the motion to be carried.

In the autumn of this year occurred the somewhat mysterious 'Gowrie Conspiracy'. So far as it concerns the Church, the story told by the King evoked a good deal of scepticism on the part of a number of ministers, who refused to enter into details in giving public thanks to God for the King's deliverance. Five of them were ordered to leave Edinburgh, and forbidden to preach in any other part of the Country, but on submission and admitting the truth of the story were restored to their churches. Bruce, however, persisted for a time, and was banished to France.

On the 24th of March 1603 Elizabeth died, and four days afterwards the Scottish King received official intimation of his peaceful accession to the English throne. He immediately began to make preparations to enter upon his new inheritance, to which his journey south was a joyous and triumphant progress.

Though he was no longer resident in Scotland his battle with the Scottish Presbyterians continued as long as he lived. A General Assembly had been summoned to meet at Aberdeen in July 1604, but the King ordered that it be not kept, and no other date was fixed. Nevertheless the St Andrews Presbytery

(1) Scot. Act. Pari. IV, p. 130.

determined to keep to the appointed day, and its three commissioners duly appeared to represent their Presbytery, but finding very few other members of the Assembly there (1), they made a notarial protest, and were commended by the Presbytery. (2) This Assembly was prorogued till the following year, but then there was a somewhat similar interference with its proceedings. In June a circular letter was sent to the Presbyteries requesting that their representatives should not attend. Chiefly, but not wholly as a result of this, only nineteen ministers attended the Assembly. Row (3) gives as reasons, tempestuous weather and the fact that in some of the letters to commissioners the 2nd of July and in others the 5th was given as the date of meeting, so that some ministers did not arrive till the Assembly was closed. Calderwood (4) says this was done of purpose. Sir Alexander Straiton, the royal Commissioner, brought a letter from the Lords of the Secret Council to the Assembly (5) requesting them not to offend the King by holding the Assembly without his 'approbation and allowance'. The reason of this letter was that alarm had been caused to the authorities by the spreading of rumours that efforts would be made to undo the legislation of the last eight years as affecting the Church, and this might interfere with some of the political schemes of his Majesty. Before the Assembly was formally opened Straiton told the few ministers present that he had this letter, but Forbes of Alford replied that it would not be well to separate without a formal meeting, but seeing that so few had convened, it would be better simply to constitute the Assembly, and prorogue it to a future date.

(1) Row, Hist. 224. (2) *Ib.* p. 224. (3) *Ib.* 227.

(4) Calderwood, Hist. VI, 279.

(5) *Ibid.* VI, 281.

The Commissioner refused to be present at the election of a Moderator, but when this was done, and it had been decided to dissolve the Assembly immediately, declined to fix a place and date for the next meeting. The Moderator then appointed the Assembly to meet in the same place on the last Tuesday of September. (1) They were quite prepared to obey so far as the transaction of business was concerned, but to break up their meeting without fixing a date for the next they would not agree. This was a vital point in their Church polity, and that polity they believed to be founded on Holy Scripture, and so divine. In this belief they had fought for it, and they would not surrender it now. Proceedings of somewhat questionable legality in some respects were at once taken against the ministers concerned. Forbes and Welsh who arrived at Aberdeen too late for the Assembly and several ministers were sent by the Council as prisoners to Blackness, that Bastille of stubborn Presbyters, for either being present at the Assembly or for approving of it. So great public indignation was aroused by this severity that James found it expedient to issue a proclamation stating that though he desired as much uniformity as possible between the two countries, he did not intend to make any sudden innovations, and also calling a General Assembly at Dundee in July next. (2)

Some of the ministers expressed their regret for having attended the Assembly, but on 24th October 14 were charged, and they gave in a written declinature of the jurisdiction of the Court. (3) This was repelled, the Assembly declared illegal, and the accused punishable. The declinature greatly annoyed the King, and he sent down orders that six of the ministers should be tried for treason. The discovery of the Gunpowder.

(1) Cald. VI, 282 Mel. 570.  
 - (2) Cald. VI, 338-341. (3) Ib. VI, 347.

Plot on 5th November had not softened James very much. On the basis of the Black Acts of 1584, and after a debate amongst the nobles who were present to assist the Court, a majority agreed that to decline the jurisdiction of the Council was treason, and the case went before a jury. But so strong was the feeling shown against the harshness displayed in this matter that six out of a packed jury refused to convict. The six ministers tried were imprisoned for fourteen months, and then banished to France; but James, yielding in some measure to the strong feeling prevailing, was satisfied to remove the other eight to remote parts of their own country.

A Parliament met in Perth in July, having for its main object the restoration of Prelacy. (1) The first Act passed declared the King to be supreme over all persons and causes, and next came one providing for the restoration of the Estate of bishops. The Act of Annexation of 1587 was rescinded, and the same Act restored the Estate of bishops to "their ancient and accustomed honour, dignities, prerogatives, privileges, livings, lands, teinds, rents, thirds and estates, as the same was in the Reformed Kirk most ample and free at any time before the Act of ANNEXATION". The limitation was to bishoprics which were benefices of cure, no alterations were made in the others. Many of the old abbey lands were constituted temporal lordships and their possessors or commendators were created peers.

On the 21st of May 1606 James sent a letter expressing his anxiety for the welfare of the Church, and inviting eight prominent ministers to come to London to consult with him on affairs affecting it. (2) The Scottish guests were graciously received both by the

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. vol. IV, 281 - 284.

(2) Calderwood, Hist. #1, 477 etc.

King and the English divines he had summoned to assist him. They were feasted and conferred with, preached at and shown the English ritual in all its magnificence, but as might have been expected, altogether in vain. On St. Michael's Day they were taken to a high Anglican service in the Chapel Royal, and Andrew Melville wrote a sarcastic Latin epigram upon it, which somehow was shown to the King. The poet paid dearly for his wit. He was charged with the offence, and defended himself with more vigour than prudence. Finally he was sent to the Tower where he remained for three years before he was allowed to accept a professorship of Divinity in the Huguenot University of Sedan, where he spent the rest of his life. His nephew James was sent to Newcastle, but was afterwards allowed to remove to Berwick, where he died. The other ministers who had accompanied them to London were allowed to return to Scotland, but under very strict conditions.

King James was gradually pressing on his plan for the assimilation of the Scottish to the English Church, but he must still exercise some caution. It was considered that a meeting might now be safely held, and this was done at Linlithgow early in December 1606. Here 33 noblemen and about 150 ministers so far met the royal wishes that they settled that every Presbytery should have a perpetual moderator. Certain limitations were imposed on their power, but there was no real force in them. It was held by some that this gathering at Linlithgow was not a real Assembly, and it was said that a minute of its proceedings had been sent to Court and falsified there. As a result great indignation was provoked throughout the country. Some of the nominated moderators declined to accept office, and some of the Presbyteries only submitted after a



futile resistance. Many parishes were still without ministers, but the Church had still in it a strong element of Presbyterianism. Some of the bishops retained parishes after they became prelates: some as long as they lived. The parishes had still kirk sessions, and the sessions were under presbyteries, and the presbyteries under synods. The discipline of the Church was still at work with nearly all its old severity. The clergy as a whole were eager to reduce the immorality that was so rampant and were doing what they could to this end.

In 1610 James, following the example of Henry VIII and Elizabeth, created by his simple proclamation (1) a Court of High Commission for each archdiocese, though the two were afterwards united. This Court could impose any fine or imprisonment for any length of time. It could depose any minister, excommunicate any person, and see that the sentence was carried out. Against its judgements there was no appeal. It was a source of much oppression, and though bishops had been hated by many Scotch people for long, they were now hated more than ever. But the fact that they had the power to influence the stipends of ministers gave them a great weight with those who are affected by such considerations.

On 8th June of the same year was held the so-called General Assembly of Glasgow. The Earl of Dunbar was the Royal Commissioner and Archbishop Spottiswood was the Moderator. Eleven propositions were agreed to, amongst them the following: the calling of a General Assembly was the prerogative of the King; bishops to be moderators of Presbyteries; no excommunication or absolution to be pronounced without the approval of the bishop of the diocese; all presentations to be

(1) Calderwood. Hist. VII, 57 etc.

directed to the bishop of the diocese, every minister on admission should swear obedience to the King and his ordinary; that bishops be subject to the censure of the General Assembly; no minister in public to disobey the Acts of this Assembly under pain of deposition.

The King sent to the Church a direction that though lay elders have no warrant in Scripture or in the custom of the early Church, yet they have a use in collecting for the poor and caring for the fabric of the Church, therefore the minister was to choose wise and discreet men to act in this way. He might also call offenders to appear before him and such "associates", and deal with them according to the canons of the Church. Here we have a compromise with the kirk session: the king evidently knew that Presbyterianism still existed.

It was realized, if not by themselves, at any rate by the King, that the Scottish bishops were not as yet truly bishops in the diocesan sense, as they still lacked the virtue of Apostolic Succession, as conveyed by the hands of those who were really in the line, and so be able to transmit it to those at home. Three of the bishops were invited to London for consecration for this purpose.<sup>(1)</sup> Notwithstanding all they had claimed and done in the past they had no scruples at such a consecration, but Spottiswood did scruple much about being consecrated by the Archbishop of York, remembering the controversy of Roman Catholic times as to the superiority of that See over the Scottish Church, but this difficulty was surmounted by choosing neither the Archbishop of York nor the Archbishop of Canterbury, but by the bishops of London, Ely, Rochester and Worcester, the two last taking the place of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who was originally appointed, but unable to attend.

(1) Calderwood. Hist. VII, 99-103.

Spottiswood. lib. VII Vol. III, 209.

Bishop Andrews of Ely was troubled about a matter: was it not necessary for the new bishops to become first deacons and then priests before their elevation to the episcopal throne? The difficulty was got over by quoting the instances of S. Ambrose and others, who had been raised directly to the rank of bishops. In December 1610 the newly consecrated bishops returned to Scotland, (1) and by May 1611 all the Scotch bishops were bishops indeed so far as titles and orders could go.

In 1612 the Act of 1592 (the Magna Charta of the Church) was repealed by Parliament (2), and diocesan (though not Anglican) Episcopacy was legalised.

A not very representative Assembly, conducted from a Presbyterian standpoint in an irregular manner, was held at Aberdeen in August 1616. Spottiswood, without even the form of nomination, occupied the chair as Moderator. A number of articles sent down by the King were brought forward. If Andrew Melville had intruded upon the State, James now intruded upon the Church. The boundary of the "two kingdoms" was not being very clearly observed. Some of the instructions of his Majesty were distinctly good, but others were an unwarranted interference with the Church. Amongst the latter was a new Confession of Faith and what were afterwards known as the Five Articles of Perth. The Primate, considering that these articles had never been seen by an assemblage of ministers, and knowing something of the feeling of the country, persuaded the King to hold them over till his proposed visit to Scotland, when his presence might ensure their acceptance by the doubting. But neither King nor bishop anticipated the indignation that the introduction of those articles was to arouse in the

(1) Calderwood. Balfour, Hist. Works II, 35-36.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. IV, 469.

country.

When James went gladly south in 1603 he promised that he would visit his native country at least once in every three years, but not till 1617 was the promise kept. In that year, however, he did visit Scotland. Great preparations were made for his visit, and he was received with every appearance of welcome as testified by elaborate mural decorations, fulsome verses and Latin orations. Having got over his troubles with the Lords of the Articles, a number of Acts of considerable importance to the Church were passed. (1) Provision very much after the fashion of the English conge d'elire was made for the election of a bishop when a vacancy occurred: the King would nominate and the chapter of the diocese would elect. One part of the Act arranged for the restoration of stipends of the deans, canons and prebends, in so far as the temporalities could be recovered. (2) Another Act was one which favourably affected the clergy as a whole. It was styled an Act "anent the planting of kirks" (3), which pointed out that there were still many churches without ministers, and consequently much ignorance and irreligion among the people, and that even many benefices which had ministers had no sufficient stipend, and accordingly a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to assign stipends to ministers, the minimum to be 500 merks and when circumstances permitted a maximum of 800 merks. This was admittedly a great boon to the clergy, and silenced a good deal of grumbling.

James had few pleasant memories of General ASSEMBLIES, and now took a bold step in the direction of opposing them. An Act to the effect "that what-

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. IV, 525 etc.

(2) *ibid* IV, 525. (3) *Ibid* IV, 531.

soever conclusion was taken by his Majesty, with the advice of the Archbishops and Bishops, in matters of ecclesiastical policy, the same should have the power and strength of an ecclesiastical law" met with a very different reception. Even the bishops whom the King consulted on the matter, advised him to revise and enlarge it on the principle that the advice and consideration of Presbyteries were essential in the making of ecclesiastical laws. The obnoxious clause was accordingly altered to read: "That whatsoever his Majesty shall determine in the external government of the Church, with the advice of the Archbishops, Bishops, and a competent number of the ministry, should have the strength of a law. The Presbyterian element among the ministers was indignant when they heard of this; and after discussing the matter, a full and formal protest was prepared by upwards of fifty of their number (1); and the King having accidentally had an opportunity of seeing this before it was actually presented to him, and realizing the force of it, withdrew the clause on his own authority, though it had been passed by the Lords of the Articles. (2)

But though the clause was withdrawn, the protesters were not suffered to pass unpunished. After the dissolution of Parliament Archibald Simson, David Calderwood, and Peter Ewart, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, (3) were summoned to appear before the Court of High Commission at St Andrews. James himself was present at the trial of Calderwood (4), and entered into a long, wordy and often vulgar discussion with him. Calderwood was pressed to retract,

(1) Calderwood VII, 250. Spottiswood Vol. III, 242.

(2) Comp. J. Hill Burton, History VI, 320.

(3) Calderwood, Hist. VII, 259.

(4) Ibid VII, 261 etc.

but the stubborn presbyter would not, and was banished to Holland, where he remained till the death of the King. Simson was deprived and confined to Aberdeen, but he afterwards submitted and was restored. Ewart was also deposed and imprisoned.

During his visit to St Andrews his Majesty was present at a meeting of the bishops and some 38 influential ministers. He introduced the question of the Five Articles on which his mind was firmly bent, complained of their not adopting them, and insisted on his right to enforce them. The ministers besought permission to discuss the matter amongst themselves, and this being agreed to, they retired for two hours, and on returning asked that a General Assembly might be held, when the Articles could be discussed and sanctioned. After some argument the King reluctantly consented, and an Assembly was appointed to be held at St Andrews on 25th November.

On the 4th of August James was again in England, returning thither, Pow tells us, (1) "with great contentment, onlie miscontented that he had not gotten his will in the maters of the Kirk." This was certainly a disappointment to the King. It had been his earnest desire from the first to unite both the Parliaments and Churches of his two kingdoms. The reluctance of the English Commons had prevented the one and the stubbornness of so many of the Scottish ministers and the lukewarmness of some of the bishops, and the rising resistance of the people, had prevented the other. James had discernment enough to note this. Laud indeed pressed him to go further, but he had sense enough to decline. He was not only not under his chaplain's influence to anything like the extent his son afterwards was, but he actually distrusted him as a man of restless spirit (2), and knowing the English cleric's ignorance of the Scottish people, he would not follow his lead too far. But with his natural

(1) Hist.  
p. 312.

(2)  
"Original  
Letters."  
p. 773.

obstinacy he determined that the Five Articles must be carried.

The Assembly appointed for 25th November was duly held. The Five Articles remitted to it were in brief: 1) Communicants to kneel when receiving the Holy Communion; 2) The administration of Communion to sick, dying, or infirm persons in their homes in cases of urgent necessity. 3) The administration of Baptism in private under similar circumstances; 4) the Confirmation of the young by the bishop of the diocese; and 5) the observation of the five great commemorations of the Christian Church - the Birth, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord, and the sending down of the Holy Spirit. At a private conference it was carried by a majority (1) "First, that the Communion be given to everie one severallie, out of the minister's hand. Nixt, if there be anie sicke person wha had lyen bedfast the space of a yeere, the minister of the parochie being earnestlie requested, sould minister the Communion to him, in presence of sixe elders, and other famous witnesses". As to the other Articles, especially that concerning the observance of the Holy Days, it was agreed, "after long reasoning", that the attendance being limited owing to the season of the year, the distance of the place, the shortness of the intimation given for the meeting, and the present scruples of some of those attending, to refer the same to another General Assembly, which was to be convened by petition to the King.

The King was greatly irritated at the failure to carry the whole of the Articles as he had been promised, but a royal license for the holding of another Assembly was granted, and it met on 25th August 1618 at Perth. Spottiswood presided, and preached from 1Cor. XI, 16 (2), defending ceremonies in general, and

(1) Calderwood, VII, 285. Cp. Row, p. 314.

(2) Spottiswood Miscellany, Vol. I, p. 63.

the Five Articles in particular, though he was careful to explain that he knew nothing of them till they were sent to him to be inserted among the Canons. They were due to the King alone. "These things proceede from his Majestie, and are his owne notions, not any other's." (1) The King's letter was presented by Dr. Young, Dean of Winchester, a Scotsman. It is a prolix document, full of expostulations and absurd pretensions. Here is a specimen sentence:—"And it should rather have become you, to have begged the establishment of such things of Vs, then that Wee should thus neede to be put to vrge the practise of them vpon you". (2) The Moderator followed with the express statement that they were none of his, for he did not think them expedient, but declaring the King's anxiety that they should be passed, and the revenge he would take if they were not. Dr. Young followed, praising the King's good intentions, and urging them to conformity. A meeting of nobles, gentry, and ministers nominated by the Primate was held in the afternoon, and on the following day two separate meetings of the whole Assembly were held to discuss the Articles. On the third day, after a sermon by Bishop Coupar, the last meeting was held. Before the vote was taken, the King's letter was again read, and then 86 votes were given for and 41 against.

Presbyterian writers complain of the unfairness of the Assembly, and unfairly conducted it certainly was. Before the Assembly actually met, and during its course, the bishops had been busy cajoling and bullying its members to induce them to accept the Articles. At its gatherings the bishops and nobles and gentry were seated at tables in the Little Kirk, the place of meeting, and the ministers had to stand around as if they were an inferior class. The commissions of

(1) Spottiswood Miscellany, Vol. 1, p. 83.

(2) Original Letters, II, p. 569.



ministers were closely examined, but a number of nobles and gentry were present with no other warrant than a missive from the King, and when this was objected to, the Moderator repelled the objection. When it was proposed that the Articles should be voted on separately Spottiswood declared that the King would have all or none. Before the voting warning was given that votes would be noted and reported, and during the voting exhortations to remember the King<sup>(1)</sup> were given. And the terms in which the question was put and reported by Lord Binning to the King, "Whether the Assembly would obey your Majesty in admitting the Articles, or refuse them". was most unfair. In 1621 the Articles were given the force of law by Act of Parliament- 77 voting in favour and 50 against their acceptance.<sup>(2)</sup>

Many matters connected with church government and ritual affected the majority of the public but little, but the attempt to enforce the Articles and to alter things they had been accustomed to for fully half a century stirred them deeply and provoked much resentment and opposition. The Presbyterian spirit of Welsh and Melville may have been languishing, but it was not yet dead. Many ministers refused to obey the command to read the Articles from their pulpits and to serve the elements to kneeling communicants. Many elders declined to serve where this was done, and many laymen refused to kneel. Pamphlets and poems were printed and surreptitiously circulated and eagerly read. Four of the Edinburgh ministers obeyed the edict, but thousands of their people flocked out of the city to neighbouring churches where the old custom was still observed. Nor was such a state of affairs peculiar to Edinburgh: in most parts of the country it was the same. The Court of High Commission

(1) Row. Hist. 316.

(2) Act. P. Scot. IV, 596.

Calderwood. Hist. VII. 304.

tried and punished both clergy and laity who would not obey. The King hounded on the bishops, not all of whom were eager in the business, and the public resentment deepened. The news of the publication in England of King James' "Declaration to Encourage Recreations and Sports on the Lord's Day" caused much irritation, and increased the public suspicion of the King. Many refrained from attendance on the parish churches and conventicles became numerous. So much was this the case that in 1624 his Majesty threatened to remove the Courts of Justice from the capital unless more diligence was shown in repressing this nonconformity, and a better example of conformity given by the legal officials.

During the remaining years of the reign of James affairs in Scotland were in a wretched condition. The weather was bad, and plague and famine were rife. Trade was indifferent - there was a sullen discontent - religion was in a low condition.

In England James had increasing troubles. He disliked the Puritans, unjustly suspecting them to be anti-monarchial, and he persecuted them severely. In the Catholics he had a much more dangerous enemy. Many of them were willing to make any sacrifice for their faith. Seminary priests crowded into the country and the number of Papists greatly increased. This alarmed the King, and he was roused to action against them. In financial matters he found great difficulties. His later years were clouded by the loss by his daughter's husband of the Palatinate, the failure of the Spanish Match, and the war with Spain.

On the 27th of March 1625 he died of Ague in the 59th year of his age. There was little mourning amongst his people. Probably Burnet wrote but the truth when he declared: "It is certain no king could die less lamented or less esteemed than he was." (1)

(1) Burnet, "Own Times" Vol. 1, page 8.

## CHAPTER IV.

### Charles I. Accession and Revocation.

Charles was born in Linlithgow on the 19th of November 1600, a descendant of a long line of Scottish kings. He was thus a Scotsman, and quite willing to claim Scotland as the land of his birth when occasion served. But on his father's accession to the English crown, and while he was still an infant, he was taken south, and grew up under the training of English tutors and surrounded by English flatterers. He thus became imbued with English prejudices, and learned to look on Scottish affairs as through the eyes of an Englishman of his time. By the death of his elder brother, Henry, a promising youth, believed to have not only Protestant but Puritanic sympathies, he became heir to the throne in 1612, and on the death of James he peacefully succeeded him in 1625.

He inherited not only the crown, but also the troubles which had been gathering thickly during the closing years of his father's reign. Involved in an expensive war, sorely pressed for money, faced by a stubborn Parliament bent on claiming its rights, together with a Puritanism which had gained strength through the popular hatred of the proposed but now abandoned Spanish marriage, and with the plague decimating the citizens of his capital, he was in a most difficult position. But Charles was not the man to meet such troubles successfully.

He had some virtues and many defects. His mental ability was fair. Virtuous in life, he was a devoted son of the Anglican Church (1) in whose ritual he so much delighted that some one considered him "fitter

(1) Clarendon. Hist. of the Rebellion, I, 109.

for a ceremonial Archbishop than a governing King!

He always contended that he only followed the precedent of his father. He had the same belief in himself as the divinely-appointed head of both Church and State. As such he resented the demands of the Puritans and chafed under the claim to control the national finances upon which the Commons insisted. In some respects he excelled his father: in others he fell far short. He had none of the Scotch caution of his predecessor, nor the patience and perseverance by which James so often secured his ends. He was no judge of men, as his choice of counsellors and favourites plainly shows. Buckingham, Hamilton and Lauderdale are witnesses. He lacked insight: he utterly failed to understand the growing power of the Commons and the Puritans in England and the religious earnestness of the Covenanters in Scotland. Intoxicated by his fantastic conception of the royal prerogative, he imagined he could bend to his will a people now rising into democratic freedom and spiritual power. He was opinionated and stubborn. What he reckoned right was right, and what he purposed must be put into execution without delay. This led him into the doing of unconstitutional acts and the adoption of shifty ways.

By no means destitute of manly courage, he was yet often morally weak in times of difficulty, and this caused him to prevaricate and to make concessions which he again and again showed he only awaited an opportunity to withdraw. Thus he forfeited the confidence of both his English and Scottish subjects, and ultimately brought about his downfall and death.

Charles soon made it plain that he intended not only to continue, but to advance his father's policy in reference to Scottish ecclesiastical affairs.

Shortly after his accession he wrote to Archbishop Spottiswood that he was resolved to enforce all the laws relating to the Church which had been passed in the preceding reign. In August he issued a proclamation intimating to all his subjects of Scotland that he would execute the "lawes of the countrey against Papists and all recusants; as also he would have all to conforme to the present establyshed ordour of this Kirk in giving obedience, and observing the five Articles concluded in Perth Assemblie, and ratified in Parliament, and that the disobeyers should be exemplarlie punished." (1)

In October 1625 a Convention of Estates was held in Edinburgh, at which the King was granted a taxation of 400,000 merks as an annuity. About the same time Charles made great changes in the administration of the country. He remodelled the Court of Session, the Privy Council and Lords of Exchequer, appointing several of the bishops to posts in the two latter departments of the State. In November his Majesty issued the fateful proclamation in which he revoked "all things done by his father, or his father's mother, in prejudice of the Crowne". (2) This was a most sweeping enactment, which Forbes styles "the most ample that ever was made." (3) and it was followed by great effects. In the abstract the Revocation, as some contend, may not have been absolutely unjust, but the mode of imposing it was a great wrong. We may justly blame the greed of those who grabbed for the Church lands, but we must also blame the Crown for giving what it had no right to give. The Revocation, too, "made no allowance for titles purified through contract or prescription, and it dispensed not only with erections,

(1) Row. History page 340.

(2) Ibid p. 341.

(3) page 258.

but with all Acts of Parliament <sup>confirming</sup> ~~enforcing~~ the same."(1)  
 It aroused great indignation and bitter resentment on the part of all who were benefiting by the prevailing system, and excited fear as to what other acts of the royal prerogative might follow. As regards the interests of the King himself, it was an act of consummate folly. Sir James Balfour writes thus strongly of the Revocation, " of which the kingdom received so much prejudice, and in effect was the ground-stone of all the misery that followed after, both to the King's Government and family; and whoever were the contrivers of it deserve, they and all their posterity, to be reputed by these three kingdoms infamous and accursed for ever."(2)

The object of the King in attempting this Revocation appears to have been twofold. He was greatly pressed for money, and evidently considered that by the annexation of the Scottish Church lands he would replenish his exchequer. And being resolved to establish prelacy in the country, he could not fail to realize that if it were to take the same high position in Scotland as it already held in England, the bishops must not only have their titles, but wealth and power. The issue of the proclamation of November was generally understood in the country to be a first step in that direction.

In July 1526 a Convention of Estates was held in Edinburgh by appointment of the King, and was numerously attended. Its object was to proceed with the recovery of the Church lands and tithes, but the opposition of the nobles was strong and all that was done was to appoint a Commission to examine the state of the teinds, to ascertain who were the proprietors,

(1) Mathieson, "Politics and Religion etc." 1, 348.  
 (2) Balfour, "Annales" II, 128.

and by what tenure they were held. This Commission began its work in August.

The titulars and possessors of teinds, greatly concerned as to what might follow, sent Rothes, Loudon and Linlithgow to London early in 1627 "to make overtures to his Majestie, whereby he might agree with his subjects in the matter of his revocation. but they came small speed." (1) Stopped by royal orders at Stamford, they forwarded a memorial to the King, but it was couched in such terms that Charles denounced it "as of a strain too high for subjects and petitioners," and they were finally received as suppliants rather than complainers.

The patrimony of the Church had been a vexed question in Scotland ever since the Reformation. In 1560 the co-operation of the material greed of the nobles and the religious earnestness of the commons had destroyed the power of the Romish Church, and now a combination of the same forces was about to effect the overthrow of Episcopacy.

Some of the property of the Romish Church - lands, teinds, rents, feus, moveable wealth - was confiscated to the Crown - most of which was afterwards gifted away to the friends and courtiers of the sovereign; some was seized by neighbouring lords, and a number of the dignified clergy of the old faith who conformed to the new religion were suffered to retain the temporalities of their benefices. As we have seen, James VI erected many of those lands into temporal baronies, and their possessors were known as Lords of Erection. The feuars of Church lands were likewise confirmed in their usurped rights, and became the acknowledged proprietors. The tithes were seized by laymen, who were, and still are, known as Titulars of the Teinds. At first the reformed preachers were de-

(1) Row. Hist. 343.

pendent on the free-will offerings of their hearers, but soon laws were passed, obliging the Titulars to give up some small portion of the teinds which they had illegally seized. Many complaints continued to be made by the clergy of the beggarly pittance which was allowed them and of the irregularity with which it was paid; and various Acts were passed for their relief, but not till 1617 was any important change effected. By the Act passed in that year every parish minister was to be paid out of the tithes of the parish in which he laboured, and not out of a general fund as previously. A minimum and a maximum stipend, both of modest dimensions were also fixed. Such was the state of affairs when Charles became king, and he took measures to remedy it in the first year of his reign by his proposed Revocation.

There was another grievance which pressed upon a numerous class of the community. The Titulars were entitled to a tenth part of the crop, and the cultivator of the land was compelled to keep his harvest ungarnered till the titheholder had appropriated his share. Such at least was the law, and though it was reasonably enforced in some cases, in many others it was so used as to provoke loud complaints, the tillers of the ground alleging that the titulars often delayed selecting their portion till the whole crop was damaged by the weather.

"This is no rare thing on their stowke that's seen,

Snow-covered tops, below their grass grown green."<sup>(1)</sup>  
 Thus the resumption of the Church lands and tithes by the King would enable him, while gaining a portion for himself, to conciliate the clergy by an increase of stipend and the agriculturists by the removal of their grievance, and so strengthen him against the resistance of the nobles, which was to be expected, and was experienced.

(1) Lithgow. Poetical Remains.



As the result of a deputation sent to London, the King, on the 7th of January 1627, issued a commission to the Lord Chancellor and a large committee drawn from all the Estates of Parliament, to negotiate with those who claimed a right to erected benefices, as to the terms on which those should be surrendered to the Crown. The Commission continued its work for several months, and decided that all superiorities of erection should be surrendered to the King, it being left to his Majesty to fix what compensation should be paid for the rent of such superiorities; and it was also agreed that this, and all questions which had been raised as to the valuation and sale of teinds should be finally settled by décreeets- arbitral, to be pronounced by the King. The surrenders were of four kinds. The first was made by the Lords of Erection; the second was signed by the bishops and clergy in connection with the tithes to which they were legally entitled, but of which they were not in possession; the third by the commissioners of several royal burghs, for such right as they could claim to the tithes formerly granted for the support of ministers, colleges, schools or hospitals within their respective burghs; and the fourth by certain tacksmen and others claiming right to teinds.

On the second of September 1629 the King pronounced on each a decret- arbitral. In these his Majesty states that he had consulted a number of his nobility, but his chief adviser was Sir Thomas Hope, the Lord Advocate, who had prepared the Act of Revocation in 1625. With reference to the submission of the Lords of Erection, the decret declares the Crown's right to the superiorities of erection resigned in the submission to the King, who was to give a thousand merks Scots or thereby in full payment of each chalder of feu farm, and the same for each hundred merks of

feu duty or other constant rent of these superiorities, and the feu duties were to be retained till such payment was made. It was also provided that heritors were to have and enjoy the teinds of their own lands, the teinds to be valued at one-fifth of the rent. All teinds were to be valued, and sold to those heritors who should choose to buy them at nine years' purchase, probably a reasonable price at the time. It was also taken into account in fixing the price that the heritor was to pay for no more than what remained after the minister's stipend had been deducted, and it was provided that a certain portion of the rent or price was to be paid to the King, as the same should be fixed by commissioners. The decree affecting the bishops appointed that they should enjoy the fruits and rents of their benefices as at the date of submission, without the burden of the King's annuity, but the right to that annuity on the expiry of tacks was reserved. The burghs were only to pay the King's annuity after providing for "pious uses". This somewhat vague term was specified to mean - sustentation of ministers, rectors, and regents of colleges, masters of schools, and the poor of the hospitals of the respective burghs, and considerable trouble arose later as to its exact scope. The decree applying to the tacksmen was similar in terms to that affecting the Lords of Erection.

Charles was never able to pay the agreed-upon price for the superiorities of the church lands, though valuations continued to be made. And finally in 1707 one of the last Acts of the Scottish Parliament (1) was one entitled "An Act renouncing the Reversion of Kirk Lands", (1) which discharges the crown right of redemption and the successors of the Lords of Erection were allowed without purchase

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. 1707. Cap. 84. Vol. XI, 482.

to retain possession of the church lands and superiorities which Charles I was so eager to secure.

The King's annuity provided for in the Decretals benefited him little. It never extended over the whole teinds of Scotland. It was early converted into a security for a debt of £10,000 contracted by the King.

Charles had several times promised to come to Scotland, but circumstances hindered his visit till 1633, eight years after his accession. His ostensible purpose in making the journey north was to be crowned King of Scotland, but there was more in his Majesty's mind than that. The action of the Privy Council in dealing with the Catholics and the state of the country generally made it very desirable that he should pay it a personal visit. In this way, too, he would be able to further his darling scheme of bringing the ritual of the Scottish Church into harmony with that of England, and possibly also increase the amount to be derived under the proclamation of Revocation.

He had indeed been quite willing to be crowned at an earlier date, and had proposed that the Scottish regalia should be removed to England that he might be crowned there at a second coronation, declaring that this would be to assert the dignity of Scotland. The keeper of the regalia, however, rebelled against the proposal, declared that he could not be so false to his trust, but assured his Majesty that if he pleased to accept it in his own country, the country of his birth, he would find his people ready to yield him the highest honour; "but if the crown was not worth a progress, there might be some other way of disposing of it." (1)

(1) I. Disraeli, *Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First*. III, 191-2.

The northern progress of Charles in 1633 was much more splendid than that of James in 1617, and great preparations had been made for it. The King was attended by a personal retinue of over 150 persons, besides 61 yeomen of the guard, entailing an enormous expense. In addition there was a great number of English nobles and their followers invited by the King, but who came at their own charges. So great was the number of such volunteers, that the correspondent of the Mercurie Francois estimates it at more than 5,000, which Disraeli mildly declares to be "probably excessive". (1) The most sumptuous hospitality was provided all the way; feasts were a feature of every day of the progress. Clarendon declares, "This whole progress was made from the first setting out to the end of it with the greatest magnificence imaginable . . . . to the great damage and mischief of the nation in their estates and manners." "The debts contracted at that time by the nobility and gentry, and the wants and temptations they found themselves exposed to from the unlimited expense, did very much contribute to the kindling of that fire which shortly after broke out in so terrible a combustion." (2) Nor were the English alone in this extravagance. (3) Once in Scotland it was increased by them and equalled by the Scotch in a spirit of rivalry. Clarendon indeed suggests that the Scots, from the natural pride and vanity of the people, would rather suffer the inconvenience than confess the poverty of their country, and that they were all the readier to bear the expense because the King was not likely to be back (4) again, so that it would only require to be borne once.

(1) Commentaries, III, 196.

(2) Hist. of the Rebellion, I, 108.

(3) Kirkton, History, p. 28, testifies to this.

(4) Rebellion, I, 108.

The King commenced his journey on the 11th of May, and arrived at Dalkeith on the 14th of June. On the following day he entered the Capital in great state. Notwithstanding the existing discontent, the people gave him a very hearty welcome. They had had but one royal visit for the last thirty years, and they made the most of the present one. The city was decorated at great expense. (1) Triumphal arches spanned the streets at prominent points. Obelisks, artificial mountains, and "diuersse otheres costly shewes" adorned the route, and music enlivened the way. Charles rode a Barbary charger, richly caparisoned, and with jewelled harness. With him were the two counsellors, Laud and the Marquis of Hamilton, who were to serve him so ill, and a host of English and Scottish nobility, gentry, and high officials. The King entered the city by the West Port, and followed the same route as his father had done sixteen years before - through the Grassmarket, up the Nether Bow, and down the Lawnmarket, High Street, and Canon-gate to Holyrood. At his entry all the time-honoured ceremonies were performed, and no less than seven speeches were addressed to his Majesty on the way to the Abbey.

Next day, Sunday, June 16th, he attended Divine service in the Chapel Royal, where the service was conducted after the Anglican fashion, as were most of the services attended by Charles in Scotland.

Dr. William Laud was first raised to the episcopal bench as Bishop of St David's, then promoted to Bath and Wells; he was now Bishop of London, and was soon to be hailed by royal lips as "my Lord's Grace of Canterbury." On the death of James he became the adviser of his son. He was a little, red-faced fiery-tempered man, vain and superstitious, but unquestionably energetic. Charles, like his father, found him

(1) Falfour, Annales, II, 196.

an eager agent in carrying out his design for the uniform establishment of Episcopacy throughout his dominions. Laud indeed had an intense craving for uniformity in ritual, and to him anything but ritual was not worship at all. To secure this he was prepared to go to a daring length, and in England with the royal support he went far. He was a bitter persecutor of the Puritans, and did not hesitate to have men's ears cropped, their noses slit, their cheeks branded, in addition to confinement in foul jails or the imposition of ruinous fines, in the effort to secure conformity. His idea of uniformity was of necessity limited to outward observances. Men have souls as well as bodies, and while the one can be controlled, the other remains free. But the mistake of persecutors in all ages has been a failure to recognize this.

Laud had been in Scotland in 1617 as chaplain to King James, and had accompanied him in his tour through the country. What he saw of the religious observances of the people did not please him. Indeed he saw no religion at all. "I could see none they had. Their churches are little better than barns or dovecotes; in their worship no fixed order, all left to option." (1) Still in 1633 he found "no religion", but he hoped to introduce one. As a prelate he had no authority in Scotland, but as a statesman he could influence the King to enforce various changes in the services of the churches, and he did. Moreover, he could show the Scots what true religious worship was. "Laud in person 'performed the service' in a way to illuminate the benighted natives, as was hoped. - show them how an artist could do it." (2)

(1) Laud's Diary.

(2) Carlyle, *Cromwell*. I, 73.

Tuesday, the 18th of June, was appointed for the Coronation, and on the Monday evening previous Charles drove to the Castle, where he lodged for the night. Next morning the nobility, all suitably robed in scarlet and fur, gathered in large numbers to escort the King and the national regalia to the scene of the ceremony in an imposing state procession. Laud acted as the Master of Ceremonies, and would no doubt see to it that Sir James Balfour, Lord Lyon King at Arms, had everything arranged to his mind. The fittings of the royal chapel were according to high church ideas, and seats were erected in tiers, on which, according to their rank, were placed the leading people of the country and a number of distinguished visitors from foreign lands. John Spalding, the Commissary Clerk of Aberdeen, was present, and gives a brief account of the proceedings. He himself was an Episcopalian, but he was clearly surprised, and not a little doubtful as to the wisdom of the arrangements made. He tells us how it was "marked that there was a four-nooked taffil in manner of an altar, standing within the kirk, having standing thereupon two books, at least resembling clasped books called blind books, with two chandlers and two wax candles, which were on light, and a bason wherein was nothing, at the back of the altar (covered with tapestry) there was a rich tapestry wherein the crucifix was curiously wrought, and as the bishops who were in service past by this crucifix, they were seen to bow their knee, and beck, which with their habit was noted, and bred great fear of inbringing of popery." (1)

*omit*

Archbishop Spottiswood, who himself took such a prominent part in the solemn function, has given us in his History (pp. ) a full account of the pro-

(1) Spalding, "Troubles", I, 2316.  
cp. also Rushworth, II, 181.

ceedings.] Six bishops, who were to take part in the service, clad in full episcopal costume, received the King at the west door of the Church. He was first conducted to a seat at the west pillar of the side aisle, where Mr. James Ramsay, the preacher of the Chapel Royal, addressed him in a short speech. The King then proceeded to a chair of state on a platform towards the other end of the Church. The ceremony proper of coronation followed on some preliminary ceremonies. His Majesty took his seat on the chair of state, and the Archbishop of St Andrews asked him if he were willing to take the customary coronation oath. The King agreed, and took the oath on the Bible lying on the table, and answered the usual questions about administering faithfully the laws of the Kingdom, the promoting of true religion, etc.. The hymn "Veni Creator" was then sung, the Primate afterwards offered prayer, and the Bishops of Ross and Moray said the Litany. Afterwards the Archbishop anointed the King, and, with a prayer, placed the crown upon his head - about two in the afternoon, Spalding tells us. The usual homage was then paid by the nobility, and the oath of allegiance taken. Other ceremonies followed, and the proceedings of the day closed with the office of the Holy Communion. Thereafter, his Majesty, wearing the crown and bearing the sceptre, entered the palace with his train amidst the sound of trumpets and the thunder of artillery from the Castle.

Rushworth tells a strange story of an incident (1) which he alleges took place at the Coronation ceremony. The Archbishop of Glasgow, who wore a simple Genevan gown, took his place at the King's left hand, and so 'spoiled the picture', and so offended Laud's histrionic sense, that he pushed him aside, with the remark, "Are you a Churchman and wants the coat of your order?"

(1) H, 182.



and introduced Maxwell of Boss into his place. This, however, may be but an exaggerated account of some misunderstanding as to the arrangements of the service on the part of the Archbishop. While most Presbyterian writers emphasize the occurrence, the Episcopalians minimise it.

The Scottish Parliament differed in various respects from that of England. It likewise consisted of different orders, but all the members sat in one house, and voted together. Its methods of transacting its business were less formal and less governed by precedent - at times were even slipshod. When much business had to be done it had often worked by committee, and by degrees a dominating committee, known as the Lords of the Articles, came into being. It was chosen in the following manner at the beginning of each Parliament: Eight prelates out of the twelve entitled to be present were elected by the greater nobles, of whom sixty had seats in the house; and those eight prelates next elected eight nobles, and those sixteen then chose eight of the lesser barons and eight burgesses. The thirty-two thus appointed settled all the details of the various measures to be brought before the house. "This practice of electing the Lords of the Articles shifted from time to time in a manner too characteristic of the Scottish parliamentary practice." (1) On the present occasion, however, the method followed is indicated in the record to be as above described. It was open to several objections. It was held that it gave the bishops an undue power in Parliament, and inasmuch as no amendments were allowed, but that the whole measure submitted by the Lords of the Articles must be passed

(1) J. Hill Burton, History, Vi, 369 etc.  
cp. Dicey and Pait, pp. 33 etc.

or rejected, it thus afforded a dextrous politician the opportunity of mixing up popular and unpopular items, and so causing the acceptance of the latter for the sake of the former. An instance of this was to happen in the Parliament of 1633.

On the 20th of June Parliament assembled, riding to its meeting place in great pomp as the custom was. The King was on the throne, and the attendance of nobles, prelates, barons and burgesses was large. The Lords of the Articles were chosen, and at once set to work. For seven days they laboured at the bills submitted to them. During those sittings the King gave great attention to their proceedings. On the 28th the whole Parliament met to give its assent to the bills passed by the Lords of the Articles. They were all accepted. The decretals of the king in connection with the Revocation were ratified, a larger subsidy was granted to Charles than any Scottish king had ever received before; several Acts referring to schools, ministers, colleges and teinds were amongst those passed. In 1616 the Privy Council ordered a schoolmaster to be appointed for every parish at the expense of the parishioners, and under the superintendence of the bishop, but this was not well followed up, and often the state of education was deplorable. In this Parliament the Act of Council was ratified, and was followed up to a certain extent, but much remained to be done. Several of the bills were most unpopular in the country. An impost, somewhat of the nature of an income tax, which had been made for the assistance of the King's brother-in-law, the Elector of the Palatinate, was grudgingly continued. But two Acts in particular were specially offensive to many of the Presbyterian party. One was a combination of two Acts passed in the reign of James VI. and personal to

that monarch, extending the royal prerogative to all causes, spiritual as well as civil, and the other giving the sovereign power to prescribe the official apparel of all churchmen. The other Act was a virtual ratification of Episcopal government and worship as it then existed in Scotland.

The former of these was entitled "An Act anent his Majesty's Royal Prerogative, and Apparel of Churchmen". It was against the latter part of the Act that objection was chiefly raised, and it was this indeed that roused a constitutional opposition - a new feature in the Scottish Parliament. (1) The Earl of Rothes was the leader. He was prepared to accept the first part, but objected to the second, so he wished to separate the two, but it must be all or none. When the vote was taken the King was present, and exercised a shameful intimidation. He had a list of the voters in his hand, and as each vote was given he marked it down with some such remark as this: "Your names are here, I shall know to-day who will do me service." "An uncouth practise", Row well styles it, "whereby (no doubt) many were afraid to vote, as otherwise they intended to doe; Albeit some (by an holie *Ἀντιπεριταξίς*) were the more encouraged to vote according to their conscience." (2) It was declared that the Act was carried by a majority, but this was objected to, and Rothes demanded a scrutiny of the Register. The King commanded him to be silent, or upon the peril of his life to make good what he had said, and Rothes prudently declined the ordeal.

The historian just quoted tells us that there were at the time many ministers in the town, and those of

(1) Rait - Scottish Parliament, p. 408-9.

(2) How. Hist. p. 366.

three sorts. there were those who adhered to the bishops; many (few in comparison) who were opposed to the prelates, and who were crying to God for help in such a needful time; and a third neutral class, who had joined neither of those parties, and who were waiting to see how matters would go. Of this second class was Thomas Hog, a minister who had been deposed by the Provincial Synod of Fife in 1620, and who was now apparently without a settled charge, who, in terms of the invitation in the royal proclamation summoning the Parliament, presented a plain but courteously worded Grievance and Petition in his own name and in those of ministers who sympathised with him. It shows on the part of some of the ministers a strong dissatisfaction with the existing state of ecclesiastical affairs. Complaint is made of the present state of the Church, and restoration to the conditions of 1592, with General Assemblies and synods, is called for. The power of the Kirk as opposed to that of the bishops is asserted. Strong objection is taken to the name of Puritans being applied to those who differ from the prelates in not observing festival days and the other appointments of The Perth Articles. It was first presented to the Clerk-Register that it might be submitted to the Lords of the Articles, but it received no attention. Perceiving that no help was to be looked for in that quarter, Hog presented it to his Majesty in person at Dalkeith before he came to Edinburgh, but after glancing at the document, Charles handed it to some one beside him, and it was never brought before the Parliament. (1) The petition of the ministers was thus summarily dismissed.

(1) Row. Hist. p. 363.

The laymen had likewise their grievances to declare. While the King and the Lords of the Articles were proceeding with their work of preparation for the meeting of Parliament, the representatives of the shires and burghs and the barons were prohibited by the King from holding any such meeting as had been usual on former occasions, and they, being suspicious that the Lords of the Articles had concluded sundry Acts to the hurt of the Kirk and country, presented a humble supplication to the king. (1) It was signed by such members of all the Estates as were unfavourable to the Acts which had been passed. It was then a dangerous thing to present documents of this kind to the King, but Rothes took a copy to him to endeavour to find out if it would be received. Charles glanced at it, and returning it, said, "No more of this, my Lord, I command you." But this was not the end of the matter.

Lord Balmerino disapproved of several expressions in the supplication, and obtained a copy that he might revise it at his leisure and endeavour to amend it. Owing, however, to its rejection by the King, it was not presented again. Balmerino was on friendly terms with a Dundee lawyer named Dunmore, and he gave him a reading of the paper in strict confidence, that he might say whether it could or should be modified. Dunmore took it home for this purpose, but he so far violated his promise of secrecy as to lend it to Peter Hay, of Naughton, "a sworn servant of the hierarchy". (2) Surreptitiously obtaining a copy, Hay took it to Archbishop Spottiswood, who straightway had it placed in the hands of the King at London. Charles, irritated by

(1) Row. Hist. p. 364.

(2) Balfour. Histl. Works, II, 219.

Row. Hist. p. 382.

the measure of opposition he had received while in Scotland, and at the instigation of Laud and Spottiswood, resolved to take vengeance on Balmerino. This was done under one of the tyrannical Acts passed in James' time against an offence called leasing-making, or the crime of sowing dissension between the King and his subjects. Even to know of such an act without revealing it was a criminal offence, and for possessing that guilty knowledge Balmerino was put on trial. This particular clause had never before been put into operation, and only the ingenuity of Spottiswood suggested it now.

The invidious task of arranging the trial was entrusted to Lord Traquair, a man without scruples in any affair by which his own interests were likely to be advanced, as he expected they would be here if he pleased the King by securing a conviction. After long delay a packed jury was empanelled and the trial began. Balmerino was defended with much ability, but a verdict against him was given by a majority of eight to seven, and only was this result secured by Traquair himself giving the eighth vote against the accused. Sentence of death, to be inflicted when the pleasure of the King was known, was at once pronounced. The public indignation was intense. During the trial many private meetings for prayer on behalf of Balmerino were held,<sup>(1)</sup> but when sentence was pronounced the feeling of the public took a different turn, and plans were made to force the prison and liberate the prisoner, or failing that, to kill the men who had voted against him. Traquair, seeing the danger of an outbreak, hastened to the King, and obtained from him a most reluctant pardon in July 1635, after Balmerino had been imprisoned for over thirteen months.

(1) Row. Hist. p. 386.

To return to and conclude the account of the King's visit to Scotland. On the second Sunday of his stay in Edinburgh his Majesty worshipped in St Giles' Church. Whether Maxwell, the minister (now Bishop of Ross), had omitted to give instructions to the contrary or not, Henderson, the ordinary reader, in his usual black gown, took his place in the pulpit for the reading of the lessons and the giving out of the Psalms prior to the sermon, as the custom was, just after the King had arrived, but Maxwell at once came down from the King's gallery, and removing the reader, put two English chaplains, clad in surplices, in his place, "and they with the help of other chaplains and bishops there present, acted their English service." (1) The Liturgy having thus been read, Guthrie, Bishop of Moray, also clad in a surplice, "went up so to <sup>the</sup> pulpit, and taught a sermon". (2) This change, unwarranted as it was, from the usual reformed order of service caused great astonishment and indignation among the congregation, and it was reported that the King himself was not over well pleased.

On the first of July Charles left Edinburgh for a short tour in the country, visiting Linlithgow, Stirling, Dunfermline, Falkland and Perth, and on the 18th he left the Capital on his return journey. Travelling via Dalkeith, Seton and Innerwick to Berwick, from whence he rode post to Greenwich, where the Queen was then residing.

During his stay in Scotland his Majesty was lavish in the bestowal of titles. He dubbed 54 knights in various places he visited, and to honour his coronation one marquis, ten earls, two viscounts, and eight Lords.

(1) How. Hist. p. 363. (2) Ibid.

## CHAPTER V.

### The Canons and the Liturgy.

Charles was as eager as his father to secure uniformity of church government and worship in England and Scotland, and holding as firmly to the maxim "No bishop, no king", he desired Prelacy to be established everywhere throughout his dominions, but he lacked the caution of his sire. James had been so alarmed at the popular outburst on the imposition of the Perth Articles that he allowed his Commissioner in 1621 to promise that if the Articles were obeyed his Majesty would enforce no other innovations, and he kept his word. Charles, encouraged by injudicious counsellors, and above all by Bishop Laud, attempted to impose a fuller Episcopacy upon his people.

His father had taken some steps to have a Service Book approximating to the English Book of Common Prayer prepared for use in Scotland. The General Assembly of Aberdeen of 1616 appointed a committee to prepare a uniform order of Liturgy, (1) not a new book, but an improvement on the one in use; and another small committee was by the same Assembly appointed to compile a Book of Canons. (2) We know that a first draft was submitted to the King, who marked his observations upon it with his own royal hand, and that a second draft was made ready for the printer in 1619 but was never printed, the excitement following the issue of the Perth Articles making James unwilling to sanction it.

Charles in 1629 began to do what his father hesitated to do. He had a copy of the 1619 draft brought him to examine, but he rejected it, probably on the

(1) Calderwood, Hist. VII, p.229. (2) Ibid.



advice of Laud, whose preference was for the English Liturgy, which he wished to see in use in both countries. The King's own desire was similar, and in 1630 and 1631 he expressed this desire to the Scottish bishops, but nothing definite was done. Charles evidently considered that when he came to Scotland to be crowned his personal influence would be sufficient to carry the matter through.

The complaisance of the Scottish people with the religious functions of the time of the royal visit did not mislead those who had eyes to see. There was much discontent amongst the people at the doings of the bishops, a fierce hatred and great fear of Popery, and a sullen anger at the threatened imposition of the rites of an alien Church. Matters were already ripening for a revolt, and had Charles been as able to judge the temper of his Scottish subjects as his father was, he would have taken measures to pacify rather than to provoke them. Some, however, of the advisers of the King who sympathised with him in this matter, were misled by the apparent submission of the people, and considered that the time had now come when conformity might be safely enforced. One such was Lord Clarendon, who, referring to the time of the Coronation, writes in his "History of the Great Rebellion", "Many wise men were then and still are of opinion, that if the King had then proposed the liturgy of the Church of England to have been received and practised by that nation, it would have been submitted to against all opposition." (1) The younger Scottish bishops, men of the Laudian school, who looked up to the bishop as their master and patron, were of the same mind, but the older bishops, some of whom had consented to the Articles of Perth against their own better judgement, foresaw the

(1) "Histy. Rebellion". Vol. 1, p.111.

danger of attempting to enforce conformity upon an unwilling people. The King and bishops met in conference shortly after the Coronation, and the matter was discussed. The King and Laud strongly urged the adoption of the English Liturgy in Scotland, but the older bishops spoke against it. They pointed out that under present circumstances and in the present state of feeling what was agreed to at Westminster would almost certainly be opposed at Edinburgh. Who was to anticipate the harmony with Westminster that was so soon to follow? The more prudent bishops spoke also of the strong national feeling, the traditional jealousy of everything English, and the fear that they might be regarded as a mere province of England. The King was impressed by their arguments, and instead of forcing the English Liturgy upon Scotland, it was ultimately agreed that a Liturgy and Book of Canons should be drawn up in Scotland, though it should be examined by Laud and the Bishops of London and Norwich.

The Book of Canons is understood to have been compiled by a number of the Scottish bishops after the model of the English Canons of 1604. The manuscript was revised by the King, Laud and Juxon, and finally authorized under the Great Seal on 23rd May 1635. The Canons were published in a thin quarto volume of forty-three pages, under the title: "Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiasticall, Gathered and put in forme for the Government of the Church of Scotland. Ratified and approved by His Majestie's Royall Warrant, and ordained to be observed by the Clergie, and all others whom they concerne. Published by Authoritie. Aberdene, Imprinted by Edward Raban, dwelling upon the Market-Place, at the Armes of the Citie, 1636. With Royall Priviledge." The Book is divided into nineteen chapters, dealing with various points for the regulation of the lives of the clergy and the services of the Church. It was

claimed that the Canons were based on decisions of the General Assemblies which were not printed and accordingly not made patent to the people who needed such a guide as the present book, but this was not really so, for the one is quite unlike the other. Yet some of the Canons are reasonable and a few of them excellent, though their general tendency is to impose on ministers and people a much more stringent form of Episcopacy than had hitherto prevailed. In the very first chapter the King's supremacy in all cases ecclesiastical is maintained, and it is enjoined that all who affirm the contrary should be excommunicated. The orders embodied in the Perth Articles were imposed. No layman, 'whatever gifts he had of learning, knowledge or holiness', was to presume to officiate as a deacon or presbyter. The order of preaching deacons was instituted. Kirk Sessions and Presbyteries are ignored, and all private religious meetings are forbidden, but provision is made for half-yearly and national Synods. In all meetings for Divine worship prior to the sermon the "whole prayers according to the Liturgy were to be distinctly read, and no presbyter or reader was to be permitted to conceive prayers extemporary, or to use any other form in the service than what was prescribed, under pain of deprivation. The sixteenth chapter orders the purchase of a copy of King James' Bible, Book of Common Prayer, a pulpit, communion table and vessels, a font and alms-box. The font was to be placed near the door of the church and the communion-table at the upper end of the church, decently "carpetted" when not in use, and covered with a fair white linen cloth at the time of celebration. For the King alone was the right to alter anything reserved.

Copies of the Book soon got into circulation, and severe criticism from all who were of Presbyterian

sympathies soon followed. Row (1), for instance, gives a list of what he terms the "impieties and absurdities" for which the Book is remarkable, 35 in number. Some of his objections are frivolous and some of his interpretations uncharitable, but many of the Canons are certainly opposed to the beliefs and customs of the Scottish Church since the Reformation. Others declaimed against both the matter of the Book and the manner of introducing it. Many of the Canons were in their judgement wholly untenable. They bitterly resented the degree of supremacy allowed to the King; they resented the abolition of General Assemblies and Kirk Sessions with their ruling elders; and the leaving all ecclesiastical cases to the decision of the bishops; and they objected to many of the individual Canons as tending directly to Popish doctrines and practices.

The manner of the introduction of the Book was to many absurd as well as offensive. The Canons which compelled the acceptance and use of the Liturgy were imposed before the Liturgy itself was published. Then the Book had no ecclesiastical sanction, but had been made the law of the Church and of the people by the simple exercise of the royal prerogative. Episcopal writers quite agree with Presbyterians as to the wrong and folly of this procedure. "It was strange," says Clarendon,<sup>(2)</sup> that Canons should be published before the Liturgy was prepared, which was not ready in a year after or thereabouts, when three or four of the Canons were principally for the observation of and punctual compliance with the Liturgy, which all the clergy were to be sworn to submit to, and to pay all obedience to what was enjoined by it, before they knew what it contained, whereas if the Liturgy had been first published, with all the circumstances, it

(1) Row. Hist. p. 392.

(2) Hist. Pebelln. 1, 139.

it is possible that it might have found a better reception, and the Canons have been less examined." Did his Lordship understand that the Canons could only be accepted by many of the Scottish clergy if they failed to examine them? A modern Episcopalian writer (1) says: "Charles ought at this crisis to have called a General Assembly, and he had then sufficient influence to secure the assent of a majority in favour of the Canons. This was always the mode which King James adopted to carry his measures. The Five Articles of Perth, the authority to compile Canons and prepare a Liturgy, the very episcopate itself were managed in this manner." "Managed" here, being interpreted, signifies by packed Assembly, to counteract which there was as yet nothing in the way of a "Barrier Act".

By this fatal mistake the King played into the hands of his enemies. The nobles were angry with the King on account of the Revocation, which was a hurt to their pride as well as to their pockets, and they were also angry with the bishops on account of the same measure, believing it to have been proclaimed by Charles largely for their benefit. They had also a more personal resentment against the hierarchy, for the bishops had given great offence by their arrogance. Just as the Romish prelates had done a century before. Ever since the bishops rode to the "Red Parliament" of Perth in 1604, in all the pomp of silk and velvet, and battled there for precedence, the temporal lords had regarded them with dislike and distrust. The appointment by Charles of Spiritual Lords to high posts in the State, which they considered as their own by hereditary right, was another wrong which rankled in the breasts of the aristocracy. Now was their opportunity for revenge. Taking

(1) Rev. J. Parker Lawson. "The Epis. Ch. of Scot. Reformation to Revoln. p.488.

no steps in the meantime to provoke an open rupture, they argued against the Book on political grounds, and sought to arouse in others a resentment similar to their own. The Presbyterian clergy took up the higher ground of religion, (1) and in their pulpits and parish work did all they possibly could to create dissatisfaction with the Canons, declaring they saw in them signs of the Arminianism and Popery the forthcoming Service-book would impose upon them all, and thus prepared all who would listen to resist it when it came to light. As Clarendon was forced to confess, the bishops were in no good odour with the Scottish people, and no doubt their advocacy of the Prayer Book meant the opposition of many. Baillie, in a letter to his friend William Spang, dated 29th January 1637 (2) gives us a good idea of the unsettled state of the times, and of the many rumours which were in circulation as to the New Prayer Book, which they were ordered to use at Easter, but of which they could not so far get a sight, as well as a view of the growing divisions in the Church itself. It would appear as if Juxon's grim jest in his acknowledgment of a copy which Bishop Maxwell had sent him, was but sober truth: "Your Book of Canons ... perchance at first will make more noise than all the cannons in Edinburgh Castle".

The idea of the compilers of the Liturgy was to prepare a Book, which, while like that of the Church of England, should yet be sufficiently different from it to entitle it to be styled the Scottish Liturgy, and so avoid giving offence to the national sentiment by imposing an English book pure and simple upon them. The work caused both the original compilers and the revisers a great deal of trouble and frequent consultation. On the 28th September 1634 a fourth draft was

(1) Baillie, "Letters & Journals. 1, 14. (2) Ib. 1, 4.

approved by the King. An edition was printed later at Edinburgh, but was discarded at the end of 1635, and sold for shop paper. This appears to have been very badly printed, but Baillie suggests differences of opinion among the bishops.<sup>(1)</sup> Finally, the King requested Laud and Norwich to enter the suggestions which the Scottish bishops had made, and after examining them himself, had them written on the pages of an English Book of Common Prayer, and this became the text of the Scottish Liturgy. In warrants still extant, written in copies of the English Prayer Book, and in the Large Declaration, the King accepts full responsibility for all the alterations which have been made. The book was published in a handsome folio, and was printed by Robert Young, "Printer to the King's most excellent Majestie, MDCXXXVII, Cum Privilegio."

In the same cover there is a Prose Psalter, also printed by Young, and dated 1636, and a metrical Psalter, the Psalms "translated by King James", London, which was authorized for use on 5th May 1632 and 14th March 1637.

*A.R. VI, 352* The Act of the Privy Council enjoining the use of this Book is dated 20th December 1636, and on the following day it was proclaimed at the Cross of Edinburgh. It was originally intended to bring it into use at Easter 1637, and under penalty of horning it was ordered that at least two copies be purchased for every parish, for the use of the minister and the reader, but the book was not ready till the month of May, when copies began to find their way into circulation, and the public reading was postponed till July. It is practically a copy of the Liturgy in use in the Church of England, with some alterations, which bring it into closer resemblance to the Romish Missal. Laud is blamed for this, and Kirkton <sup>(2)</sup> says he saw the original with corrections in the handwriting of Laud, and that they were

(1)  
Letters,  
I, p. 4.

(2)  
History,  
p. 30.

all towards Popery, bringing the Prayer Book as near to the Missal as English could be to Latin. But as Laud was instructed by the King to enter the suggestions that had been made by others, it does not follow that all the parts tending to Popery were his own.

Had the Liturgy been published before the Canons it is not unlikely that a number of the clergy would have accepted it without demur. They had been episcopally ordained and would render obedience to the bishops. Others were strongly Presbyterian and strongly opposed to both Books, and showed their hostility in various ways. Pamphlets, books, supplications, petitions and ballads came freely from the press. The most notable of these was "A Dispute against the English-Popish ceremonies intruded upon the Church of Scotland", by George Gillespie, a brilliant probationer of the Church, 25 years of age. Calderwood's trenchant pamphlets were also largely read. Row, the historian of the Church, is one of the extreme objectors. He styles the Liturgy "This Popish-English-Scottish-Masse-Service-Book", (1) and gives his reasons why it should be rejected. The English Book, he says in effect, is bad enough, to quote a phrase James VI once used, "an ill-said Mass in English", but the new Service Book is "much more Popish nor the English Booke". (2) He laments the changes in the doctrine and discipline of the Church now made, though these, unlike the new Book, have been ratified by Parliament. Especially is he wroth with the /"Pretended Communion", which "hath all the substance and essential parts of the Masse, and so brings in the most abominable idolatrie that ever was in the world, in worshipping of, and devouring a breadden god." (3) Through nine pages he goes on to rail at the contents

(1) History. P. 398. (2) Ibid. (3) Ib. p. 399.



of the Book. He condemns the position of the Communion-Table and the posture of the priest, especially for his turning his back upon the people. He objects to the Church Festivals and Saints' Days, the sign of the Cross in Baptism, the ring in Marriage, Confirmation, the arrangement of the Lectionary, the reading of passages from the Apocrypha, and, to use a phrase of his own, "severall other particulars whilk would be tedious to rehearse." The delay in bringing the Book into public use gave like-minded opponents an opportunity to stir up the minds of the people against it. Thousands who had not yet seen a page of it had already condemned the Liturgy, and were determined to give it a hostile reception.

It is not clearly known why the 23rd of July was fixed for the introduction of the Liturgy into the churches; it remains a matter for conjecture, and many such have been advanced. But orders were issued by the Privy Council that intimation to that effect was to be made from the pulpits on the Sunday previous, the 16th. Some of the ministers read the notice sent to them, some even speaking in commendation of it; some handed it to their readers to intimate; and others refused. The intervening week was an anxious time for both parties, and a period of excitement for everybody. Men felt that something - they knew not what - was about to happen.

Various accounts of that memorable day, the 23rd of July, have come down to us, differing from one another in detail, yet agreeing with one another as to essential facts. At the morning service in the Great Kirk of St. Giles metrical Psalms were sung and the old Prayer-book was read by Patrick Henderson, the Reader of the Church, who was under notice of dismissal for refusing to read the intimation of the preceding Sunday. A great congregation gathered

for the introduction of the new Liturgy and the sermon which was to follow. Many distinguished people were present to do honour to the occasion. Archbishop Spottiswood, the Primate and Lord Chancellor, occupied a seat in the royal gallery. Bishop Lindsay, several other bishops and Dean Hannay were present. Many of the nobility, the Lords of Session, and the magistrates of the city in their robes and attended by their halberdiers, were also in the congregation.

About ten o'clock Dean Hannay in his surplice took his place in the reading-desk, and began to read the service for the day - the seventh Sunday after Trinity. Immediately a disturbance began. It was the custom of the time for maid-servants and women of the meaner ranks to occupy moveable seats at the early service till their mistresses arrived for the sermon, and it was amongst these that murmurs and other signs of disorders first arose. The clamour gaining strength soon became shouts, and the whole Church was a scene of uproar and confusion. Some cried, "they are going to say Mass", some cried "woe, woe!" Others bewailed "sorrow, sorrow for this doleful day that they are bringing in Popery among us!" People rose to their feet, and clapped their hands, and shouted aloud, and when the din became so great that the detection of individual offenders became impossible even gentlemen lent their help to increase the disturbance by shouting "Baal is in the Church!" At the beginning the fury was against the Dean, who was the first to take part in the service. Coarse jests and bitter insults were hurled at him, and his courage failing, he paused in his reading. The bishop called on him to proceed, when an old woman, said by tradition to have been one Jenny Geddes, who kept a vegetable stall in the High Street,

cried out "deil colic the wame o' ye", and other suchlike expressions, and flung her stool at the head of the Dean. The action of this virago was the signal to others, and straightway stools, clasped Bibles, sticks, and other missiles were hurtling through the air at the Dean's head. Dodging these was his only safety. The rioters then attempted to drag him out of the desk. Others, dreading the upshot, ran out of the Church with pitiful lamentations. One good woman disapproving of the service but unable to get out because of the confusion, set herself to read her Bible, but a young man behind her responding with an Amen to some part of the service, she turned round and soundly smacked both of his cheeks, her Bible giving weight to her hand, and exclaimed, "False thief! is there nae ither pairt of the Kirk to sing mess in, but thou maun sing it in my lug."

Bishop Lindsay, who was to preach the sermon, now mounted the pulpit which was above the reading-desk, and spoke in fitting terms in an endeavour to calm the people. (1) He reminded them of the sacredness of the place in which they were, of their duty to God and the King, and besought them to desist from their profane conduct; but the courage, dignity and eloquence he displayed, and which Wodrow admits, failed to still the tumult. He only succeeded in turning the fury of the rabble against himself, and he was greeted with insults and curses. The Archbishop of St Andrews next made an attempt to restore order, but with no better success, and was likewise assailed with the insulting shouts of the mob below. Then in virtue of his office as Lord Chancellor, he commanded the Provost and Magistrates to come down from their gallery and clear the Church. Some of the rioters still remained within the building, and again the

(1) Wodrow's life of Lindsay.

magistrates had to act. But though thus expelled, the rowdies were not quieted, for from the outside they continued to disturb the service by hammering at the doors, smashing windows, and shouting "A Pape! a Pape! pull him down!" and similar cries. The service, however, still went on.

At the close the Dean was afraid to venture himself amongst the riotous crowd assembled outside the Cathedral, but the bishop thought it safe to proceed to his lodging. No sooner, however, did he show himself upon the street than "the multitude rushed upon him like a hive of bees." (1) Unable to return to the Church, and being a very corpulent man, he had great difficulty in making his way through the howling mob who hustled him and reviled him as a "Pape". He was at length rescued in a sadly exhausted condition by the servants of the Earl of Wemyss, and conveyed to his lordship's lodging.

In the interval a number of the bishops held a consultation in Spottiswood's chamber as to the conduct of the afternoon service. At the ordinary time of two o'clock the people crowded to the Church to hear the sermon, but no minister or reader appeared. At three o'clock several of the bishops and clergy returned privately to St Giles' accompanied by a strong guard. Another guard was stationed at the door of the Church, and only such as were known to be favourable to Episcopacy were admitted. At the close of the service there were more scenes of disorder. The guard appointed to escort the bishop to Holyrood House, whither he had resolved to go for safety, proving insufficient, he got into the coach of the Earl of Roxburgh to escape the rabble. An attempt was made to drag him from the carriage, and this was only prevented by the guards and servants

(1) Wodrow.

defending him with drawn swords. The Tron Church was at this time being built, and the yard furnished plenty of stones to the rioters, who did not hesitate to use them. But by whipping up the horses and driving hard the crowd was at length outrun and the bishop placed in safety.

A similar though less violent scene took place in Greyfriars Church, where the newly consecrated Bishop of Argyle officiated, and he gave up the service after the General Confession and Absolution had been read. The minister of Trinity College Church though supporting the Liturgy, delayed till he had learned how it had gone elsewhere, and at length for safety's sake used the old form.

During all the confusion the absence of the Earl of Traquair, the Lord Treasurer, who had guaranteed order, was noted and criticized, but he afterwards explained that he was in the country attending the marriage of a kinsman, and was kept from reaching town on the Sunday by rain.

In the north the Liturgy was on the whole favourably received, but elsewhere it met with a very indifferent welcome. At St Andrews Archdeacon Gledstones read a part of it for about a month. At Dunblane it was used for a time. At Brechin the parish minister refused to read it, and, according to one story, (1) Bishop Whiteford ordered his own servant to do so, and, according to another, he did it himself, entering the pulpit with a pistol in one hand and his Prayer-book in the other, with an armed bodyguard in the congregation.

It is claimed by Presbyterian writers of the time that the outbreak in St Giles was wholly spontaneous, "A rash emergent." "A moving by God upon the women's spirits to prevent His house from being polluted by that foul Book of Common Prayer." The Episcopalians

(1) Pothes' Relation, page 4.

have a different story to tell. Bishop Guthrie says it was the result of a consultation held in April at Edinburgh between Alexander Henderson, as representing brethren in Fife, and David Dickson, those in the west country, who afterwards conferred with Lord Balmerino and matured their plans. Later (probably owing to the postponement of the Liturgy) they did "meet in the house of Nicolas Balfour in the Cowgate, with Nicolas Balfour, Eupham Henderson, Bethia and Elspa Craig, and several other matrons, and recommended to them that they and their adherents might give the first affront to the Book, assuring them that men should afterwards take the business out of their hands". (1) The story is entirely without corroboration. It is quite possible, even likely, that Henderson and others of like opinions, in view of the threatened introduction of the Liturgy, <sup>did</sup> hold meetings to consider how they ought to act, but it is hardly possible to believe that men of such character would enter into a conspiracy of this sort with women of this class. The investigations of the Town Council of Edinburgh, of the Privy Council, and of the King himself, showed that after the strictest enquiry it appeared that the tumult was begun by the meaner class of people, without any interference of the better classes. Burnet says (2) "after all enquiry was made, it did not appear that any above the meaner sort were accessory to the tumult." How deep and how very general in many parts of the country was the resentment against the introduction of the Liturgy the events of the next few months made abundantly clear.

(1) Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs 2nd Edn. p. 23

Spalding, Hist. p. 47. Vol. I.

Both the King and Laud indicate suspicion in their Letters, but it is not alleged in Large Declaration.

(2) Mem. Dukes of Hamilton. p. 32.

From a more modern standpoint the whole affair - alike the compulsory introduction of the Book without the consent of Parliament, and above all of the Church itself, and the violent resistance of the mob - was deplorable; but we may explain it if we cannot excuse the outburst of the people. Episcopacy had now prevailed in Scotland for some thirty years, but it had so far been a matter which affected the clergy rather than the laity. Many of the old forms established by the first Reformers were still in use. The clergy still wore the simple black gown and the old Prayer-book, known as Knox's Liturgy, was still read in many churches. It is a mistake to suppose that the people were in revolt against anything of the nature of a liturgical service. It is true the old Book allowed scope for free prayer, and was rather a guide to devotion than an obligatory form of service. It is probable that of late it had not grown in the public estimation, and that the liking for extemporary prayer was increasing, but the Prayer-book was still used to some extent, and that without evoking any protest. If the bishops were beginning to wear the episcopal habit, it was only in Cathedrals and in the Chapel Royal, where comparatively few people ever saw them. Free Assemblies had not been held for forty years, and this was a grievance to some, though it made little difference to the mass of the people, to whom the accustomed doctrines were preached and by whom the old forms of worship were observed. Had the Articles of Perth been more strictly enforced it is probable that some popular outburst would have occurred before the present one. But now that the ritual of an alien Church was being forced upon them without even the form of law, and doctrines they had been taught to regard as false, and above all as Popish, were to be preached from their pulpits, at

once their national pride and their traditional religious instincts were bitterly offended, and they showed their resentment in the only way open to them. They had no voice in a Parliament which had always been obsequious to authority, though an opposition element was now developing, and they had no General Assembly which was the real representative of the community; and they resorted to violence to show what they thought and felt, as men without due representation in the Councils of the nation have often done in ages reckoned more civilized than their own.

That a religious spirit, crude but true, was again awakening in the people we shall see in a following chapter.



CHAPTER VI.The National Covenant of 1638.

After the mischief of the Liturgy riot had been done everybody was anxious to clear himself of any possible blame. On the night of the outbreak and on the following day the bishops held meetings, and decided to send a letter to the King, giving an account of what had taken place. All through the week frequent meetings of the Privy Council, the bishops and magistrates were held, jointly and separately. The Privy Council issued a proclamation on the Monday, condemning the action of the mob, and prohibiting all tumultuous assemblies. When they heard what the bishops had done, they were greatly offended that they had not been consulted, and declared that the bishops had not sufficiently examined the facts. The magistrates also denounced the disturbance, sought to lay all the blame on the rabble, promised to do their utmost to discover the ringleaders, and proved their sincerity by imprisoning six or seven of the women implicated.

The most important meeting was one of the Privy Council, held on 29th July (1), at which several of the bishops were present and at which the Primate intimated that the Service Book would be withdrawn till his Majesty's pleasure should be known, but that sermons should be preached at the accustomed times, and though neither the old nor the new services would be used, prayer would be offered before and after sermon, that "good and loyall subjects be not defrauded of the comforts of the word." Though the Council was at first inclined to enforce the use of the Liturgy, they agreed to this.

When Charles learned of the hostile reception given  
(1) Petefkin, page 52.

P.C.R.VI, 483

P.C.R.VI, 490.

to his darling project he was exceedingly wroth, and inclined to blame every one concerned in the matter. In his ignorance of the nature of his northern subjects he regarded the riots in Edinburgh as but an expression of the thoughtless hatred of the Liturgy cherished by some of the most disorderly elements in the capital, nor had he received any more correct information from any of his officials. The imposition of the Liturgy had but brought to a point the hatred of Prelacy and its rites which had been fermenting in the public mind for years past. On the 30th of<sup>(1)</sup> July, immediately on receipt of the tidings, Charles wrote to the Privy Council, ordering them to do their utmost to bring the rioters to justice and to assist the clergy in continuing the use of the Book.<sup>(3)</sup> Meanwhile the country continued in a state of great and growing excitement.

On the 7th of August Archbishop Laud wrote to the Earl of Traquair, expressing the sentiments of the King and himself. He blames the clergy for omitting to obtain the assistance of the Privy Council on the introduction of the Service Book; for intimating the intended use of it a week beforehand, and so giving malcontents an opportunity for organizing their opposition; and for transmitting their account of the disturbance without consulting the Privy Council. He also laments what he calls "the weakest part;"<sup>(2)</sup> the withdrawal of the Liturgy till the King's pleasure should be known.

A case now came before the Council which not only produced an important legal decision, but brought prominently forward a new actor upon the scene. This was Alexander Henderson, the leader of the Second

(1) Peterkin, page 52.

(2) Rushworth II, 389 etc.

(3) *Arg. Cl. Regs* VI, 509.

Reformation in Scotland as Knox had been of the First. Born of a Fifeshire family about 1583, he was trained at St Andrews University, where he distinguished himself as a student, and was at early age appointed one of the Regents. In his youth he strongly supported episcopacy, and was ordained minister of Leuchars under Episcopal auspices. His appointment was extremely unpopular, and on the day of his induction the parishioners bolted and barred the door against him, and the party had to enter by the window. For several years he was reckoned by the people as a stranger and an hireling, but a change gradually came over his views, and finally his conversion to Presbyterianism was complete. (1) Long since suspect among the bishops on account of his opposition to the Perth Articles, he was at length among the ministers of his own county and by his own parishioners held in high esteem. Henderson and other ministers in Fifeshire delayed obedience to the proclamation of 13th June ordering purchase of copies of the Service Book, and action was taken against them. On the 23rd of August they lodged a petition with the Privy Council for the suspension of the summons (2). This was drawn up by Henderson. (3) The petitioners had expressed their willingness to receive a copy of the Liturgy in order to ascertain whether they could conform to it in conscience, but this had been refused, and they were now charged with letters of horning on a narrative that they had refused the Books out of curiosity and singularity, and they humbly entreated their Lordships

(1) Lives of Henderson. Aiton, Orr, McCrie.

(2) Rothes Relation, page 5.

Balfour Annales II, 227 - 9.  
Peterkin, page 53.

(3) Baillie, Letters and Journals, I, 449.

by deciding

for a suspension of the charge. Five reasons were given for this, the first of which was that the Book was not warranted by the authority of the General Assembly nor by Parliament. In addition to this formal document information was sent to several members of the Council who were known to be in sympathy with the petitioners. This paper protests that the Book "destroyeth all the order of Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries and Assemblies and puts the whole government of the Kirk in the hands of the prelates. It complains of the compulsory use of forms of prayer and of the Liturgy containing "many gross poynts of Popery". It was difficult for the Council to meet such arguments, based as they largely were on the constitution of the country, but they got over the difficulty, that their own proclamation extended only "to the buying of the saide Bookes and no further." (1)

On the same day the Council sent a fairly full account of the existing state of affairs (2). They assure his Majesty that they have ever been ready and willing to establish the Service Book, and notwithstanding the barbarous tumult, occasioned only as far as they can learn, by "a number of base and rascall people", were hopeful to get the Book brought into use, but at a meeting of the Council held on the 23rd Instant, they were surprised with the clamours and fears expressed from every part of the kingdom even by those who had been hitherto most obedient subjects, and that the murmurs and grudges against the Book were so increasing that they dared no longer delay nor conceal it from his Majesty.

(1) Balfour. Annales 11, 229. (cf. page 227)

(2) Peterkin, Records, page 53. P.C.R. VI 521 + 694.

Not knowing what effects this might produce, they could not proceed further in the matter till they had received his judgement on it. They suggested the calling of some of the Council to London to explain the circumstances to him, and afterwards to hear his decision how they were to act. The Council accordingly delayed giving a full answer to this and other supplications till the 20th of September, when it was expected that the King's reply to their letter should have been received.

There followed a time of seeming peace in the Capital. The Courts were now in vacation, and many had left the city temporarily. In the country the peasantry were busy with the harvest. But the work of propaganda was being actively carried on. About this time we have indications of the growing sympathy between the English Puritans and the Scottish objectors to the Liturgy, who had much in common. The former sent pamphlets well calculated to stir up the public mind against the bishops and their Book, and these were eagerly read. The Scottish leaders kept in touch with one another, and all depended on Sir Thomas Hope as their legal adviser. By visiting various parts of the country they sought to secure the united action and support of the people.

About the middle of September Lennox brought down the King's reply to the Council (1). It is dated 10th September, and is sharply worded. His Majesty does not consider it fit that he should receive a deputation as they suggest, as it would make it appear that he had either a very slack Council or very bad subjects, which he does not believe. He orders a sufficient number of the Council to remain in Edinburgh or neighbourhood during the vacation till the Service Book be settled. He blames both the Privy Council

(1) Eailie. Letters, I, 452. Peterkin. Records.

and the Town Council for the intermission in the reading of the Liturgy; that the rioters were not punished; that they had not accepted the offer of the clergy to read the service on receiving an indemnity; orders every bishop to cause the Liturgy to be read in his own diocese; and that they see to it that the burghs only elect as magistrates those favourable to it. (1)

The purport of the King's letter became known before the 20th of September, and great excitement was caused. The harvest was now gathered in, and the country folks were able to flock to the city. Burgesses from other towns, lairds, and nobles did the same, as if, says Clarendon, in a general cause which concerned their salvation. It was a spontaneous gathering of those deeply interested, for many of them did not know the others were in the town till they met at the Council House door. A private meeting of the leaders was held, and they resolved to petition the Privy Council and to request the Duke of Lennox to act as mediator between them and the King. (2) A great number of petitions which had been sent in were examined, but many of them were but echoes of that of Henderson and some of them very badly expressed, so it was decided to unite all in one petition in name of the nobility, barons, ministers, and burgesses. A copy was taken by Lord Rothes to Traquair, who advised them not to irritate any one, and smoothed it down. This petition expressed their loyalty to the King, their detestation of the Liturgy, and besought the Council, as the guardian of

(1) Rothes' Relation, p. 7.

Peterkin, Records, p. 53.

Balfour, Annales, Vol. 11, 232.

(2) Rothes' Relation, p. 9.

their religion, to plead their cause at Court. With considerable ceremony the pacer was presented on their behalf by the Earl of Sutherland. In the end the Council decided to forward the General Petition and two particular ones to Court, Lennox undertaking to present them, and to explain the difficulties of the case. It leaked out that the King's reply to the Petition would be received about the 18th of October, and towards that date the people flocked into the town in great numbers. On the date expected the King's answer was to hand. It was clear that he did not yet understand the state of feeling in the country, and that he had been badly advised by his counsellors in London, for his reply was a series of three proclamations, which were made at Edinburgh Cross on 17th of October. The first was to dissolve the standing committee of the Privy Council so far as it was called for ecclesiastical affairs, and ordered all strangers to return to their homes within 24 hours; the second commanded the adjournment of the Courts of Justice to Linlithgow and thereafter to Dundee; and the third called in and ordered to be burnt the pamphlet of Gillespie - "Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Kirk of Scotland" - which had caused so much annoyance to the Court party. (1)

The chiefs of the Presbyterian party on their arrival in Edinburgh held meetings as to their future action, and were indeed assembled together when the proclamations were being made. Owing to the largeness of their numbers the nobles, the gentry, and the ministers met in separate places. (2)

The contents of the proclamation being now known,

(1) Letter - Balfour Annales, 11, 236.

Roths, Relation, p.13. P.C.R. VI 536-7.

Large Declaration, p.33.

Peterkin, p.55.

(2) Baillie 1, 34.

and being ordered by it to leave the town within 24 hours, after a "little astonishment and rage" (1) they considered that their best policy was to draw up a formal complaint against the bishops as "the authors of the Book, and all the trouble that had, and was likely to follow on it," (2) and to present it to the Privy Council. The drawing up of the complaint was left on the one hand to Henderson and Lord Balmerino, and on the other to Dickson and Lord Loudon. As Baillie quaintly puts it, "that night these four did not sleep much". (3) At a meeting on the following day the two forms were presented, and that prepared by Loudon and Dickson (the Western) was unanimously received, and signed by 38 earls and lords, 2 or 300 gentlemen of quality, and several hundred ministers, (4) while upwards of 500 signatures were added the same night. A number of copies were likewise prepared for ministers to take home to their parishes to be signed. Some difference of opinion at first manifested itself, some present thinking they were going too far in seeking to bring the bishops to trial, but such objections were soon overcome.

The proclamations greatly provoked the people. They much resented that their supplication had not been allowed to reach the King, that the nobles would have to leave the city and allow the Provost to work his will, and the removal of the Law Courts. That night another petition, in name of the men, women, children and servants and indwellers of the Burgh, protesting against the Service Book was prepared and largely signed. (5)

(1) Baillie, Letters 1, 35. (2) and (3) Ib.

(4) Peterkin, Records, page 56.

(5) Large Declaration 41-44.  
Peterkin, Records, p. 56



On the 18th, while the Supplication was being signed, a tumult began in the streets. A great crowd of men and women gathered round the house where the Town Council was assembled, demanded them to maintain the true religion, to restore their silenced ministers and reader, and to join in the Petition and Complaint, threatening that unless this were done, to burn the house about their ears. At this point Sydserf, the Bishop of Galloway, happened to come along the street, and as it was rumoured that he wore a golden crucifix under his vest, some of the excited women laid rough hands upon him to ascertain if that sign of Popery were really there. Severely jostled, he was dragged by some friends to the door of the Council House. Traquair and some of his followers came to the rescue, but only shared his captivity, the mob blocking all exit. Somehow they contrived to send to the magistrates for assistance, but they were in no better case. Aided by their followers, Lords Traquair and Wigton forced a passage to the town-council-room, and it was resolved by his Lordship and the magistrates that every demand of the rioters should be granted, notwithstanding all their professions to Laud and the King's Secretary, Lord Stirling. (1) This ended the tumult so far as the magistrates were concerned, but the bishop was not yet safe, and the Treasurer returned to effect his release, but in spite of all the promises they had just received the fury of the crowd against the bishop increased, and Traquair was thrown to the ground, and his hat, cloak, and staff of office torn from him, and with difficulty he was rescued from their hands. Not till some of the Presbyterian lords were summoned to appeal to the mob was it possible for him to remove in safety,

(1) Large Declaration page 36.

and even then with shouts and insults ringing in his ears. (T)

That night the bishops fled to Dalkeith and the Provost in terror left the town. The Presbyterian lords and ministers met, and at a most harmonious gathering agreed to assemble again on the 15th of November. They also decided that if any of them were summoned to appear before the Court of High Commission, they should decline its jurisdiction, and appeal against such unlawful judicatories.

In the troubles of July the mob had been the sole actors though many of the upper classes were in sympathy with them in what they did, but men and women of all social ranks were now committed to oppose the Liturgy. The ministers on their return to their parishes had taken care that the flame of popular resentment did not die down.

As the 15th of November approached, greater crowds than ever flocked into the city. This was the cause of great alarm to the authorities, who feared their ability to control so many excited people, as well they might considering what had already happened. The nobles among the supplicants were asked to refrain from meeting, but maintained their right to do so. They were quite willing to help to keep the people quiet, but did not think they could induce them to return to their homes. To ensure order it was agreed that the petitioners should act through committees instead of en masse. It was then arranged to appoint a few of the noblemen, two gentlemen from every county, and a minister from every Presbytery, and a burghess from every burgh, to act

(1) Rothes' Relation, p. 15.

Rushworth, II, 404.

Large Declaration, 34 v.

for the whole. After urging their grievances and much consultation with the Council, seeing that the King's answer was expected in a few days, they expressed their willingness to persuade the body of the supplicants to return home, on the understanding that the Council would communicate the contents of the King's letter as soon as it came to hand, or, if it were unsatisfactory, they were to ask permission from his Majesty to send the Supplication to Court.

From this large committee four smaller committees were chosen - one of nobles, one of gentlemen, one of ministers, and one of burgesses. These sat at separate tables or in separate rooms in the council House, and hence they came to be known as THE TABLES. The arrangement was a matter of convenience for both sides. It was a severe tax on many of the Presbyterians to have to travel frequently to the Capital - roads were bad and money scarce. It was a convenience, too, for the Council to meet and discuss matters with a small body of representative men rather than with an unwieldy committee, and there was less danger of another riot.

The Tables continued to sit in Edinburgh, ready when necessary to summon the others who went home. Every measure which originated in the country was submitted to the Table of the district, composed of gentlemen from it, then to a general Table of 16, and last of all to a Table of four, one from each Table. This was the plan, but soon Rothes, Loudon, Balmerino, Dickson and Henderson became the real rulers of the Tables. The Privy Council sanctioned this arrangement, perhaps thinking to split up the Presbyterian party, but at the time they little understood what the effect would be, for very soon the Tables were the real controlling power in Scotland, "and issued orders that were even obeyed with more promptitude than those of the

most despotic of sovereigns.(1)

One of the leaders of the movement after the 15th of November was the young Earl of Montrose. On his return from his continental travels he was but coldly received at Court, and soon, in his own impulsive way, flung himself into the arms of the opposition party, by whom he was warmly welcomed. The "canniness" of Rothes is said to have won him over, but Montrose himself says that Murray, the minister of Methven, was the instrument of bringing him into the Covenanting ranks. (2)

Towards the end of November Roxburgh returned from Court, having received, it was announced, instructions dated the 15th of that month,(3) and a Privy Council was summoned to meet at Linlithgow on 7th December. The Tables at once took steps to attend, but Roxburgh and Traquair urged them not to come to Linlithgow, promising that nothing injurious to their interests should be done, and that they should have an opportunity of appearing at a meeting within four days thereafter, and to this they agreed. On the 7th the Privy Council issued a proclamation assigning the King's reason for delaying the consideration of the petition to the late disgraceful tumult, declared his Majesty's abhorrence of popery, and that he would allow nothing within his dominions but what would tend to the advancement of true religion, as it is presently professed in Scotland, and that nothing would be done against the laudable laws of his native kingdom.(4) It says little for the intelligence of Charles that he supposed the supplicants would be deceived by such a paper. So far from

(1) Aiton, "Henderson" page 213.

(2) Montrose and the Covenanters, Napier, 1, 143.

(3) Balfour, Annales, 11, 237.

Peterkin, Records, p. 57.

(4) Ibid. p. 57. P.C. Reg. VI, 545.

allaying the excitement, it augmented it. While saying one thing he meant another, and the Presbyterians knew it. When he spoke of "true religion", he wished them to understand Presbyterianism while he meant Episcopacy. BY "religion presently professed" he likewise wished the supplicants to understand "Presbyterianism" while he meant the religion of the bishops, thus yielding nothing. By the "laudable laws of the land" he only intended those passed since his father's accession to the English crown. He little understood the temper of the people to imagine they would be so put off, or that they would fail to resent the attempt.

The Treasurer and Roxburgh vainly endeavoured to induce the supplicants to be satisfied with the proclamation. Then they tried to get them to make their supplications separately on the plea that this would be more acceptable to the King, but they understood that this would only weaken their cause, and refused. Then they strove to induce them to give up their action against the bishops and to be content with a petition against the Book of Canons and the Prayer Book, but this was also in vain. The Privy Council tried to escape the persistence of the petitioners, but they forced an audience, and compelled the Council to receive a deputation large enough to meet their wishes. After several meetings at which temper was shown on both sides, the Council finally agreed to hear the petitioners on 21st December.

At this meeting of the Council, which was held at Dalkeith, and which consisted only of laymen, Loudon was the chief speaker, and in an eloquent speech (1) set forth their grievances and made their claims. He denounced the innovations which had been made without

(1) Baillie, Letters, Vol. 1, 455.

Balfour, Annales 11, 240. Peterkin, p.57.

the sanction of Assembly or Parliament. He traced the steps that had been taken to secure redress, and pleaded that their "pressing grievances and just desires" be fully presented by the Council to the King. And in respect that the bishops were the contrivers and urgers of the innovations they craved that the matter be put to trial, and decided accordingly to justice, and consequently they declined to receive them as judges in the matter.

On their return to Edinburgh the supplicants drew up a Historical Information, in which they vindicated themselves from the slanders of the bishops, and justified their proceedings, and <sup>lodged</sup> an Information against the Liturgy, the Canons and the High Commission. They also appointed a committee to confer with Traquair and Roxburgh, and appointed new ~~deputies~~ <sup>deputies</sup> to attend at the Capital by turns till March 1st.

The Privy Council wrote to the King, showing the dangerous state of affairs, and suggesting that he should send for some Councillors whom he could best trust to explain how things actually stood. While they were awaiting a reply. Sir Robert Spottiswood, son of the Primate, posted off to London, and not only opposed the Presbyterians in various ways, but so acted as to cause discord between the King and his Scottish advisers. This was partially counteracted by the Earl of Haddington, and Traquair was sent for. He refused to carry the Historical Information to London himself, but was agreeable that Hamilton, the Lord Justice Clerk, who accompanied him, should do so. Traquair presented to the Court a full account of the state of affairs in Scotland. At this critical time the Archbishop of St Andrews wrote a letter to his Majesty which had most evil results. He pointed out that those who had banded themselves to slay Rizzio had fled when they were proclaimed traitors, and so, he urged, would the Presbyterian

leaders if treated in the same way. This fell in with the King's own despotic sentiments. Despite the tumults in Scotland and the dangers of rebellion, and despite the counsels of his more moderate advisers, Charles ordered Traquair to return to Scotland to enforce strong measures, and bound him by oath to obedience and secrecy.

Matters were assuming a more critical aspect every day. Robert Baillie, writing to William Spang on 4th October 1637, says he at first feared an ecclesiastical rupture, but now he was afraid of a "bloudie Civill war". (1) Feeling was now even more tense than in October. Both sides had gone far, and one of them must give way if peace were to be maintained, but neither of them was so disposed. Charles was stubborn and his worst counsellors ministered to his obstinacy. He had learned, too, by this time that leading men both in England and Scotland were acting together, and he saw that a forced concession in Scotland would rouse the English Puritans to an energetic assertion of their own rights.

The opposition party were also in a very difficult position. By their protest and declination they had committed what might be construed as treason. If they failed to establish the position they had taken up the fate which had threatened Balmerino might be that of them all. There was further a grave danger of division in the Presbyterian ranks. Since the troubles with the King began they had been weakened by the existence of three differing parties. (1) The survivors of the school of Andrew Melville and those who agreed with them. Such were Presbyterians of the most democratic type, more sympathetic with a republic than with a monarchy, and who were strongly opposed

(1) Letters, Vol. 1, page 25.

to every form of Episcopacy. 2) The "Westerns", mostly resident in the south-west of the country. This group had accepted, and had not repented of the acceptance of the Perth Articles, and for a time had willingly adhered to a modified Episcopacy. ("Bishops I love", wrote Baillie in 1637<sup>6</sup>). They were not at first opposed to an absolute government. 3) Between these two extremes were the "Easterns", who for the most part came from the Lothians and the country north of the Forth. Of this group were such men as Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford and Andrew Cant. They were supporters of a limited monarchy, and for a time accepted a modified Episcopacy, but were always opposed to the Articles of Perth.

In various respects the Easterns and the old ultra-Presbyterians were at one, and in others the Easterns and the Westerns united against the extreme Presbyterian party. The Court party was well aware of these divisions, and played to widen the gap. To this end the older and more prudent of the bishops endeavoured by moderate concessions to win over the Westerns, and Traquair worked on individuals. In the hope of creating dissensions and breaking up the party, edicts were issued to prevent the Presbyterians from holding general meetings in the Capital; the establishment of the Tables was permitted; efforts to obtain separate rather than united supplications were made; and unnecessary delays were caused in the course of negotiations.

Henderson noted all this, and by a masterly stroke of policy succeeded in uniting the Presbyterians into one firm band. In concert with several of the nobles and David Dickson, he resolved to draw up a National Covenant which would effectually secure this result. Certain concessions were necessary, and were made, and every Presbyterian in Scotland was in the end



united to all the others, and the efforts of the Prelatists to break up their party were defeated.

Traquair returned to Edinburgh on the 14th of February 1638. The supplicants had secret information that he brought a proclamation from the King, and what its purport was, and they accordingly prepared a legal protest, which they were ready to present as soon as the proclamation was made public. The Privy Council at this time held its meetings at Stirling, and the Treasurer, <sup>decided</sup> that the proclamation should be made here on the 19th of February. (1) To avoid the protestation he expected would be made he had resort to a trick. Very early on the morning of the nineteenth Traquair, Roxburgh and the Lyon-King set off from Edinburgh for Stirling, to make the proclamation before the supplicants could arrive there. Through the blabbing of a servant the fact of this expedition became known to Lord Lindsay, and at once divining its purpose, he and Lord Home immediately set off after Traquair. They passed him during the night, and arrived at Stirling before him and his companions. When they and the heralds arrived at the Cross they found the protesters awaiting them, and as soon as the proclamation was read they followed with the protest, and affixed it alongside the proclamation to the Cross. (2)

The proclamation declared the King's approval of the Liturgy, that all petitions against it were derogatory to his authority and deserving of the severest censure, and forbade the supplicants to assemble again under pain of treason. (3) The protestation claimed the right of access to the King by petition; declined the prelates as judges in any Court, civil or ecclesias-

(1) Peterkin, Records, page 59. (2) Ibid.

(3) Large Declaration. p.48. Peterkin, p.59.

tical, until they purge themselves of the crimes laid to their charge; that no Act or proclamation, past or future, passed in presence of the bishops should be prejudicial to the supplicants; that the Presbyterians should not incur any danger to life or property for not observing the Liturgy, but that it should be lawful for them to worship God according to His Word and the constitutions of the Church and Kingdom; the whole ending with professions of loyalty to the King. (1)

Similar protests were made in other towns where the proclamation was made. This was a legal means for protecting the subjects of Scotland from the sudden operation of statutes which they regarded as unacceptable. It implied the entering of an appearance in the Supreme Court, and a trial of the legality of the objectionable ordinance.

By the afternoon a couple of thousands of the protesters had crowded into the town, and to avoid the possibility of a disturbance, Traquair besought the leaders to get their followers to withdraw, promising that the Council would not be asked to ratify the proclamation, and that a small deputation would be received to make their declination. With difficulty the chiefs persuaded their followers to agree to this. Later in the afternoon the Council held a meeting. Protest against the presence of bishops was made, but it was overruled. Notwithstanding the pledges given, the Council ratified the proclamation. The Lord Advocate refused his consent to this, and warned them what a dangerous step they were taking in declaring so many of the lords and commons traitors in such a dangerous time. Because of this breach of faith several nobles forsook the cause of the King, and others apologized.

(1) Large Declaration, p. 50.

Feterkin, Records, pp. 59-60.

Rothés, the leading spirit of the movement on its more material side, realizing how alarming was the state of affairs, now summoned the supporters of the protest from all parts of the country to meet in Edinburgh, though this was to defy the proclamation to the contrary which had just been made. Thousands responded to the call, and flocked into the Capital on the 23rd of February and following days. The serious condition in which they were placed individually by the action of the King and the grave danger of divisions among themselves were earnestly considered by the leaders. Henderson pointed out that as they were now declared rebels by the King, they should form a Covenant with God, and depend on His protection. He recommended the renewal of the Covenant of 1581 with some additions, as the state of the times demanded. The suggestion was at once adopted, and Henderson and Johnston of Warriston were appointed to draw one up, and Rothés, Loudon and Balmerino were selected to revise it. A Fast was arranged for Sunday, the 25th. At the same meeting the practical proposal was made by Rothés that voluntary contributions should be raised to meet such charges as the business might necessitate. (1)

On Tuesday, 27th February, the draft of the proposed Covenant was ready, and Rothés, Loudon and Adamson were appointed to carry it to the ministers to endeavour to secure their concurrence. There were differences of opinion on some points, but after discussion the reference to the Perth Articles was modified, and the draft unanimously accepted. We may reckon both some of the questions and answers at this meeting as sophistical, but they were in the spirit of the age, and we may add of the nation.

(1) Rothés' Relation, p. 71.

The Covenant consisted of three parts. 1) The King's Confession of 1580-81. - the Negative Confession. It was an able move to insert this document in the new Covenant. The heart of the nation was still strongly anti-Papal, and the powerful denunciatory eloquence of the 1581 Confession was acceptable to the great majority of the people, and had a unifying effect. Besides, what the father had signed, the son could hardly treat with contempt. 2) A list of the Acts for the suppression of Popery and the establishment of the Protestant religion in Scotland. This was the work of Johnston, the lawyer. 3) The new Covenant proper, understood to be the work of Henderson. In this section the subscribers declared with their whole heart that they would adhere to and defend the fore-said true religion (forbearing the practice of all innovations already introduced till they have been tried and allowed in free Assemblies and in Parliament) and to labour by all means lawful to recover the purity and liberty of the Gospel. After examination they asserted that they had found the foresaid innovations unwarranted in the Word of God, contrary to the Acts of Parliament cited, and sensibly tending to the restoration of Popery, and promised and swore IN THE GREAT NAME OF THE LORD THEIR GOD to continue in the profession, obedience and defence of the foresaid religion. Then came a promise of loyal support of the King in the defence and preservation of true religion, "as also to the mutual defence and assistance every one of us of another, in the same cause of maintaining the true religion." Next came a faithful promise to be a "good example to others of all godliness, soberness, righteousness, and of every duty we owe to God and man." Finally there was a solemn appeal to the LIVING GOD to witness to their sincerity, and a prayer to be strengthened by the Holy Spirit, that their

proceedings might have success, and that religion might flourish in the land.

Covenants were no novelty to the people of Scotland. In former days the barons had been wont to join themselves by "bands" for mutual defence in times of danger. Bands of man-rent were an old institution. At the time of the Reformation the Lords of the Congregation leagued themselves by covenants which were frequently renewed. The Covenant of 1581 had been signed by all ranks, but the enthusiastic reception of that of 1638 was unprecedented. Is it possible to account for its enormous popularity? As we have seen, the first Reformation was to a large extent a spiritual movement, though baser elements entered into it, which, in the good providence of God, helped to further it. Of the covenanting movement, which has been termed the "Second Reformation", the same might be said. Neither was a purely spiritual movement. In the case of the Reformation of 1560 the great spiritual impetus of the time gradually died down in many quarters, as is unfortunately often the case after periods of exceptional earnestness. The official records of the Church again and again contain complaints of the decay of religion. But for several years before the signing of the Covenant of 1638 we find distinct traces of revival in various parts of the country. The fervent evangelistic preaching of men like David Dickson of Irvine, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Blair, John Livingstone, and other earnest preachers who had been driven back to their own country by the persecution of the bishops in Ireland, and other ministers of like spirit, was bearing fruit, not only in their own parishes, but wherever they preached, and through those who came from far and near to wait upon their ministry. What was mockingly styled the "Stewarton Sickness" and the occurrences of

the Kirk of Shotts are clear evidences of spiritual awakening. No doubt the revolt against the Service Book was with some but the patriotic protest against the enforcement of the Liturgy of an alien, and that an English Church. Nor can we close our eyes to the fact that as the grabbers of the Church lands helped on the work of 1560, so the sufferers from the Revocation of Charles furthered that of 1638.

The signing of the Covenant began on Wednesday, 28th February.\* The place chosen for this purpose was Greyfriars Church, and the hour two in the afternoon. Henderson opened the proceedings with a powerful and appropriate prayer, and Loudon followed with an impressive speech, explaining the object of the assembly, and in conclusion appealed to the great Searcher of Hearts to witness that they neither intended dishonour to God nor disloyalty to the King. A solemn pause ensued, for all realized what a serious step they were about to take. After a little Rothes broke the silence by asking if there were any objectors, and said that if there were any such, those from the south and west country were to go to the west end of the church, where Loudon and Dickson would meet their difficulties, and those from the Lothians and the country north of the Forth were to go to the east end, where Henderson and himself would endeavour to make matters clear. "Feu comes, and these feu proposed but feu doubts, which were soon resolved." These preliminaries occupied till four o'clock on that wintry day.

\*" Both Mr. Laing and Dr. Cook say it was on the 1st of March (on the authority, perhaps, of Guthrie and Stevenson), but Rothes' Relation, and the minutes of the subsequent Assembly, show that it was in February."

Note to page 13 of Peterkin's Records.

Accounts vary as to what followed. The popular tradition is that the aged earl of Sutherland was the first to sign, and that he was followed by Sir Andrew Murray, the minister of Ebdy in Fife, and that soon all within the church had inscribed their names upon the parchment. It was then carried to the waiting multitude outside, for whom there was no room within the building, laid upon a flat tombstone, and signed by as many as could reach it, till the whole sheet was completely covered with their names.

There is material for a very picturesque description here. The account of the weird surroundings, the dead and their memorials, the adjoining Grassmarket with its grisly gibbet, the towering Castle rock, the deepening shadows of the evening, the flare of torches, the earnest multitude pressing forward to append their names till the great sheet is too full to receive even on the margins more than bare initials, forms a picture that appeals to the imagination of every one, and invests the event with a solemn interest.

But the critics have something to say. Dr King Hewison disposes of the touching story of the venerable Earl of Sutherland stepping forward, and with deep emotion signing first of all the for ever memorable parchment, by pointing out that the Earl of that period was only twenty-nine years of age, and that his name does not appear among the subscribers given by Bothes, nor is it to be found on any of the early copies of the Covenant examined by the Doctor. He suggests that the "forward Montrose" probably signed first.(1) Dr. S. R. Gardiner, on the other hand, says: "At four o'clock in the grey winter evening, the noblemen, the Earl of Sutherland leading the way, began to sign. Then came the gentlemen, one

(1) "The Covenanters", Vol. 1, p. 268.

after another, till nearly eight." (1) On the following day, Thursday 1st March, at a meeting in the Tailors' Hall, nearly 300 ministers and the commissioners from the burghs signed the document. Not till the day after - Friday, 2nd March - according to this writer - did the populace begin to sign. He gives his reasons in a foot-note: "The general signature is not described in contemporary accounts. The 28th and 1st were too fully occupied, and I have therefore assigned it to the 2nd, though there is no direct evidence about the date." (1)

Whatever difference of opinion there may be among historians on this point, all are agreed as to the enthusiasm with which the Covenant was received by the multitudes who had flocked into the city - 60,000 according to some, in addition to the normal population, though this is probably an exaggeration. There is no need to question the tradition that a copy of the Covenant was signed on a flat tombstone in the Greyfriars church-yard by crowds, who swore to it with uplifted hands, nor to doubt that many did so with streaming eyes. We are told (2), and may well believe, that some signed with their own blood instead of ink, and that others added after their names the solemn words "till death". The great mass of the nation was deeply moved, the reserve characteristic of the people was for a season broken down. Copies were carried through the city for signature, and crowds of excited and weeping women and children followed. Notaries attended to attest the signatures of those who could not write. It is said by some that children were freely allowed to sign, but Rothes declares that only communicants were permitted to do so. No distinction of rank was considered, but it is maintained by the covenanting party that only persons of good

(1) "Hist. of England, VIII, 353. (2) ...



character were permitted to sign. On Friday, March 2nd, copies were despatched to every shire, bailiery and parish. These were signed by several of the leaders as a guarantee of genuineness and as an encouragement to others, and this will account for the many copies which have been preserved. Nobles and lairds procured copies, which they carried about with them, and which they endeavoured to induce others to sign. Scenes of enthusiasm in some quarters attended the signing of the Covenant. as an example of this we read in the life of John Livingstone, written by himself, the following, "I was present at Lanerk and at severall other paroches, when on ane Sabbath after the forenoon sermon, the Covenant was read and sworn, and may truly say that in all my life, except one day in the church of Shotts, I never saw such motions from the Spirit of God, all the people generally and most willingly concurring, where I have seen above 1000 persons all at once lifting up their hands, and the tears dropping down from their eyes; so that through the whole land, except the professed Papists, and some few, who for base ends adhered to the Prelates, the people universally entered into the Covenant of God for reformation of religion, against prelatie and the ceremonies." (1)

As we might expect in such an outburst of popular feeling, there were incidents which were to be regretted and condemned. Both Pothes and Baillie lament that their cause had been injured by the actions of some of its partizans. From contemporary evidence it is clear that compulsion was occasionally employed. It is certain that in some cases undue pressure was used to obtain signatures. Where moral suasion was not found sufficient, threats of Divine judgements, and even of personal violence were made. In a letter (2)

(1) Select Biog. (Wodrow Socy.) Vol. 1, p. 160.

(2) Baillie, Letters, Vol. 1, p. 462.

sent by David Mitchell, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, and afterwards bishop of Aberdeen, to John Lesley, bishop of Raphoe, dated 19th March 1638, he depicts the condition of some at least of the supporters of the bishops. He tells that the Covenanters "have made vs so odious that we dare not goe on the streets. I have bin dogged by some gentlemen, and followed with many mumbled threatenings behinde my back, and then, when I was upstaires, swords drawn, and, "If they had the Papist villaine, O!" Yet I thanke God, I am liuing to serue God and the King and the Church, and your LoP. Your Chiefe (Roths) is chiefe in this business. There is nothing expected here but ciuill warre. There is no meeting of Counsell; the Chancr. (Archbishop Spottiswood) may not with safetie attend it, nor any Bishop; the verie name is more odious among old and young than the Devill's". Several ministers who approved of the Liturgy and refused the Covenant were deposed by their Presbyteries. The fire of hatred of the bishops had long been smouldering, and this had of late been stirred up by various acts of the Court of High Commission, but now it burst into flame in various quarters. When Spottiswood learned of the signing of the Covenant, he is said to have exclaimed: "All which we have been attempting to build up during the last thirty years is now at once thrown Down." But more than this was feared. Dreading personal violence, some of the bishops fled to London. Three of the four who remained in Scotland soon solemnly renounced Episcopacy, but Guthrie of Moray, who would neither fly nor abandon his faith, suffered severely.

Though, as Mitchell mentions in the letter just quoted, "The greater part of the kingdom have subscribed, and the rest are daily subscribing a Covenant," all had not signed, nor would all sign. Guthrie says, (1)

(1) Memoirs p. 35

"It was everywhere done with joy except in the north parts, where many opposed it." This was the case. Here and there were districts which adhered to the bishops with practical unanimity, but those were mostly in the north, where opposition to the Covenant was strongest. Here in an earnest form Presbyterianism had never obtained much hold, as may be seen from the fact that many of the symbols of the Romish faith had been suffered to remain un mutilated since the Reformation. The Roman Catholics were chiefly located in this district, but their opposition was unimportant. Protestant Episcopacy, however, was strong. The Marquis of Huntly, the great landowner of the north, was an Episcopalian and a supporter of the King, and threw his influence against the Covenant. While the Universities of St Andrews and Edinburgh signed with few exceptions, and while there was considerable opposition in Glasgow, the antagonism in Aberdeen was both able and strenuous.

In most other quarters any opposition had given way before the enthusiasm of the time, but in Aberdeen it continued strong and active. From the first the town had been stubborn in its refusal to sign the Covenant. The first summons made by the Tables was not even answered, and a second was presented on 16th of March by a deputation of four lairds. Thereupon a meeting of the Town Council was called, and the Covenant publicly read. The only avowed exception taken was to the bond of mutual defence, (1) but a 'modest refusall' to sign was given to the Table of Burghs, which refusal the deputation declined to accept. The 'Aberdeen Doctors' were men of ability and determined in their opposition, and by their preaching and the publication of pamphlets, did all they could to stir up a popular feeling

(1) Row. History, page 490.

against the Covenant. Doctors Baron and John Forbes were the principal writers. Dr. William Guild, one of the ministers of Aberdeen and a royal chaplain, also wrote against the Covenant a "Friendlie and Faithfull Advise", but he afterwards changed his opinions, and became a Covenanter. (1) The Bishop of the diocese did not forget to inform the King of the loyalty of the city, and received a letter of thanks and encouragement. (2) The Tables, however, had not yet given up hope of winning Aberdeen, and on the 7th of June Erskine of Spotiscraig and Andrew Cant of Pitsligo came to the city to endeavour to secure subscriptions. On learning of this proposed visit the doctors renewed their attacks on the Covenant by vehement and frequent preaching, and the magistrates by menaces attempted to stop all subscription. This aroused the Tables to a fresh effort to win the city to their cause. They accordingly appointed a stronger deputation to deal with those determined Prelatists. Amongst others it included the Earl of Montrose, Alexander Henderson and David Dickson. As Row puts it: "This sett a new edge on the doctors in their sermons to cry down the Covenant." (3) And he notes under date of 19th July, "A terrible sermon againis all the poynts of the Covenant, by Dr. Rosse". The magistrates had already taken action; for at a meeting on Thursday the 16th they decided by a majority of votes "that none within the toune should subscribe the Covenant." (4)

On arriving at Aberdeen the deputation were tendered the Cup of Bon Accord, but they ungraciously refused, alleging that they could accept no hospitality till the Covenant was received by the city. (5) Here we have a sidelight on the religious spirit of the time.

(1) Pow, History, p. 491. (2) Ib. 490. (3) Ib. 494.

(4) ib. 494. (5) Ib. 494.

It reminds one of Shylock's refusal of Bassanio's invitation: "I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you." (1) The doctors were ready for them. That very night they had a list of fourteen debatable questions in print, which they required to be answered to their satisfaction before they would sign the Covenant. The questions were shrewdly put and not easy to answer, but the deputation did their best. The doctors prepared an elaborate reply, which was duly answered, and so the paper war went on, the documents being printed as they were produced. The honours of war appear to have remained with the local forces. Certain it is that they were not convinced even against their will. On applying for permission to preach in the churches of the town, the ministerial members of the deputation only received the answer they expected, being told: "their awin ministers were prepared to preach in their awin pulpitts". (2) They accordingly had to preach in the court-yard of the Earl Marischall's house or in his house according to the state of the weather, but they did so at such times as would not interfere with the usual hours of public worship. Material success, however, so far lay with the supporters of the Covenant, that a number of the clergy in this district fled the country to escape signing, but on the triumph of the Covenant in the following year returned to accept it with professions of repentance.

(1) Merchant of Venice, Act 1, Sc. 3.

(2) Row, History, p. 495.

CHAPTER VII.The Glasgow General Assembly of 1638.

In view of the very serious state into which affairs had come, the Privy Council met at Stirling on the 1st of March. The only prelate present was the Bishop of Brechin, who left before the business was finished. Spottiswood, who had been urged to attend, did not come, but sent a letter of apology, in which he gives his mind on the matter, which is, "to lay aside the Booke, and not to presse the subjects with it anie more, rather than to bring it in with suche trouble of the Church and Kingdom as we see." (1) After debate on "the present Combustion in the Countrie", as they term it, they came to the conclusion on 2nd March that the causes of the combustion were the fears apprehended by the subjects, of innovations of religion and discipline of the Kirk established by the Laws of this Kingdom upon occasion of the Service Booke, Book of Canons, and High Commission, and the form of introduction thereof, contrary or without warrant of the laws of this Kingdom. (2) The Council also decided to send one of its members to explain to the King the true state of affairs in Scotland, and Sir John Hamilton, of Orbiston, Justice-Clerk, was chosen. In the Instructions given to him for his mission he was requested to represent to his Majesty the opinion of the Council as to the causes of the existing troubles in the country, and to request him to make trial of his subjects' grievances in his own time and way, according to the laws of the Kingdom. In case his Majesty should approve, he was to submit to his consideration whether he should not allow one to be sent

(1) Register of the Privy Council, 1 March 1638. VII, 7.

(2) Ibid 2 March 1638. p. 10.

from the Table. And if his Majesty (which God forbid) should dislike the proposal of the Council, he was to urge with all the arguments he could that his Majesty should not determine on any other course without allowing some of the Scottish Privy Council to give their reason for what they advised. Other letters were also sent to the King and to the Marquis of Hamilton on this matter.

After signing the Covenant, levying contributions, and organizing themselves throughout the country, the leaders of the movement saw that they were doing the very same thing as that they so strongly condemned—imposing a Confession of Faith without the sanction of a General Assembly and raising taxes without parliamentary authority. Thereupon Easterns and Westerns agreed to demand a General Assembly and Parliament to give legal authority to what they were doing. They accordingly on 15th March prepared another Supplication to the King, requesting that these be called, and ending with every protestation of loyalty. They further resolved to send it by the hands of Livingstone, a preacher who had been in trouble in Ireland because of his opposition to the bishops there. By the same messenger letters to Lennox, Hamilton, Haddington and Morton were sent, urging them to use their influence in favour of the supplication. Orbiston arrived in London before Livingstone, and told the King the object of his journey, and that he had been excommunicated by the Irish Church, and orders were given that he should be arrested as soon as he reached London. Haddington, who knew this and many other things concerning the intentions of the King, kept him hidden for a few days, and then sent him back with a budget of private correspondence.. The Supplication was returned unopened, but Covenan-

ters were informed individually that the King would consult his Council, and inform them of the result by proclamation.

Before the Council met Traquair, Foxburgh and Lorne were summoned to Court that they might advise as to the actual state of affairs, and were requested before coming south to obtain the opinion of the Scottish lawyers as to the lawfulness of the action of the Covenanters. Sir Thomas Hope, the Lord Advocate, and other eminent lawyers agreed that there was nothing distinctly illegal in it. Some of the Scottish bishops were already in London, a number of the Scottish peers were always there, and they united with members of the English Privy Council in the consideration of the state of affairs presented to them. There was great difference of opinion. The lay lords - both English and Scottish - were on the whole for peace. Lennox, Traquair and Lorne argued strongly for it. The former made what is termed "a pithie speech", which had great effect. Lorne declared that while he was ready to fight for the King in any just quarrel, he would rather leave the country than agree to forcing the Liturgy and the Perth Articles upon his fellow-countrymen. The churchmen of both nations, on the other hand, declared for war. They held that to make concessions to the rebels would be cowardice; to retract now would be to compromise the dignity of the Crown, to sacrifice his personal feelings, and to encourage the English malcontents. They advised the King to call in the aid of Hamilton, Douglas and Huntly, and with the help of the loyal clans in the north, bring the Covenanters to submission. Charles was swayed by those differing opinions, now in one way and now in another, but finally made the fatal mistake of deciding for war.



Peaceful counsels, however, prevailed for the time. Charles had no army, nor the money to pay one, and though his navy was in a better condition, it could be of little use against the Scots without an army to support it, so he decided to temporize. He would send a Commissioner, who could treat with them in the meantime. Several noblemen were thought of, but finally he decided to send Hamilton. The Marquis was by no means eager for the difficult and doubtful honour, and indeed declined it till it was in a measure forced upon him. He was the next heir to the throne, failing the present royal family, and it was charged against him by some of his contemporaries that he wished this for himself, and so played Charles false, but this is without foundation. By his expenditure in military service abroad he had run himself deeply into debt, and the King had dealt generously with him. Besides this, we have some evidence that he had an affection for Charles. He had been educated at Oxford, and was profoundly indifferent to the religious aspect of the present quarrel. He was no patriot: he said he hated Scotland next to hell. Later he vowed that his sons should be bred in England, and wished his daughters never to be married in Scotland. (1) But self-interest was his ruling passion. Like his master he had grave defects of temper, and was but a poor judge of men. He had considerable talent and was of insinuating manners, as well as the head of a family of high standing in Scotland. So that he was probably as well fitted for the task as any one on whom Charles could call. He received his final instructions from the King at Windsor on the 16th of May. Early in June he reached Berwick, and while here received a secret pardon and warrant for his action in this mission. He was to act as a spy

(1) Letter to King, 27 Nov. 1658. Peterkin p. 113.

upon the Covenanters, to split up the party if he could, or to turn them from their purpose. He was not only authorized but required to talk with them to ascertain what were their plans. "For which end you will be necessitated to speak that language which, if you were called to account for by us, you might suffer for it. These are therefore to assure you, and, if need be, hereafter to testify to others, that whatsoever ye shall say to them to discover their intentions, ye shall neither be called in question for the same, nor yet it prove in any way prejudicial to you." (1) Such papers are not given unless they are asked for, and here we have at once a proof of Hamilton's caution and his Sovereign's duplicity.

Charles was prepared to grant something, but not all the Covenanters demanded. In the 28 articles of his instructions of 16th May he informs his Commissioner how far he may go. (2) The following are some of the provisions. The Court of High Commission was to be continued, but regulated by the first Parliament that should meet; a General Assembly was to be called as soon as the state of the country would permit, and a Parliament thereafter to ratify its proceedings; the use of the Liturgy was to be suspended; the Articles of Perth were to continue, but not to be enforced; any who made protestation against the royal declaration were to be treated as rebels; six weeks to be allowed for giving up the Covenant.

Uncertain what Hamilton might do, the Covenanters arranged to meet any proclamation by a protestation, and agreed that they would be satisfied with nothing less than the abolition of Episcopacy. Henderson at their request wrote a paper entitled "Articles for

(1) State Papers, II, 101.

(2) Peterkin, Records p. 67.

Burnet, p. 50, &c.

the present Peace of the Kirk and Kingdom of Scotland." From Lord Borthwick they learned of the warlike plans of the King for the invasion of the country, and his scheme for dividing the Easterns and Westerns over the use of the Perth Articles. As a result the country generally was in a very perturbed condition. Thoughts of war filled the minds of many, and arms were already being imported by the Covenanters and others. The arrival of Hamilton in Scotland caused warlike action to be put aside for the time.

Even before he left England the Commissioner had said: "I have no hope in the world of doing good without coming to blows, for though the King was willing to grant so much, the Covenanters would continue to make fresh demands." (2) In this mood he set off. Before leaving London he induced the King to ask as many of the Scottish nobles as were not actually required at Court to return to Scotland, so that they might at once give éclat to his arrival and be prevented from working him mischief during his absence, (3) and orders were sent to the nobility in Scotland to be present at a Council meeting in Dalkeith on 6th June, instructing them to meet the Commissioner at Haddington on the preceding day. The anticipated pompous parade to Dalkeith was a failure, for only two lords with ten followers each and six barons met Hamilton at Haddington, and a deputation of Covenanters told him that none of their party would be present. Even the Privy Council would not advance beyond Dalkeith. At their meeting the Marquis was told some very plain things regarding the state of the country, and learned something of the tendency of the aristocracy, though the Council would not sign the Covenant as they were petitioned to do.

(1) Peterkinn. p.63. (2) To Con, quoted by

S. R. Gardiner, Hist. Engl. VIII, p. 341.

(3) Baillie, 1, p.75.

A deadlock took place at the very beginning of the negotiations between Hamilton and the Covenanters. He refused to come to Edinburgh because of the armed guard set around the Castle to prevent the munitioning of the fortress, an act which gave him great offence, and which he regarded as rebellion. The covenanting leaders refused to come to Dalkeith, alleging their fear of being blown up by the gunpowder stored there, but really because they considered it would offer greater opportunity for causing division amongst them, which they clearly saw was the design of the Court party. Traquair denied upon oath any intention of doing hurt to the commissioners and the Marquis threatened to retire to Hamilton, but the Covenanters refused to meet with him there, as it would be a tedious business to carry motions back to the Capital for the consideration of the whole committee assembled there. The magistrates of the city then went to Hamilton, and invited him to take up his residence at Holyrood, and to this he agreed on the conditions that he should be received in state and that the guards upon the Castle should be withdrawn, promising that no munitions of war and only provisions for daily needs should be taken in. The conditions were accepted, and the large guard (a hundred men, according to Baillie (1) ) was removed, though a smaller and secret one was still kept.

By the 7th Hamilton had had an interview with Rothes, and informed him that if the King's terms, which he was to submit to the Covenanters, were refused, his Majesty would come to Scotland with an army of 40,000 men to enforce his authority. (2) Rothes was not alarmed. He knew too much of the present state of

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, p. 82.

(2) Rothes, Relation, pp. 112-129.

affairs with Charles, for one thing, and he was confident the people would support their religion at any cost, for another. The Commissioner was now in a position to give his master some account of the condition of the country, which he did, assuring his Majesty of the resolution of the Scots to maintain their demands, "impertinent and damnable as they were". He also assured the King that if he would not call a Parliament, the Covenanters would summon one themselves. He continued, "Be confident they by God's grace, shall neither be able to do the one nor the other in haste, for what I cannot do by strength I do by cunning". (1) He would be faithful to his instructions to gain time.

Friday, 9th June, was the day fixed for Hamilton's journey to Holyrood, and his reception ought to have satisfied him. "I think as much honour was done to him as ever to a king in our country", says Baillie (2). A roundabout road was chosen, the cavalcade travelling by Musselburgh. Covenanters had in recent days flocked into the city - 60,000 - according to Burnett - and they now stood in long ranks on the seaside. "Nobles, gentry of all shyres, women a world" (3), and multitudes of the citizens of Edinburgh, all awaited the passing of the Commissioner. A conspicuous part of the crowd was provided by the ministers, who, to the number of 500 or so, all clad in their black cloaks, stood by themselves on a brae-side on the Leith links. They had appointed Mr. William Livingstone, "the strongest in voice and the austerest in countenance" of them all, to deliver a short address of welcome. A report that he would attack the bishops reached the Commissioner, and he

(1) Hamilton to King, 7 June 1638. Hamilton Papers.

(2) Baillie - Letters, Vol. 1, p. 82

(3) Ibid. p. 83.

got out of the public delivery of the oration very neatly by informing Livingstone "that harangues in the field were for princes, and above his place,"(1) but that he would gladly hear him in private, which he afterwards did. The magistrates of Edinburgh received his lordship with every outward sign of welcome. His own gracious demeanour on this public occasion made the Covenanters hopeful of good things to come, in which they were grievously disappointed.

The negotiations between the Commissioner and the Covenanters, characterized on the one hand by duplicity and on the other by suspicion, went on in Edinburgh, but little progress was made. Quite early in the proceedings the Covenanters made it plain to the Marquis that all such negotiations would prove in vain unless he were empowered to grant a free Assembly in which they could deal with the innovations and put the bishops on trial, and a Parliament in which all unconstitutional acts could be rescinded and redress afforded. Hamilton declared that he would answer their demands by proclamation, and they let him understand that a protestation would certainly be made if that failed to meet the necessities of the time. He went so far as to order preparations to be made for the publication of the proclamation at the Cross, and a great crowd assembled, including about a thousand gentlemen with swords loosened and ready for use, and prepared to defend the protesters against any attack. Seeing this and fearing the issue, the Commissioner withdrew his orders and the proclamation was not made at that time. (2)

At this point Hamilton offered to grant both an Assembly and a Parliament if they would surrender the Covenant, but this they indignantly refused, and

(1) Baillie, Letters Vol. 1, p. 84.

(2) Ibid p. 85.

Henderson was instructed to write a paper to explain why they could neither withdraw nor modify their Covenant. To support this a Supplication renewing the request for an Assembly and Parliament was handed in: (1) About the same time another paper was circulated, containing suggestions of what they might find it necessary to do if the Commissioner should resort to force, or prolong the negotiations to an unwarrantable length. In this it was hinted that if the King did not call an Assembly they might call one themselves, and that if force were employed against them a committee might be chosen to consider what they ought to do in defence of religion and liberty. (2)

During the time thus spent in barren discussion Charles continued his correspondence with Hamilton, always urging him to win time in order that he might advance his preparations for war, and explaining to what extent he had succeeded in doing this. (3) The Commissioner had done his best to spin out the days according to his orders, but this was not always easy work, for those Covenanters were pertinacious men. They pressed for a satisfactory reply; or, they hinted, they might act.

Hamilton's instructions did not permit him to grant all that the Covenanters demanded, and he resolved to return to Court to consult his Majesty. They fell in with this suggestion, and agreed that they would disperse to their homes, and take no action for three weeks while he was absent, on the understanding that he would do his best to persuade the King to summon an Assembly and Parliament. The Commissioner's request

(1) Peterkin, Records, p. 70.

Ralfour Annales, 11, p. 266.

(2) Large Declaration, p. 96.  
Peterkin, p. 71.

(3) Burnet, Mem. Hamilton, p. 62.

for permission to return was granted by the King. He was to promise nothing that might have to be refused, but he might recall the Privy Council and the Court of Session to the Capital, from which they had been banished since the tumults of 1637, and give some hopes of an Assembly and Parliament. But he was also instructed to publish before he left the more modified of the two proclamations he had brought with him.

On the 7th of August Hamilton returned to Edinburgh with certain new powers. One was to call an Assembly, but the King laid down ten conditions on which it could meet. (1) These were afterwards reduced to two. the Assembly was to be purely ecclesiastical: no layman was to vote in the election of members by the Presbyteries, and none was to be a member, and if possible a bishop was to preside. The second condition was that the Assembly when it met was not to meddle with matters determined by Parliament, unless by remonstrance and petition. (2) The covenanting leaders would not listen to any such proposals. They remembered the packed Assemblies of the past and their doings, and knew enough of affairs at Court through their spies there to be very distrustful of the intentions of the King. The nobles were more strongly opposed to the bishops than the majority of the ministers, and were determined to have a place in the Assembly, and the Tables agreed that they should. Some even of the Presbyterian ministers were doubtful of the wisdom of this, fearing that as soon as they had gained their own ends the nobles and gentlemen would be indifferent to the cause of the Church.

(1) Peterkin p. 76.

Baillie, Letters, 1, 99. (*Baillie says eleven conditions*)

(2) Large Declaration p. 123.

Peterkin, p. 78.



Relations were for a time rather strained between them, but by the efforts of Henderson and Dickson a reconciliation was effected, and nobles and ministers were again on amicable terms.

Having failed to effect what he purposed, Hamilton again suggested a return to Court to consult the King. This was reluctantly agreed to by the Covenanters (1), and once more he went south with the promise that he would be back by the 20th of September, a promise which was faithfully kept. The Council met on his return, and were informed of the concessions which the King had made. The Canons, the Liturgy and the High Commission were to be given up, the Perth Articles were to be discharged, and, if Parliament so pleased, repealed; and Episcopacy was to be limited with such restrictions as should accord with the laws of the Church and Kingdom. It was his Majesty's wish that the Confession of 1581, with the accompanying bond, should be signed by all. After considerable debate, the Councillors on the 22nd consented to sign the Confession and bond. On the same day they passed an Act making offer of their lives and fortunes in defence of the royal authority. (2) They further decided to publish it at the Cross, and had proclamation made that a General Assembly should meet at Glasgow on the 21st of November, and a Parliament at Edinburgh on the 15th of May following. It was still further required that all should follow the example of the King and Council by signing the Confession and annexed bond. (3)

Had these terms been granted at the beginning of the negotiations with the King, it is probable that they would have been received with universal satisfaction. Even now it seemed to many as if all difficulties had been cleared away, and the prospect of civil war removed.

(1) Baillie, 1, 100. (2) Peterkin, p. 80.

(3) Large Declaration, 134-135.

removed, and the proclamation was received with joy. The Covenanters, however, must needs protest against the Declaration, which they did in a very lengthy protestation. (1)

The two Covenants were now before the public, and the Commissioner tried all he could to get the King's well signed, and his agents went through the country doing their utmost to this end.. Stories were current of men being compelled to subscribe under the influence of pointed pistols and threatening daggers. The leaders of the Covenanters wrote to the Commissioner of the many complaints that had been made by those who were forced to sign against their consciences, but his Grace made a strongly worded reply, telling of the violence that had been used to induce many to sign their Covenant, and of the clergymen who had been deprived of their livings and excommunicated because they refused to subscribe it. It is understood that about 12,000 persons signed the King's Covenant in the Aberdeen district and some 16,000 in all the rest of the country - under 30,000 in all - though this included a large number of persons of importance. Meanwhile the Covenanters were busy in their efforts to add to their own signatories, in which they had great success.

So determined were the Covenanters to have their own Assembly "according to their minds though the King should discharge ~~it~~"<sup>(2)</sup> that even before Hamilton had left for England in August, they had taken preparatory steps. (3) To every Presbytery minute instructions were sent for the conduct of elections of representatives to the Assembly. It was necessary that this should be done. There had been no Assembly of any kind since 1618, and all those held since 1597 had been more or less tampered with by King

(1) Peterkin, 84. Large Declar. 157. (2) Baillie, 103.

(3) Large Declaration, 129.

James, so that the nature of a true Assembly may not have been known to the majority of the ministers, to whom such a statement would bring a much-needed enlightenment. In the Directions sent to Presbyteries, every Presbytery was required to have a copy of the Act made at Dundee on 7th March 1597 (1), according to which it was ordered that three of the 'wysest and graivest of the brethrin' and a layman be appointed commissioners from each Presbytery, also one lay elder from every burgh except Edinburgh, which might have two. This rule they were now to follow. No one might attend as a member of the Assembly unless he bore a commission, a form of which was provided. (2)

Some 'private articles' were sent to 'these ministers whom most they trusted.' (2) According to those articles, ministers erroneous in doctrine and scandalous in life were not to be elected. All charges against bishops, with the proofs thereof, were to be carefully gathered and timeously forwarded; the ministers were to post themselves up in such controversial questions as were likely to be agitated in the Assembly; they were to see to it that no supporters of Episcopacy and only those well disposed to Presbyterianism should be chosen to represent the Presbyteries. Here, in packing the Assembly, they were but following the example of his late sacred Majesty, King James VI.

The Commissioner's attitude towards Episcopacy was simply that the office must be preserved, but the individual bishops must submit to trial for their alleged offences. The Covenanters, however, were determined on the abolition of the office itself as well as to sit in judgement on the present Episcopal bench. The usual procedure would have been to apply to the Moderator and Clerk of the last Assembly, but

(1) Baillie, I, 469. (2) Baillie, I, 103, 469.

as that was the hated Assembly of 1618, they would not. Rothes and some others made application to the Commissiener for a warrant to compel their attendance, but he refused as contrary to precedent. They then tried the judges of the Court of Session, but they held that the matter was not within their jurisdiction. Lastly they appealed to the Edinburgh Presbytery, who received the complaint, and referred it to the next Assembly. How exceedingly grave the charges were we shall shortly see.

Hamilton had been so disappointed in many of his expectations by the intractable disposition of the Covenanters, that Baillie and others were afraid that he would either decline to hold the Assembly at all or bring it to an end before it had accomplished anything, but, however unwillingly, his Grace opened the proceedings on the appointed day. The intervening weeks from the summoning of the Assembly were a busy and anxious time for all concerned. Every effort was made by both parties to increase the number of their adherents. Debtors were pressed to prevent them from taking their place in the Assembly. The expenses of poor ministers were provided for. As the great day drew near those interested crowded in. The little city was able to accommodate more than was expected, and provision of some sort was made for the Privy Council, the Court of Session, the Parliament, the Assembly, and their hosts of retainers. Naturally the citizens met the extraordinary demand by asking excessive prices, and the magistrates had to interfere in the interests of moderation.

On Friday the 16th the west country members came in, each of the nobles being attended by a great company of friends and vassals. On the following day most of the east country people arrived. In the afternoon the Commissioner, his Council and train

reached the city. Montrose, Rothes, and others went out to welcome him, when they assured him they would crave nothing but what was supported by clear Scripture, reason and law, to which Hamilton replied that nothing reasonable should be denied. (1) During the three following days prior to the actual meeting, both sides were busy with their preparations. The ministers settled on their officials in advance. Alexander Henderson was 'incomparablle the ablest man amongst us all,' (2) but they hesitated to place him in the chair lest they should lose his help in any debates that might arise with the Aberdeen doctors or the bishops. Still, in the other possible men "there were some things evidentlie wanting", and so they were obliged to choose Henderson. (3) Johnston, of Warriston "was a nonsuch for a Clerk". (4) Rothes and several others went to the Commissioner to explain that it was the custom to begin their Assemblies with solemn fasting, and that in the absence of the former moderator it was the rule for the oldest minister or moderator of the place to preach and to moderate till another was chosen. His Grace agreed to the Fast, and claimed that it was his right to nominate the preacher, but out of respect to Mr. John Bell, whom they had named, he consented that he should preach and preside, and shortly after sent Dr. Balcanquhall to ask him to do so.

The commissions to the Assembly of at least 140 ministers and 100 ruling elders were duly sustained. Following the ignorant and prejudiced report of the Marquis to the King that the members were a lot of boors many of whom could neither read nor write, and a similar assertion by Burnet (5), who was not born

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, 121. (2) Ib. 122.

(3) Ib. 122. (4) Ib. 122.

(5) Hamilton to King, 22nd November 1638.

(Burnet Memoirs,  
p. 98.)

till five years after the Assembly met, a number of more modern writers, to whom the idea of lay members being present and voting was distasteful, have made a like statement. The late Principal Lee, (1) however, has amply vindicated the lay element of the Assembly from the slander - the clerical needs no such defence. He points out that of the ruling elders present two were professors, not being ministers, 17 were noblemen of high rank, nine were knights, 25 were landed proprietors or lesser barons, of such station as entitled them to sit in Parliament, and 47 were burgesses, generally of high authority in their respective towns, and who were capable of representing their community in Parliament. There was not a peasant, nor even a farmer or yeoman in the number. Some of them were Masters of Arts. Dr. Lee indeed from documents in his possession was prepared to prove that not one of them was illiterate. Baillie (2) gives us the names of many of the nobles who were present, and assures us that there were few barons of note in the country but were either members or assessors, that there were representatives from all the royal burghs, from all the four Universities, and from all the 63 Presbyteries "except a verie few." This statement may perhaps require some slight modification. It will be observed that a goodly number of churches were not fully represented, but taking the Assembly as a whole, we have a body of men of an influence and intelligence that otherwise could not have been drawn together in the country.

The meetings were held in the noble Cathedral, which had been fitted up for the occasion. At one end a chair of state was provided for the Commissioner,

(1) Quoted by Peterkin, Records, page 111.

(2) Baillie, Letters, 1, 125, &c.

on which he sat surrounded by his Council. At the opposite end was a small table for the use of the Moderator and Clerk. The nobles sat at a long table in the middle of the church, and behind them were seats for the ministers and burgesses. In one gallery were the young nobles and persons of rank who were not members of the Assembly, and in another still higher places were found for ladies and persons of lower degree. There was no ecclesiastical pomp, but plenty of weapons were in evidence, for swords and daggers were worn in the church itself. (1) The members with their assessors and other supporters formed a great company, and for part of the time during which the Assembly met the crowding was so great that it was almost impossible for the members to get into their appointed places. There was much jostling and disturbance. Baillie was shocked, and sorrowfully compares the conduct of those present with that of Anglicans, Papists, and even Turks and Pagans in their places of worship. Indeed, if they had behaved so badly in his house, he frankly declares that he would not have been content till they were down the stair. (2)

On Wednesday, 21<sup>st</sup> November, the people observed the Fast and there was preaching in the churches of the town, but the Assembly, for fear of any legal quibble about their not meeting on the appointed day, was opened in the Cathedral in the afternoon, after sermon in the morning. The venerable John Bell preached what Baillie calls "a verie good and pertinent sermon", the pity being that owing to the weakness of the aged speaker's voice not a sixth part of the audience could hear it. Having preached, Bell came down to the Moderator's table, offered a fervent prayer, and constituted the Assembly in the name of

(1) Burnet, Mem. of Hamiltons p.93.

(2) Baillie, 1, 123.

the Lord Jesus Christ. His Grace then handed in the King's commission in his favour to Thomas Sandilands, the son of the Clerk to the last Assembly, who had taken his place as the Clerk of the present one. Following this, commissions in almost identical terms were lodged by the representatives of Presbyteries, Universities, and Burghs.

Differences arose very early between the Commissioners and members. On the 21st the Interim Moderator presented a letter to his Grace, that they might proceed to the election of a Moderator, but Hamilton requested that the commissions of members should be examined before they did so, lest some might vote who were not qualified. Rothes and some of the leading Covenanters insisted that the election should take place first, urging various reasons for this step. Hamilton was strongly supported by Traquair and Sir Lewis Stewart, who was in the place of the Lord Advocate. Both sides had prepared themselves for the encounter, and the result was "the teuchest dispuitt we had in all the Assemblie." (1) The Marquis retired to consult with his Council, and at length very reluctantly gave way, entering one protest that it should not imply his approbation of any commission against which he might afterwards take exception, and another that the nomination of a Moderator should in nowise be prejudicial to the bishops. Against these protests protestations in name of the Covenanters were taken by Rothes, and both parties took instruments. (2)

Bell again moved the election of a Moderator, but Hamilton stated that a paper had been presented to him in the name of the bishops, which he now wished to be read. Objection was taken that no bill, supplication or protest could be received in the Assembly

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, p.125. (2) IBID 126.



till it was fully constituted, but the promise was given that it would then at once be read. After a sharp debate his Grace got angry, and ordered the paper to be read in the King's name. Much clamour immediately arose, and cries of "No reading!" followed. Hamilton having calmed down somewhat, protested that the refusal was unjust. Rothes was again forward with a protest against this protest that the refusal was just and necessary. Everybody was now tired of protests except the Clerk, who with every one received a piece of gold. (1) Still other protests were made against and for styling the prelates "pretended bishops;" and poor old Mr. Bell, evidently very unhappy in his present post, again urged his leet for the moderatorship, but not yet with success. His grace now raised another matter of contention. (2) The King had nominated six of his Privy Councillors, including Traquair, Argyle and Lauderdale, as his assessors, not only to counsel but to vote. Argyle's letter was the first considered, but it was maintained that the King if present in person would only have one vote, and the giving of more to his assessors might open the way to so many that they might control the whole. More protests. At last the leet was voted on. The names were Alexander Henderson, John Kerr, John Row, J. Boner, and William Livingstone. The last four were all old and more or less infirm men, and their names were only inserted as a matter of form - those of such men as Dickson, Rollock and Famsay being intentionally omitted. As was intended and expected, Henderson was elected, no contrary vote but his own being given (3) On taking his seat Henderson delivered an address of encouragement and direction

(1) Paillie, Letters, 1j127.

(2) Peterkin, Records, p.130.

(3) *Ibid.*, p.131.

to his fellow-members, and closed with prayer. And so ended this stormy session.

At the next diet there was a rather painful discussion as to the appointment of a Clerk to the Assembly, but finally Archibald Johnston of Warriston, was elected. The son of the former Clerk stated he had received no Registers from his father, but only two books, containing some acts from the year 1590 till the Aberdeen Assembly of 1616, and the minutes of the 1616 Assembly on a paper apart. He also had the minutes of the Assemblies of 1617 and 1618. And these he handed in. The new Clerk then dramatically produced five volumes of the minutes of the Kirk, declaring that in the good providence of God they had come into his hands, and that they embraced the records of the Kirk from 1560 till 1590, except a few leaves which had been torn out by Bishop Adamson. (1) With those already handed in they now had the full minutes of the Church. The news was received by the Assembly with great joy, and a committee was appointed to enquire into the genuineness of the documents, to which they afterwards bore full testimony. (2)

It was Tuesday, the 27th, before the real business of the Assembly began. Then the long delayed declination of the bishops came up, and was read by the Clerk. It is a lengthy document, and from their point of view rather cleverly constructed. (3) It had been carefully revised by the King. It protests against the Assembly as a gathering of laymen and of ministers elected by laymen avowedly hostile to Episcopal rule. As soon as the paper was read several of the leading Covenanters took instruments against

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, 129.

(2) Peterkin, Records, pp. 22-24.

(3) Ibid page 99.

the bishops, of their acknowledging of their citation, of their compearance by their proctor, of their wilful absence in person, that sentence may be given against them as present. Against this protest his Grace protested. (1) Thereafter he produced three papers, nominally supplications but really protests against the Assembly if elders or commissioners chosen by them should have votes. (2) One was by the Dean of Edinburgh and about a score of others, one by the ministers of Dundee and a few more there, and another by eight ministers, including several Covenanters, of the Presbytery of Glasgow. At the request of Principal Strang of the University, the last was withdrawn. The reason for this was learned by the Commissioner with great indignation. The Moderator and others had sent for Dr. Strang on the previous night, and when their other arguments failed, had warned him that unless he withdrew the protestation, they would "deal with him as an open enemy." (3) It had been boasted that the number of objectors was "hudge", but it was now found to be very small. Presumably others had been dealt with in the same way as Dr. Strang.

Next morning a rumour was current that the Marquis would leave the Assembly that day, and so break it up as far as he could. It was desired that he should sit till the business was concluded, and his own expressed intention to do so had encouraged the hope that he would, but it was suspected that he had received fresh orders from Court. At this diet the first business taken up was the matter of the recovered Registers, and this was followed by a discussion of the bishops' declinature. Two written

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, p. 137.

(2) Ibid 1; 138.

(3) Ibid 1. 134.

answers were submitted. Henderson had noted that in the declinature some of the arguments employed by the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort were used, and made this an opening for a long theological discussion. He came to the point at length by asking the Assembly if they found themselves qualified to judge the bishops notwithstanding their declinature. Hamilton, knowing what would be the result, urged delay, but the Moderator declared that now was the time to vote. The Commissioner then said that it behoved him to depart. The Moderator besought him to remain, and Rothes, Loudon and others urged the same thing in vain. The Commissioner produced the royal proclamation granting several points asked by the Covenanters, "yet nothing that gave us a tolerable securitie of any thing." (1) The Moderator in a grave and learned speech gave thanks for royal favours received, but pressed for a vote. The Commissioner then spoke in dignified terms with tears in his eyes of his sorrow yet necessity to depart, and he drew tears from many of the members who foresaw something of the tragedy that was to follow. "I stand to the King's prerogative," said Hamilton, "as supreme judge over all causes civil and ecclesiastical. To him the lords of the clergy have appealed, and therefore I will not suffer their cause to be further reasoned here." He called upon the Moderator to close the meeting with prayer, but was answered that no such instruction was valid. Just before leaving Hamilton gave a parting warning (2) that "he behoved to renew all his protestations in his Master's name, and in the name of the Lords of the clergie, That no Act there should

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, 141.

(2) Ibid 1, 142-3.

import his consent, and that nought done by the voyces of the present members was lawfull; also that he discharged them to proceed any farder." While he and his train - all save Argyll - were leaving the Church the Clerk by request of Pettes was reading a protest.

On the 29th the Commissioner had a proclamation made at the Market Cross of Glasgow, (1) dissolving the Assembly, against which, of course, a protest was duly made. (2) Argyll had signed the King's Covenant and was a member of Hamilton's Council, but he now took his place with the Covenanters, and assisted in their deliberations to their great comfort and contentment.

The Assembly was not dismayed by the departure of the Commissioner, but lest any of the more timid might have any dbubt as to the wisdom of continuing their work, Henderson delivered a speech of encouragement, asserting the right of the Church to call Assemblies with or without the consent of the civil magistrate, and while the minds of his audience were still roused by his eloquence, the youthful Lord Erskine spoke from the gallery, and with tears professed his sorrow for so long refusing the Covenant, and begged to be admitted to it. The accession of Argyll, this nobleman and others greatly encouraged the Covenanters. The Moderator remarked on the evidences of the Divine favour they were receiving, and put the question whether the Assembly would adhere to its protestation against the Commissioner's departure, and would remain till its business was concluded, or not. Only three or four men from Angus declined. The members again declared themselves a lawful and competent tribunal to judge the bishops.

(1) Large Declaration 290. Peterkin, 118.

(2) Large Declaration 294. Peterkin 119.

The Assembly then proceeded with the business before them. Many of their measures were bold enough and in direct opposition to various Acts of Parliament. In all they passed 72 Acts. The six Assemblies which they reckoned illegal - Linlithgow 1606 and 1608, Glasgow 1610, Aberdeen 1616, St Andrews 1617, and Perth 1618 - were for various reasons annulled. (1) The oath exacted by the bishops from ministers contrary to the Acts of Parliament was also annulled. the much hated Articles of Perth were abjured and removed. The Service Book, the Book of Canons, the Book of Ordination, and the Court of High Commission were condemned. (2) Episcopacy was abjured and removed. (3) The Presbyterian Church Courts were restored to their former powers. Parochial Schools were ordered to be established. An Act was passed against the opponents of the Covenant, and another ordered all ruling elders to accept it and the Kirk Constitutions. Ecclesiastical chapters and suchlike Episcopal institutions were condemned. Ministers were forbidden to hold civil offices.

A very important part of the Assembly's proceedings was the trial of the bishops. The charges brought against them were very serious. The first case was brought up on 6th December, and was that of Thomas Sydserf, Bishop of Galloway. (4) He was accused of preaching Arminianism, the use of the crucifix, the institution of unlawful fasts in his diocese and a Communion service for ministers at his synods, the deposition of ministers, fining and imprisoning for unconformity, associating with excommunicated Papists, neglecting prayer in his family, and Sabbath-breaking. The aged Spottiswood of St Andrews was libelled with much more serious offences. (5) It was alleged that he

(1) Peterkin, Records, p.24. (2) Ibid p.26.

(3) Ibid p. 28. (4) Ibid p.165. (5) Ib. p.166.

played cards and dice on Sunday, rode about the country on that day, tumbled in taverns till midnight, slandered the Covenant and old Assemblies, and more grievous still, a witness declared him guilty of adultery, incest, sacrilege and frequent simony.(1) Whiteford of Brechin was convicted of vile drunkenness, the use of the crucifix, and a reputation of many crimes.(2) Lindsay of Glasgow wobbled as to the withdrawal of his declination, but finally considering that his pecuniary interests would be best served thereby adhered to it.(3) Bishop Lyndsay of Edinburgh was charged with various ecclesiastical offences, and that he made "no bones" about swearing and cursing. (4) Bishop Ballantyne of Aberdeen was charged with slander and simony and many ecclesiastical offences. It was noted that he had not signed the declination, but it was considered that this was not owing to any lack of good-will, but simply because of his distance. This defect in his process was not allowed by the Moderator to be taken into account, and he shared the fate of the others(5) The next case was that of Bishop Maxwell of Ross, probably the man most offensive of all to the Presbyterians. His process was noways perfect, and though the evidence did not arrive in time, they found him guilty of various liturgical offences, a deposer of godly (Presbyterian) ministers, an admitter of fornicators, a companier of Papists, a Sunday card-player, of robbing his vassals of 40,000 merks, keeping fasts on Friday, a usual traveller on Sundays, a chief decliner of the Assembly, and a prime instrument of all troubles both of Church and State.(6) Similar offences were charged against Wedderburn of Dunblane.(7)

(1) (2) (3) Peterkin 166. (4) (5) Ibid p.170.

(6) Ibid. 171. Paillie 1, 162

(7) Peterkin, 171

All these were deposed from their ministry and summarily excommunicated.

On Tuesday, 12th December, the case of Bishop Graham of Crkney was first disposed of. (1) he, too, was an alleged Sabbath breaker, a setter of tacks in favour of his own relations to the prejudice of the Church, overlooked adulteries, slighted charming, neglected preaching, held back part of the ministers' stipends for the building of his Cathedral. Guthrie of Moray (2) was not formally summoned, but was an alleged Sabbath breaker and the first to wear "whites". The Moderator managed to save him from excommunication at the time, in spite of the objections taken to his partiality. Soon after he was excommunicated by Rollock. Fairlie of Argyll (3) had only been consecrated in the July previous, but according to Baillie, he had already shown good will to go on the worst ways of the faction. He was an urger of the wicked oath upon entrants, an obtruder of the Liturgy upon them, an oppressor of his vassals, a preacher of Arminianism, a profaner of the Sabbath, "and a beginner to do all that Canterbury could have willed." Nothing was libelled against the Bishop of the Isles except breach of the Caveats. (4)

On the following day Bishop Lindsay of Dunkeld and Bishop Abernethy of Caithness submitted themselves to the Assembly, and requested to be continued in the office of the ministry. Their submission won for (5) them this favour on condition of their repentance.

Several of the excommunicated bishops found a shelter and some of them a living in England or Ireland where their excommunication was not recognized.

(1) Peterkin 171. (2) *ibid.* (3) *ibid.* 172, Baillie 1, page 165. (4) Peterkin p.172.

(5) Peterkin, p. 173.



Several of them died soon after their excommunication. Campbell of the Isles is understood to have retired to Iona or that neighbourhood. Graham of Orkney was a very rich man, and contrived to keep his property from escheat. Abernethy of Caithness was to obtain a parochial charge, but we have no notice of his ever having done so, and it would appear that he was excommunicated later. Fairlie of Argyll became the parish minister of Lasswade, and Lindsay of Dunkeld the minister of his former charge of St Madoes. Sydserf alone of the Scottish bishops survived till the Restoration.

On the 13th of December sentence was passed on the bishops. All were deposed, and eight of them were excommunicated. The Cathedral was crowded with a deeply expectant audience. The accused were called, but none was present. Henderson had had but little time to prepare, but he preached very powerfully from Psalm CX, 1. (1) The solemnity of his utterance as he pronounced the words of excommunication is said to have struck awe into his hearers. "We, the people of God, and I, as their mouth, in the name of the Eternal God, and of His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, ..... do excommunicate the said eight persons from the participation of the Sacraments, from the Communion of the visible Church, and from the prayers of the Church; and so long as they continue obdurate, discharge you all, as ye would not be partakers of their vengeance, from keeping any religious fellowship with them, and thus give them over into the hands of the devil, assuring you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that except their repentance be evident, the fearful wrath and vengeance of the God of heaven shall overtake them even in this life, and after this world, everlasting vengeance." (2)

(1) Peterkin, 174.

(2) ib. p. 180.

It is difficult, almost impossible, to believe the grosser charges against the prelates. No defence was offered, and it is urged that no appearance was made on their behalf at the Assembly, except to decline its jurisdiction, lest it might be construed as an admission of its legality. Burnet says of Spottiswood that he was a prudent and mild man, but "of no great decency in his course of life", that he "used often to eat in taverns", and that "all his livings were scandalously exposed to sale by his servants", but this was only what he had heard long after the Archbishop's death. A more modern Episcopal writer admits, "It is evident that the Primate, like most of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, made no secret of his aversion and contempt for the austerity of the Puritans, and thus would appear to evince a laxity of decorum which his traducers magnified into egregious crimes." (1) We can understand that the haters of bishops would make the most of such things, but unless there was something more than breaches of decorum it is not easy to say why charges of adultery, incest and simony could be brought. Still the excommunications did not prevent promotion in the Anglican Church, and Maxwell, formerly of Ross, held two Irish sees, and was finally Archbishop of Tuam. On the other hand, we have the damning contemporary testimony of Hamilton in his report to the King. He blames the bishops for the trouble that has been raised, and writes: "It will be found that some of them have not been of the best lives, as St Andrews, Brechin, Argyle, Aberdeen, too many of them inclined to simony". (2) It was a grievous fault in the eyes of a Covenanter to be a bishop, but the Assembly trial must have had some basis in their doing as well as in their being. In the closing words of Henderson's sermon as he spoke the words of doom we

(1) J. Lawson Parker, p. 609.

(2) Hamilton to King, 27 Nov. 1638.

have an appeal to posterity that they really believed that the charges had been honestly made and fully substantiated. "you may perceive how circumspectly this Assembly have gone in giving out their judgement against these men according to the degree of their guiltiness. Neither have they judged according to rumours and reports, nor yet by their own private knowledge, but have proceeded according to things that have been clearly proved, which makes us rather be persuaded of God's approbation of our sentence. (1)

A considerable number of the parochial clergy were also excommunicated and more deposed for various causes. Some had undoubtedly been guilty of scandalous and immoral conduct, while others were condemned for teaching doctrines and for ecclesiastical acts objectionable to the now dominant party. In most of the latter cases the offenders were offered restoration on expressing penitence, accepting the Covenant, and conforming to Presbyterian rules. A number of ministers were transported to other parishes, irrespective of the rights of patrons and churches, sometimes in opposition to their own wishes, though not always in accordance with their own desires. Amongst those who were unwillingly transferred was Henderson, whose ministrations were sought both by Edinburgh and St Andrews. In the end the Assembly by a small majority ordered his removal to the Capital.

The Assembly after a debate upon the legality of diocesan Episcopacy and the innovations, issued a deliverance that Episcopacy, the Perth Articles, the other books, rites and ceremonies which were complained of, were all incompatible with the terms of the Confession of Faith and were already abjured. (2) One Act was passed ordering Presbyteries to publish

(1) Peterkin, Records, page 180.

(2) Peterkin, page 28.

this explanation, (1) and another ordained the Covenant subscribed in February last to be again subscribed, with the Assembly's declaration thereof, and this to be intimated by all ministers in their pulpits. (2) As a result of these Acts the later Covenants have an Addendum, explaining that subscribers swear the Covenant on the understanding that the Confession of Faith abjures Episcopacy and the "nocent ceremonies". On the last day of their meeting the Assembly set up a censorship of the press under the control of their Clerk, Archibald Johnston. (3)

On Thursday, the 29th of December, the Assembly came to an end - "a blyth day to all", says Baillie, though many probably shared with him in sorrowful forebodings of troubles to come. The great convention closed very quietly. The Moderator modestly referred to his own share in the proceedings, and acknowledged the great goodness of God and of the King. The town of Glasgow was thanked for the pains it had taken to secure the contentment of the Assembly, and Argyle "for the comfort of his assistance from the beginning to the end." Several others addressed the brethren, and besought them to maintain the Reformation in the bonds of unity, peace and love. After prayer and the singing of the 133rd Psalm, the Assembly ended.

Episcopacy of a kind had prevailed for about thirty years in Scotland. It had been set up by the machinations of King James, and never been popular in most parts of the country. The recent efforts of Charles to increase its power had greatly deepened the dislike of all classes of the people. That the Presbyterians had been able to pack the Assembly to the extent they did shows that it was also unpopular amongst the clergy, though the majority of them were

(1) Peterkin, Records, p.47, no.62. (2) Ib. No. 64.

(3) Peterkin, page 39.

episcopally ordained. But it was among the aristocracy and gentry that the opposition was strong. The Revocation had angered them, and they were afraid lest further measures might affect their interests in the Church lands which they held. The bishops, too, had been given civil posts which they considered to be their own by right. The prelates had been overbearing and haughty, and affected a superiority over the proud barons who regarded them as upstarts. The Court of High Commission had been a serious grievance to some and had aroused much wrath. Besides Presbytery was cheaper, the ministers more modest, and their claims on the tithes more reasonable. Among the common people also the Episcopate was unpopular, both on account of their doctrine and their reputed way of life. Arminianism was opposed to Calvinism, and the Calvinism of the Reformers which had been so long taught was still dear to the Scottish people. Stories of the misdeeds of the bishops, for which they were judged by the Assembly, had long been current.

The Glasgow Assembly of 1638 effected what is known as the Second Reformation in Scotland, and such it was. The First Reformation was the work of the Parliament: the second that of the General Assembly. The first was constitutional: the second was in violation of various Acts of Parliament by which Episcopacy was legally established. Both movements were expressions of the will of the people. Neither was purely spiritual, but into both spiritual forces largely entered. It would be unfair to say that in either case the ruling classes were purely materialistic in their aims, but beyond question material considerations influenced the action of many of them. In the first Reformation some were inspired by the hope of winning a share of the wealth accumulated by the

Church of Rome, and in the second some were provoked by the Act of Revocation of Charles and the fear of further loss. But in both cases there was in the mass of the people a great spiritual uprising. By the co-operation of these two forces in each instance the Reformation was carried through. In the Assembly there were fully a hundred members of the Scottish Parliament (1), so that it is impossible to regard it as a purely ecclesiastical body - representing only the Church. In a very real sense it spoke both for Church and State. It was more truly representative of the people than any other body of men could have been in the country at the time. Its decisions were a declaration of the religious beliefs and wishes of the nation. By those decisions Scotland secured for itself the form of doctrine and Church government the people loved. It was again Calvinistic and Presbyterian.

(1) Peterkin, p. 194.

## CHAPTER VIII,

### The First Bishops' War.

From various indications given in the course of the narrative it will have been seen, that from the period just subsequent to the troubles connected with the Liturgy both the King and the leaders in Scotland had in view the contingency of an appeal to arms, though neither of them made it very public. The action of the Glasgow Assembly in refusing to disperse and in deposing the bishops made war inevitable. Charles had been preparing for this in some measure ever since Hamilton had gone to Scotland in May 1638. Well knowing that the English Parliament would not supply him with money for a campaign against the Scots, the King sought in other ways to raise the necessary funds. On an appeal for voluntary contributions, the nobility gave him a considerable sum, though not what he expected. The Queen raised something from her Catholic friends. Laud put pressure upon the clergy, claiming this to be a war on behalf of the Church, and secured a liberal response. From such sources Charles received about £200,000. He raised an army whose numbers are variously estimated, by some as high as 30,000 foot and 6,000 horse. His plan, suggested by Wentworth (1), for the overthrow of the Covenanters was well conceived, and had he had the power to carry it out, it certainly would have gone hardly with the Scots. He equipped a fleet of 20 vessels under Hamilton, which was to hold the Firth of Forth, and convey 5,000 infantry for reinforcements to the Marquis of Huntly, who was his lieutenant in the north. These landed, Huntly was first to secure the north for the King, which was expected to

(1) S.P. Gardiner, Hist. of England, VIII, 354-5.

prove an easy task, and then, as soon as Charles had crossed the border, to press southwards to his support with his own feudal following and such recruits as he could obtain. Ten or twelve thousand men under the Earl of Antrim were to invade Argyleshire. Strafford was to enter the Firth of Clyde with such troops as he could gather in Ireland, and the men of Arran, whom Hamilton had promised, were to overrun the west. Had these forces been able to converge upon the covenanting army assembled in the south-east of the country, a speedy victory might naturally have been expected. In the country itself there were grave dangers to be faced. The Catholics were preparing to join Hamilton and the Marquis of Douglas. Aberdeen had been fortified and the royalist leader in the north supplied with munitions of war. Others of the aristocracy and their followers and the citizens of Glasgow were doubtful.

The Covenanters were tolerably well advised of the King by various agents, chiefly Scotsmen, some of them even in the King's own service, in London. (1) Winram's more secret correspondence showed "the true estate of the Court, which was not very terrible." But the first unmistakeable evidence they had that the English Council had consented to the King's desire to go to war with the Scots was the exaction from the Scots at Court of an oath renouncing the Covenant and the Acts of the Assembly, the issue of a letter on the 26th of January 1639 summoning the English nobility and gentry to gather to the royal standard at York by the first of April, and the issue of a commission to the Marquis of Huntly as the King's lieutenant in the north of Scotland. These tidings spurred them on in the work of preparation.

(1) Paillie, Letters, 1, 188.



Much depended, both for them and for the King, on the attitude adopted by the English people, and they sought to keep them correctly informed as to their true position. Some months before they had issued a statement with this view. Later other papers, denying as a slander the report that they intended to invade England or to cast off their obedience to their Prince. The publication of those papers had proved of great use in enabling the English to understand exactly how they stood. But this success so galled some of the opposing party that they moved the King to make what Baillie styles "that pitifull Declaration of the 27th of Februar; wherein we are, contrare to all reason and law, declared in all the churches of England, the foulest traitors and rebels that ever breathed." (1) This Declaration, however, seems to have done no harm, for the productions of the Covenanters won for them more sympathy than ever, and greater detestation for the bishops.

Some who afterwards signed the Covenant at first had scruples about so doing, and now many had scruples about taking up arms against the King. Many of them had been trained to regard resistance to the civil magistrate as altogether illegal, and it was hard for them to offer armed opposition now. Baillie himself, at first a doubtful but now a resolved Covenanter, was one of the number, but by study of writers on both sides he got over the difficulty, and both spoke and wrote in favour of taking up arms in defence of their views. Though doubts as to the lawfulness of their position seemed to disappear on all hands, and though some became eager for war, there was always a large number among the Covenanters who were all for conciliation if it could possibly be arranged without abandoning their principles. In this spirit they went on

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, 189.

with more active preparations for war.

Their enemies were representing them on all hands to the Continental powers as desperate rebels, but, according to Baillie (1), they decided to do nothing in the meantime to make use of any friendships abroad, even among nations who were not on good terms with England. He gives a series of reasons for this which are not quite harmonious with each other. The most commendable is one which appears to support the claim of the Covenanters to be desirous of peace with their Sovereign. "We still hoped to bring of our Prince by fair means, which had not been so easie if we had brought once forraigne forces within the Isle." On the other hand, Dr. Lingard states positively that Richelieu ordered the French ambassador to pay Leslie 100,000 Crowns, though this was kept a profound secret by the Scottish leaders, and not made known to the ministers, who would have regarded the acceptance of the money as a sacrilegious breach of the Covenant. But Dr. S. R. Gardiner says "Richelieu did nothing of the kind." (3)

However this may have been, full use was made of such means as they had at home. A central committee was appointed, who were to reside in Edinburgh, and for every shire, and sometimes for every Presbytery, a local committee was chosen to take charge of all military affairs, such as the enlisting of men, the raising of money, and the provision of arms. In this matter they were greatly helped by General Alexander Leslie, who was at the time in Scotland. The Thirty Years' War was not yet concluded, but it was drawing to a close, and the armies which had been engaged were breaking up. Scotland in the earlier

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, 191.

(2) Lingard, Hist. of England, VIII, 213.

(3) Gardiner, Hist. England, VIII, 382.

part of the seventeenth century had long been at peace with foreign powers, and had therefore had no need for men to fight its own battles. It had no colonies nor dependencies, it had little local industry and comparatively little foreign trade. The younger sons of lairds and nobles as well as those of lesser rank had thus to seek in foreign lands the living which their own could not supply. Many enlisted in the various armies of Europe. Especially was this the case during the great upheaval of the Thirty Years' War. Now that peace abroad was drawing near and war was looming at home many of those stout warriors were returning to their native land. Some of them at least were already Covenanters, for Baillie tells us (1) that Leslie had caused a great number of the Scottish commanders in his army to subscribe the Covenant. Such soldiers were valuable recruits, and very capable officers to train the raw recruits of ploughmen and townsmen now being enrolled to uphold the Covenant.

Spalding declares Leslie to have been of base birth, but frankly acknowledges his valour and the high rank he held as Field-Marshal.<sup>(2)</sup> There is a difference of opinion as to the reason of his return from Sweden to his native country late in 1638. (3) The strong presumption is that the old little crooked soldier knew of the signing of the Covenant, that he had signed it himself, used all his influence to get others to do the same, and had now returned to Scotland in spite of the risk of capture by the enemy, for the express purpose of placing his military experience at the disposal of the Covenanters in their anticipated contest with the King.

(1) Baillie, Letters, Vol. 1, page 411.

(2) Spalding, Histy. of the Troubles, 1, 87.

(3) Baillie, Letters, 1, 111.

The Covenanters already had a revenue. In the month of February 1638 a project for a 'contribution' was brought forward, and by the beginning of the following month 670 dollars had been subscribed by 37 of the leaders of the movement. Amongst them was Montrose, who was entered at the highest rate of 25 dollars. (1) This was followed by a scheme for levying a voluntary tax over the whole country at the rate of one dollar for every thousand Merks of free rent, according to the value declared by the contributors. (2) Though styled "voluntary", "it was a tax exacted to the last penny with a rigid uniformity unknown before either in England or Scotland, unless, indeed, it might be said that in the exaction of ship-money the English Council had achieved a like ~~success~~. (3) exactness."

The leaders were thus in a position to follow Leslie's advice to order munitions from the Continent, chiefly from Holland. Such weapons as could be produced at home were busily made. In Potter Row, then a suburb of the Capital, a foundry for cannon was established and actively employed. Smiths were everywhere engaged in fabricating halberts and pikes and suchlike weapons. Provisions were gathered into magazines in various districts. Beacons, the telegraph of the time, were set up on all commanding points to give due warning of the approach of the enemy. All round the eastern coast batteries were mounted and trenches dug. The old fortifications of Leith were in ruins, and realizing the great importance of keeping this town in their own hands, volunteers were called for, and above a thousand of all classes responded daily, Noblemen, gentlemen, citizens, women and children, (4) and even ladies of rank cheerfully took part in the

(1) Rothes, Relation, p. 72. (2) Ibid pp. 80-81.

(3) J. Hill Burton, Hist. of Scotland, VII, 9.

(4) Baillie, Letters, I, 197.

work. So heartily was the labour performed and so great was the confidence in the fortifications planned by Sir Alexander Hamilton, their engineer, that the defence of Edinburgh was soon regarded as secure. Inchkeith and Inchcolm for some unexplained reason were left unfortified, but elsewhere there was no resting place for the enemy, nor port where he might land. An interesting example of the enthusiasm which prevailed amongst many of the people is found in the story told of the Countess of Hamilton, the mother of the Admiral of the English fleet, who is said to have ridden on the sands at Leith with pistols in her holsters, and threatened to blow out her son's brains if he dared to land to the hurt of the Covenant.

With the King's army threatening them in such force on the south, it was essential that every precaution should be taken to secure themselves on the north. Argyle had strong guards on the west coast to meet the expected invasion from Ireland. The fortresses in Scotland were secured. Probably profiting from some of his experiences in the Continental wars, on the 21st of March, by a clever stratagem, Leslie captured Edinburgh Castle. "In halfe ane hour that strong place is wonn without a stroke." (1) Dumbarton Castle, regarded in those days as impregnable, was also secured by a daring stratagem. Hamilton Palace, Douglas Castle, and Dalkeith also fell into the hands of the Covenanters. (2) With them was not only seized much military material, but the regalia of the country, which was restored to its proper place in Edinburgh Castle. The gentlemen of Clydesdale, whose loyalty to the Covenant was doubtful, were made to give security that they would remain at peace.

(1) Baillie, Letters, I, 195.

(2) Balfour, Annals, II, 322.

The Covenanters had thus made good progress in bringing the country into submission to their policy. There was, however, still one great danger to be provided for, and that was a probable attack by the Marquis of Huntly and his following. He was the great aristocrat of the north, as Argyle was of the west, and the natural leader of the clans in that part of the country, and a man to be won if possible to the support of the Covenant. Efforts had already been made to win him over. The present head of the house had been brought up as a Protestant, so there was no insuperable barrier to keep him from joining with the Presbyterians, as there had been in former times. The Covenanters had offered to make him chief of their forces, and to pay off all his debts, estimated at £100,000 Sterling, if he would ally himself with them, or, as an alternative, if he refused their offer, and took up arms against them, they declared that they would find means to prevent him from helping the King, and made him expect the ruin of his family and estate. To all their proposals the Marquis gave a firm but courteous response. He told them "that his family had risen and stood by the kings of Scotland, and for his part, if the event proved the ruin of the King, he was resolved to lay his life, honours, and estate under the rubbish of the King his ruins." (1)

As we have seen, the response to the Covenant by the city of Aberdeen and the district generally had been by no means cordial. Still, it had a small but increasing number of supporters, some on religious grounds, and some because they resented the domination of the Gordons. Report was brought to Montrose that there was to be a meeting of friends to the Cause at Turriff in the middle of February, and that the Gordons were to gather in force to disperse

(1) Gordon. Scott. Affairs, 49-50.  
J. Hill Burton. VII. 3.

them. The army of which Montrose had command, with Leslie as his lieutenant, was not yet ready to march, but with a force of not quite 200 men he moved north by unfrequented drove-roads for Turriff, and had his men and the committee in a position of defence before the Cordons arrived. Huntly naturally shrank from shedding the first blood in the war and his instructions were that it would be well to avoid fighting till the royal forces were more near at hand, so he withdrew his greatly superior force with<sup>out</sup> a battle. Meanwhile the people of Aberdeen, both men and women as at Leith, were busy fortifying their city, and the Tables, regarding this as dangerous, resolved to crush this menacing spirit in the north before they were attacked by the royal forces from the south. An army of eight or nine thousand men was sent for this purpose.

Spalding, cavalier though he was, was greatly impressed by this military display, and gives a graphic description of it in his account of the troubles of the time.

Especially he notes the banner borne for Montrose with the motto FOR RELIGION, THE COVENANT, AND THE COUNTRY. This is the first mention we find of the "Blue Blanket" of the Covenanters. It was a flag on which was the Scottish arms of a white St Andrew's cross on a blue field, and the motto as given by Spalding, or one similar, was painted in gold letters. The strength of the force brought against<sup>it</sup> was so overwhelming that Aberdeen at once surrendered. 6197

The bishop and doctors and other persons of note who would not sign the Covenant fled from the town. Those who remained professed submission. All plundering by the troops was forbidden, and what provisions were requisitioned were paid for. A demand for 100,000 merks was made, but it was reduced to 10,000. Notwithstanding this leniency of Montrose, the Tables fined the representatives of the city who came to

Edinburgh 40,000 merks for "their outstanding against them and their Covenant." (1)

Seeing no sign of succour from his royal master, and fearing that he would soon be attacked by Montrose, Huntly sought to come to terms with him. It was agreed that the Marquis should accept the old Confessions and sign a document acknowledging the King's authority and "the liberties both of Church and State", though he should not have to undergo the humiliation of signing the Covenant itself. He even proposed a plan for the co-operation of the Catholics. This would have secured for the Covenanters the neutrality of the only force that seemed likely to trouble them in the threatening conflict, but it did not satisfy the extremists. It was held necessary that Huntly should return to Aberdeen to complete the Concordat, which he did in good faith that he was free to come and go as he pleased. This pledge was broken, and on the 14th of April he was sent with his two elder sons as a prisoner to Edinburgh. The second son, Lord Aboyne, was released on parole, which, at the entreaty of friends, he broke. This treacherous act is not in keeping with the other conduct of Montrose in this campaign, and it does not accord with his frank and impulsive nature, but it leaves a stain on his character that he not only did not oppose this unworthy action, but actually furthered it. In Edinburgh terms which he reckoned base were proposed to the northern chief, but he gave the brave and loyal answer: "Yow may take my heid from my schulderis, but not my hairt from my Sovereigne."

Meanwhile stirring events were happening further south, but it may serve for clearness to finish the account of the present troubles in the north before dealing with them.

Hamilton arrived in the Forth on the second of May

(1) Spalding.



with a fleet of twenty sail. His arrival was joyful news to the royalist party in the north, and raised hopes which were never to be fulfilled. Aboyne, who had been invested by the King with all the powers his father had possessed, gathered a large body of northern cavaliers, and having received a royal order on Hamilton for 2,000 men from the fleet, had expectation of striking a blow for the King. But the men were not forthcoming, and there is a story that Hamilton, knowing of the order in advance, had sent them home on the plea of sickness and scarcity of provisions. An opportunity, however, offered itself to Aboyne of doing something. A number of Covenanters of the north had arranged for another meeting at Turriff on the 13th of May, and were to wait for others to come in till the 21st, and then to act. Hearing of this, the Gordon party assembled a force of about 1200 men, and managed to surprize the Covenanters, who, after a little fighting, hurriedly dispersed. The affray hardly deserves the name of a battle. Though there was a considerable expenditure of ammunition, the loss on the attacking side was one man, and on the other two. It is known as "the Trot of Turriff".

After this victory the anti-Covenanting force assembled so strongly that the destruction of the Covenanters north of the Spey seemed imminent, and Montrose was sent to dispel this new danger. Passing through Aberdeen, he marched westwards, but could not find the enemy, who at his approach had fled to the hills. The idea of Montrose was now to do what some of the Covenanters blamed him for not doing before, namely, to destroy the castles of the hostile chiefs.<sup>(1)</sup> He first attempted that of Cight, but as he had no battering-train, and as his light artillery was practically useless against the stout walls of the tower, he began a regular siege. In a couple of days this was raised, and he was in full retreat to

(1) Baillie, I, 205

Edinburgh. This flight was due to faulty intelligence. He was informed that Aboyne, as the King's lieutenant, had brought a fleet to Aberdeen with a land force on board. The "fleet", as a matter of fact, consisted of two pinnances conveying an indifferent cargo ship. This, however, brought some trained officers, and a welcome supply of brass guns and ammunition. Aboyne had also brought a number of copies of the King's Proclamation, and the circulation of these and the news of the hasty retreat of Montrose soon gathered the scattered barons together, and Aberdeen was once more in the hands of the enemies of the Covenant.

Great as was now the need for every available man in the south, it was absolutely necessary to crush this fresh outbreak without delay. So in the middle of June Montrose again led an army to the north. The royalists judged themselves strong enough to come forth to attack him, and the two armies came into contact at Muchalls, some five miles north of Stonehaven. The northern army consisted to a considerable extent of highland clansmen, who had an intense dread of cannon, the "musket's mother", as they termed it. A feint attack by the Covenanters gave opportunity for a discharge, and the Highlanders, seeing the effect, though untouched themselves, fled from the field, and the other troops followed. (1) This encounter is known as the "Raid of Stonehive". An attempt was made to hold the Bridge of Dee at Aberdeen, but by a stratagem it was captured, and the city fell. A number of the leading supporters of the King managed to escape, but others were taken. This happened on the 19th of June. While the fate of the town was still undecided, news arrived on the evening of the 20th of the peace which had been made between Charles and his subjects. The Covenanters are said to have

(1) Gordon. Scots Affairs, II, 275.

been much disappointed at not being allowed to plunder the city, but had to be content with exacting a fine of 5,000 merks. (1) And so the sorely tried town had peace for a season.

We now return to note the doings of the Covenanting main body under Leslie. On the 20th of May the army was assembled on Leith Links and the Articles of War were read, and on the following day they began their march southwards, and finally took up their main position on Dunse Law. The army consisted of 12,000 men, with 45 guns. Alexander Leslie was the Commander-in-Chief, and he had an aristocratic staff, consisting of General Baillie, and Lords Rothes, Lindsay, Loudon, Yester, Montgomerie and Dalhousie. Argyle's following was posted at Stirling, from which they might control the Highlands. Other forces on the coast and Montrose's army in the north served to guard the rear of the main army. The rank and file were indifferently clad and equipped, but abundantly fed and well lodged during the brief campaign.

Robert Baillie, the minister of Kilwinning, had been chosen chaplain of the Ayrshire contingent, and as such was present in the encampment at Dunse Law. In one of his letters he gives us an account of the proceedings there in very graphic terms. He tells us something about himself, and that account may well apply to others who occupied a similar post. (2) "I furnished to half a dozen of good fellows, musquets and picks, and to my boy a broadsword. I carried myself, as the fashion was, a sword, and a couple of Dutch pistols at my saddle; but I promise, for the offence of no man, except a robber in the way; for it was our part alone to pray and preach for the encouragement of our

(1) Spalding says 6,000, and Row (page 520) 7000.

(2) Letters I, 211.

countreymen, which I did to my power most cheerfullie".

The Covenanters proved the sincerity of their professed desires for peace by the efforts they made to this end - efforts which some of the more extreme men considered far too submissive. Nothing came of them. The King was disappointed at the small support he had received in Scotland, he considered that his honour was at stake, and replied by a proclamation<sup>(1)</sup> forbidding the Scots to come within ten miles of the border. To show that their warfare was purely defensive the Covenanters obeyed. Their obedience was interpreted by Charles as due to fear, and he issued another proclamation, declaring that if the Covenanters did not within eight days surrender their fortifications, lay down their arms, and accept of his pardon, they would be regarded as traitors. The affair of Kelso seems to have helped to remove this misconception. A large body of Scots - four or five thousand men - were stationed at Kelso, which is within the ten miles limit, and Lord Holland advanced against them with a force of about equal strength, but finding they were resolved to stand their ground, he speedily retired.

Dunse Law is a rounded trap hill, which occupies an isolated position, and commands an extensive view of the surrounding country. On this the camp was placed, which is well described by Chaplain Paillie in few words. "Our Hill was garnished on the toppe, towards the south and east, with our mounted canon, well near to the number of fortie, great and small. our regiments lay on the sydes of the Hill, almost round about, the place was not a myle in circle, a prettie round rysing in a declivitie, without steepness, to the height of a bowshott, on the toppe somewhat playne, about a quarter of myle in length.

(1) Peterkin Records, p. 220. 14 May 1639.

and as much in breadth, as I remember, capable of tents for fortie thousand men." (1) The regiments for the most part were under the command of noblemen as colonels, and the captains were landowners of importance - men we might suppose to have been affected by the Revocation. The lieutenants were mostly veterans from the European wars. Baillie seems at once proud of the aristocratic officers and surprised at the harmony which was maintained amongst them, and the readiness with which men usually so haughty and jealous of control obeyed the orders of a commner like Leslie. At the door of every captain's tent waved a banner on which over the Scottish arms were painted in golden letters the words "FOR CHRIST'S CROWN AND COVENANT".

The number of men in this army varied at different times from twelve to twenty thousand men. These were all lowlanders except a few companies of highlanders. The warlike appearance of the Celts and their reputation for barbarity caused at once admiration and fear amongst the English on the borders. Every day the chief officers held a council of war in the General's head-quarters in Dunse Castle. Drilling of the troops went on regularly, discipline was maintained and the efficiency of the men continually increased. There was a good deal of religious enthusiasm amongst them, though it was not so universal as is usually supposed. No doubt many were still inspired by the religious enthusiasm under the influence of which so many thousands had signed the Covenant at the beginning of the preceding year, but others were stirred by lower motives. Some had joined the blue banner from patriotic feelings, some from the love of adventure, others because compelled by landlord or employer, and some simply for pay. Nevertheless it must be

(1) Baillie, Letters, I, 211.

admitted that the great motive principle of the expedition was religion, and but for this the army would never have been raised or marched. Each detachment had its chaplain, and every corps its eldership, who administered kirk discipline. Besides this there was an ecclesiastical judicatory composed of ministers and elders representative of the whole army. On all, willing or unwilling, the forms of religion were imposed. Paillie is enthusiastic in his account: "the sight of the nobles and their beloved pastors dailie raised their hearts; the good sermons and prayers, morning and even, under the roof of heaven, to which their drumms did call them for bells; the remonstrances verie frequent of the goodness of their cause; of their conduct hitherto, by a hand clearlie divine; also Leslie his skill and fortoun made them all so resolute for battell as could be wished." (1) But, unfortunately, this reading of Scripture, singing of Psalms, and prayers were not all. In his honesty Paillie is forced to admit "there was swearing, and curseing, and brawling, in some quarters, whereat we were grieved." (2) We can well understand this. Before as well as during Uncle Toby's time the troops swore horribly in Flanders, so the returned warriors would add their contribution to the local profanity of the Covenanting host, and add to the grief of their "beloved pastors."

Of the 5,000 men embarked under Hamilton for service in the north most were raw levies, of whom it was said that not 200 of the privates, and few even of the sergeants and corporals were trained to fire a musket. The fleet was detained at sea for nearly two weeks by contrary winds, and during this time the Scots, free from blockade, were able to import what munitions they pleased. When at last the ships arrived before

(1) Paillie, Letters, I, 213. (2) *ibid* I, 214.

Leith on 2 May, they found all classes labouring at the fortifications, which were already almost completed. Their appearance was the signal for lighting the beacons, and troops from many parts of the country, even from Ayrshire, marched to the Capital. The Forth with its many batteries was impregnable to Hamilton's forces. Soon the long confinement to the narrow limits of shipboard, together with the lack of fresh water and provisions, caused sickness to break out, and the islands which the Covenanters had left unfortified were occupied as hospitals. The Commissioner sent ashore the latest proclamation by the King, at the same time in his usual tactless way accusing the magistrates of fomenting the rebellion. They would neither publish the proclamation nor allow it to be published. Meanwhile many of his soldiers were dying and mutiny was threatening. Of the ten thousand men promised by the Earl of Antrim only 1,500 arrived. The five or six thousand Irish and Walloons intended for Scotland were driven back to Dunkirk by a Dutch admiral.

In England the breach between the King and the Parliament was daily widening and the popular discontent increasing. The papers written by Henderson and others had been widely circulated by the pedlars who traversed the country, and had admirably served as propaganda. The English, especially those who were Puritanically inclined, were made to see that the grounds of quarrel were really the same in both countries, and they were therefore opposed to the war. Lord Brookes and Lord Say refused to take part in it till the consent of Parliament had been obtained. Many of the militia asserted that they were not bound to leave their own country on any warlike expedition. The leaders of the royal army found no enthusiasm amongst their followers even when they possessed it themselves, which was by no means always the case. The English

Papists, who at first had been ready in promises of support to the Sovereign, after consulting the Pope, decided to withhold their aid till further liberty of conscience and worship had been secured to them, but this was more than Charles at present dared promise them. Huntly, who was to aid the King from the north, had, as we have seen, been prevented by the attack of Montrose and the arrest of himself and his eldest son. But despite all adverse circumstances, the King managed to collect an army of some 20,000 men, and advance to Birks, about three miles above Berwick. The Earl of Arundel was in chief command, Lord Holland was general of the cavalry, and the Earl of Essex was lieutenant-general.

Birks and Dunse Law are only a few miles separate from each other, and on these bright summer days the King through his telescope could see the camp of the Covenanters, and estimate their strength. The rival armies were of almost equal numbers, but the Scots had the advantage of position, and of spirit. Their intelligence department, formerly so good, had somewhat failed them of late, and they had no correct knowledge of his Majesty's intentions nor strength.<sup>(1)</sup> As Leslie's army increased, he gave hints of his intention to approach the English camp, but meanwhile was content to cover the Scottish border against any advance of the enemy. The royal troops on their part showed no inclination to fight, but were satisfied to throw up defensive trenches. Small-pox had broken out amongst them. Clarendon was of opinion that the King should have attacked the Scots,<sup>(2)</sup> but either fear or caution stayed his Majesty's hand. Neither side was eager to begin hostilities, and so they remained for some time face to face with each other, the Scots at once unwilling to quit their

(1) Baillie, Vol. I, 215. (2) Rebelln. 1, 153-155.



strong position and reluctant to fight their King, and the English lukewarm in the royal cause and unwilling to attack the Scots. At last a way out was found by which the Covenanters might secure what they armed for and the King's dignity would be spared.

One Robin Leslie, a Scotsman, one of the old pages, came over to Dunse Castle one day, and in the course of his talk made, as it were entirely on his own initiative, a suggestion that the Scots should offer a Supplication to the King before the English army had so increased that they would easily be able to overcome the Scots. The Covenanters, however, were by this time becoming aware of their superiority to the King, but being equally desirous of ending the war and saving his Majesty's honour on terms favourable to themselves, they took the hint, and on the 7th or 8th of June a brief "Humble Supplication" (1) was sent by the Earl of Dunfermline, together with a letter to the English Council. The message, as might be expected, was favourably received, and negotiations commenced. To save the dignity of the King, it was required as a preliminary that the Proclamation so offensive to the Covenanters should be read at the head of the troops on Dunse Law (2), but fortunately Sir Edmund Verney, the King's envoy, had wisdom enough to be satisfied with the reading of it at the General's table, and so to report the proceedings to Charles that he was content that his desire had been met, and he invited six of the Scots to come to Birks to discuss matters with an equal number of his own followers. A question as to safe conducts was raised, but it was decided to trust in the King's simple word. (3)

(1) Peterkin, Records, p. 225.

(2) Balfour, Annals II, 324.

Rushworth, III, 938. 938

(3) Balfour says a safe conduct signed by the King was given. II, 325,

The first meeting was held on Tuesday, the 11th of June(1). Rothes, Loudon, Sir William Douglas of Cavers, and the Earl of Dunfermline, with a fair convoy, represented the Covenanters. They had hardly entered the General's tent at the English head-quarters when the King came in to their great surprise. He was in an affable mood, and so continued during the other meetings that were held in the first week of the Conference. He expressed his willingness to hear all that the deputation had to say, and to clear himself from the slander that he shut his ears to the just complaints of his people in Scotland. Henderson and Warriston, owing to the Covenanters' suspicions of the king, were not suffered to attend the first meeting: "we had not will to hazard all at once". (2) They remembered the fate of Andrew Melville. They were permitted to attend the second and other meetings, and took a leading part in the discussions. There was much plain and lengthy speaking by the Scottish delegates, and though the English commissioners said little, the King spoke a good deal. Baillie says "the King was verie sober, meek, and patient, to hear all"(3), and everything went pretty well. At the close of the last meeting of the week, on the Saturday, the Covenanters waxed bold, and on their knees besought the abolition of Episcopacy. Charles would give no answer to this most unwelcome demand, but expressly desired them not to take the delay for a denial. At parting he gave them his hand to kiss, and they left the camp on seemingly the best of terms.

When things were thus moving so prosperously for the Covenanters to their great joy, on the Sunday some of the Scottish bishops, notably Ross and Aberdeen, had

(1) Balfour, Annals, II, 325.

(2) Baillie, Letters, I, 216.

(3) Baillie, Letters, I, 217.

access to the King, and contrived to regain much of their former influence over him. The result was seen in the next day's proceedings, which were somewhat more tart than any of the former, and closed with a demand for a written statement regarding the King's right to convoke or to dismiss Assemblies, and whether he could exercise a veto over their enactments. Correspondent with their principles they answered that though the King had power to call Assemblies, he had neither a power to dissolve Assemblies, nor to veto their acts. (*Peterkin 228*)

This demand, however, and the tone of the last meeting were displeasing to the Covenanters, who saw in them a device to gain time in the faint hope that English or Irish reinforcements might be brought forward for the King, or, by expending the resources of the Covenanters, compel them to retire. So they determined to dally no longer, and either have a treaty made, or to advance within a cannon shot of the King's trenches. Argyle had been summoned to Dunse Law to aid in the deliberations before the matter was placed in its final issue, for he was too important a man to the Covenanters to be left out in making a peace.

At last, on the 18th of June, Charles published a Declaration (1), which embodied the terms of peace. In this document as published he is made to appear as a victor dictating terms of peace to a vanquished foe.

There are in it seven articles, according to which the Scottish army was to be disbanded within 48 hours (2) of the publication of his Majesty's Declaration; the King's castles, fortresses, and munitions were to be delivered up as soon as his Majesty was prepared to receive them; thereupon the fleet was to depart

(1) Peterkin, Records, p. 228.

(2) Peterkin, 48 hours: Balfour 24.

with the first fair wind; all persons, goods, or ships arrested or detained since the 1st of November were to be restored; no meetings were to be held except such as were warranted by Acts of Parliament; no fortifications were to be erected; the Covenanters to release all subjects of the King who were held by them, together with all their houses, lands and goods. But this was not the whole bargain. Several other articles were signed by the King on condition that they were not to be published, lest the world should think that his Majesty's honour was thereby impaired. A copy of this paper was afterwards, by the advice of Laud and Strafford, burnt by the hangman at Cheapside Cross, London. "His Majesties honor neuer receiving such<sup>a</sup> vound, then by his assenting to so vnworthey and dishonorable ane acte, as in so scuruey a way to disclaime and disavou his auen concessions, seigned by his owen hand befor so many famous vittnes of both nations." (1)

The King could not condescend to ratify and approve of the doings of the "pretendit" Assembly held at Glasgow in the year before, but he was pleased to confirm and make good whatsoever his Commissioner had promised in his name. He agreed to this, and to the calling of an Assembly on the 6th of August and a parliament on the 20th, in a declaration made by the Lord Lyon on June 22nd to such of the Covenanting Lords and soldiers who had not already disbanded. Immediately after the declaration was made the Earl of Cassilis in name of the nobility, gentry, burgesses and commons, protested their adherence to the Assembly of November 1638, and tendered a paper to that effect to the Lyon, who refused to receive it. Though there were complaints made by both sides with reference to the fulfilment of the treaty, on the whole it was well kept by both parties, and nominally peace was restored.

(1) Balfour, II, 328.

CHAPTER IX.

The Second Bishops' War.

The Pacification of Berwick was rather a truce than a peace. The King had no intention of permitting free Parliaments and free Assemblies. He had got out of the immediate difficulty by making promises he did not mean to keep, and the pacification would give him time to prepare to take stronger, and he hoped more successful measures with his opponents. He made his real intentions clear enough to the Scottish bishops, who were meanwhile in a very unhappy position. According to Baillie, (1) "The King was weary of them; the whole court did hate them; the pages publickly gyred at them", and all their present consolation was a farewell gift of ten or fifteen pounds apiece from the King. Probably his Majesty's letter to Spottiswood, which came later, would give them some comfort. (2) Charles wrote, "though perhaps we may give way for the present to that which will be prejudicial both to the Church and Our Own Government, yet We shall not leave thinking in time, how to remedy both." He also, in the same letter, gave the definite promise: "It shall be still One of our chiefest Studies, how to rectifie and establish the Government of that Church aright and to repair your losses, which We desire you to be most confident of." If the King were sincere in this promise to the prelates, as he probably was, what are we to say of his treaty with the Covenanters?

(1) Letters, i, 221.

(2) Charles to Archbishop of St Andrews, 6 Aug. 1639.

Furnet, page 154.

Quoted by Peterkin, Records, page 234.

When the Lyon went to Edinburgh to make the same proclamation as at Dunse Law a similar protest was made. A more formal protest was made on the first of July against the proclamation summoning the Assembly in August, by which bishops as well as commissioners of churches were required to attend. (1)

Many of the Covenanters had little confidence in the King, and were much dissatisfied with the terms of the treaty, maintaining that these might have been more favourable if they had held out for a few days longer. (2) They especially regretted the surrender of Edinburgh Castle and the other fortresses, with their munitions. The citizens of the Capital greatly resented what had been done, and showed their resentment in their usual turbulent way. When Hamilton was passing along the streets to the Castle he was assailed with reproaches by the populace, and had to seek the aid of some of the covenanting Lords to prevent a riot. Traquair was similarly attacked, and on one occasion when passing down the High Street with Lord Kinnoull and General Ruthven, the newly appointed governor, he was stoned, and the white rod of office which was carried before his coach by a servant, was taken away. On his complaint to the Town Council, they added insult to injury, for all the reparation they offered was to provide him with a new rod. This was playing into the King's hands, for it gave him, if he so desired, an excuse for not attending the Assembly and Parliament in person, as he had promised.

Meanwhile, though the armies had been disbanded, the fleet recalled, and the fortresses given up, the King still lingered at Berwick. On Loudon going thither to apologize for the insult offered to the Treasurer, he was given an order requiring fourteen of

(1) Peterkin, Records, pp. 230 and 231.

(2) Baillie, Letters, 1, 219.

the leading Covenanters to attend the King at a conference on 16th July. Different opinions are held by contemporary historians as to the object of this summons. One is that Charles was innocently desirous to arrange matters for the approaching Assembly and Parliament. (1) Another view is that it was a trap laid for the arrest of the leading spirits of the covenanting party. Balfour says the Covenanters were warned of the King's intention by a friend at Court. (3) Still six of those invited ventured to go to Berwick, but Charles refused to submit the matters he wished to be discussed till all fourteen were present, and an express was despatched for them. Again the Covenanters sullenly remembered the fate of Andrew Melville and his companions, but the return of the six was reassuring, and all fourteen set out on their journey to Berwick. A mob, however, intercepted them at the Water-gate, and took away their horses. Only Loudon and Lindsay were suffered to go forward to make an apology to the King for the insult to the Treasurer. This confirmed his Majesty in his resolve not to go to Edinburgh, and he set off for London.

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh on 12th August, six days after the time originally fixed. (2) Hamilton had been asked by the King to act as his Commissioner, but begged to be excused, and Traquair acted in his stead. The Commissioner wished Henderson to be chosen as Moderator, but this was opposed, by none more strenuously than by Henderson himself, on the ground that it savoured too much of the permanent moderator. David Dickson was heartily chosen. It had been agreed that the Glasgow Assembly was not to be referred to, and the Covenanters had so far humoured

(1) Guthrie, Memoirs, 61. (3) Annales, II, 334.

(2) Peterking, Records, 238 et seq.

the King, but they proceeded to re-enact all that had been done by it. The Commissioner informed the Assembly that his Master had commanded him "not only to heare, but to consent and concurre with you, in everie thing ye shall agree upon." (1) On the 17th an Act was passed with one heart and voice, which, after a wordy preamble, declared that the Service Book, the Books of Canons and Ordination, and the High Commission were rejected; that the Articles of Perth were to be no more practised; that Episcopal government was unlawful in this Kirk; that the six preceding Assemblies - Linlithgow 1606 and 1609, Glasgow, 1610, Aberdeen, 1616, St Andrews, 1617, and Perth, 1618 - be accounted null; that General Assemblies be held yearly and oftener as required, - the necessity for the latter to be reported to the King by humble supplication; as also that the government of the Church be by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synodal Assemblies. The Lord Commissioner gave his consent to this Act, and promised he should ratify it in the coming Parliament. (2) This declaration was received by the Assembly with exultant joy. A number of the ministers gave expression to their satisfaction, and some of them did so in terms which showed how greatly they were moved at this restoration of Presbytery. (3) Old Mr. John Row, when called upon, declared with tears, "I bless, I glorify, I magnify the God of heaven and earth, that He has pitied this poor Church, and given us such matter of joy and consolation; and the Lord make us thankful, first to our gracious and loving God, and next obedient servants to his Majestie." Mr. John Wemyss "could scarce get a word spoken for teares trickling along doune his gray haire, like droppes of raine or dew upon the toppe of tender grasse, and yet withall smylling for joy." A good deal of other

(1) Peterkin, Records, 245. (2) Ibid, 205

(3) Ibid, 251.



business was got through by the Assembly, the chief parts of which were the condemnation of the Large Declaration, the sending of a supplication to the King asking the withdrawal of the objectionable Books, the renewal of the Covenant, and a petition to the Privy Council to give it the sanction of an Act of Council, requiring it to be subscribed by all his Majesty's subjects, to which Traquair and the whole Council agreed. (1)

On the 31st of August, the day after the Assembly closed, the Estates met. The members rode in great state, but not to their accustomed chamber in the Tolbooth. For the first time they assembled under the grand oaken roof of that Hall, which, though no longer a home of a Parliament, is still an ornament of the Capital. At the commencement of the proceedings there was some dispute over the selection of the Lords of the Articles, as the Lords Spiritual were not represented in this Parliament, but it was at length agreed that on this occasion a committee of eight nobles nominated by the Commissioner, eight commissioners of shires, and eight burgesses should act in that capacity. This committee passed the Acts of the Assembly, deposing the bishops, abolishing Episcopacy, and condemning the Large Declaration, but they were not allowed to be passed by the Estates. Traquair now knew that he had granted too much to the Assembly to be pleasing to the King, and he sought to make up for his liberality by hindering the ratification of the proceedings of that Court. Nine times in about ten weeks did he prorogue the House for this purpose. Irritated by this conduct, a deputation was sent to the King to implore him to allow the Parliament to proceed with its work, but they were forbidden to approach within a mile of his Majesty. Finally

(1) Peterkin, Records, 269.

Traquair received orders to prorogue the Parliament till the second of June in the following year, (1) 1640 and that simply by a commission under the Privy Seal, the like never having been done in Scotland before. After the prorogation the Commissioner was summoned to Court to give an account of the state of affairs. The Estates then, as well they might, publicly declared "the conduct of the King to be contrary to the laws, liberties, and constant practice of this free kingdom, and also a violation of the late treaty of peace; and they took God and man to witness, that they were free of the consequences in adopting whatever course might secure the liberty and independence of the Kirk and kingdom." (2)

The Committee of Estates then applied for a safe conduct for its commissioners to go to Court to state their grievances, and this was granted. Trusting to this Loudon and Dunfermline on the 15th of January went to London. The doings of the Assembly and Parliament were most displeasing to his Majesty, and he was determined on a renewal of the war. At this time he was getting his army ready to invade Scotland, and to gain time for this the commissioners were kept hanging about the Court. (3) Not till the third of March had they an audience with the King, but on this occasion Loudon spoke with great freedom. (4) Various discussions ensued, but these were devised merely to put off time. At last, in spite of the safe conduct, Loudon was arrested and sent to the Tower. On the charge of being concerned in a letter which was addressed to the King of France by the Covenanters, though never sent, he was without trial, and on the

(1) Balfour, Annales, II, 362.

(2) Rushworth, III, 955.

(3) Balfour, Annales, II, 363.

(4) Rushworth, 992, 1016, etc. ||

King's own letter, sentenced to death. This only became known to the Lieutenant of the Tower and the Marquis of Hamilton the night before the day fixed for his execution, but Hamilton, realizing the enormity and danger of the proceeding, hastened to the King who was already in bed, and with great difficulty persuaded him to destroy the warrant, though the Earl was not released for several months, and then on doubtful terms.(1)

Charles was confirmed in his resolve for war by the counsels of Laud and Strafford, but the great difficulty was the raising of the necessary funds. The campaign of the last summer had cost him about £300,000, which was more than his illegal imposts could meet, and he was now sore pressed for means to supply his ordinary expenditure. How then was he to meet the expenses of another war? Strafford and other lords advised him to summon a Parliament, and though this was most distasteful to him, Charles felt that it was absolutely necessary. So after eleven years intermission England once more had a House of Commons. The King counted on the Covenanters' "au roi" letter to stir up a patriotic enthusiasm against their old enemies in the north, but the attempt utterly failed. The English as a whole had no wish to see the Scots defeated. They realized that at present they had much in common with them, and the Parliamentary party at least saw in them possible allies rather than actual foes. They demanded that the intention of war against the Scots should be abandoned, and before they would grant taxes of any kind, they must have their own grievances redressed. The King was wroth, and after a session of only 23 days the Parliament - "The Short Parliament" - was dissolved. This added at once to the irritation of

(1) Peterkin, Records, p. 283.

the Parliamentarians against the King and inclined them to be more friendly with the Scots. Charles offered various concessions to the Commons, but in vain; grievances must be removed. By various devices and from various sources the King at length raised a considerable sum. The Irish, against the orders of the Pope, gave liberally. Convocation made a large grant and other royalists helped. And so Charles was able to raise and equip an army, which he appointed to assemble at York.

The Covenanters in the meantime had not been idle. The intentions of the King were well known, and they prepared to meet them. During the nominal peace the Tables had kept in touch with those experienced officers who had served in the 1639 campaign. In March military districts were assigned to certain commanders and plans of defence arranged. Leslie's commission was renewed on the 27th of April. The preachers were fervent in appeals for support to the good cause of religion and liberty. A plan for a national conscription of every fourth man was arranged. The people as a whole responded heartily. Volunteers were numerous. Contributions of money and of plate were liberal. Loans were raised and an assessment levied. Non-Covenanters were fined and plundered. Munitions were brought over from the Continent, and by the month of May soldiers were being mobilised and drilled. But we have to remember that Scotland was then a poor country, and it was hard on her to maintain so large an army.

On June 2nd 1640 the Scottish Parliament again assembled. No Commissioner from the King was present, but Lords Elphinston and Napier, the Justice Clerk and the King's Advocate, presented an order from his Majesty for another prorogation. Elphinston and Napier, however, had some doubt as to the legality of

the proceeding, and at last declined to act. The others could do nothing without them. Whether this was a blunder or a deliberate trick, the design of the Court was defeated. The Estates voted themselves a lawful Parliament, and proceeded to business. In 1560 the Reformation was carried through in opposition to royalty, but the Act was prudently confirmed in 1567. Now the Estates again defied the Crown. Acting in the King's name, and technically speaking under his authority, they began a parliamentary war with him. They elected Lord Balfour of Burleigh as their President. A vindication of their position was put on record, and before beginning their legislative business they agreed with the testimony of the Assembly against the Large Declaration, and ordained that the authors and spreaders thereof should be punished under the laws of the Kingdom for leasing-making between the King and his subjects.<sup>(1)</sup> The Acts of the Assembly were ratified. Presbyteries were ordered to plant ministers with consent of the people in vacant churches. The Covenant was adopted as an Act, and all citizens were ordered to subscribe it under civil penalties. They began by the imposition of this test upon themselves: any member of the Estates who failed to subscribe it would be disqualified to sit or vote. Amongst the other legislative enactments of this Parliament was the appointment of a permanent "Committee of Estates", to act when the Parliament was not sitting. This body might sit "in the camp" as well as at the seat of government. On the 11th of June they adjourned till November, with, of course, the usual profession of loyalty.

While the Parliament was yet sitting hostilities had already broken out. The royal magazines of munitions were invested, and some of them captured. Edinburgh

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. V, 256 - 7.

Castle was firing on the town and the Covenanting troops were firing on the Castle, which made a gallant defence till the 15th of September, when its greatly reduced and diseased garrison surrendered. Argyle was marching his forces across country into Angus, subduing the chiefs who would not subscribe the Covenant. Major-General Monro with his army was at work in the north on a similar errand. At the beginning of August he was at Banff, where, Balfour tells us, "he plays the deuil" (1) in the destruction he wrought amongst the non-covenanters. In these expeditions many who refused to sign the Covenant were sent to Edinburgh as prisoners, their lands ravaged, their houses plundered, and heavy fines imposed.

An Assembly was held at Aberdeen on the 28th of July. Here, as in the case of the late Parliament, no royal Commissioner appeared, and here also they acted without one. The matters brought before the Assembly were neither numerous nor of great importance. A number of the "Aberdeen Doctors" were put on trial, and deposed for various offences in matters of doctrine and for upholding Episcopacy. All idolatrous monuments were ordered to be demolished. No preacher or Schoolmaster was to be allowed even to reside within a burgh, university, or college, who refused to sign the Covenant. An interesting sidelight on the internal condition of the Church is given in a discussion over alleged Brownist practices in certain quarters.

On the English army advancing toward the border, the Covenanting army of some 22,000 foot and 3,000 horse marched south towards the end of July, and encamped at Choicelee, near their old quarters at Dunse Law. Alexander Leslie was again in command, and a

(1) Balfour, *Annales*, II, 382.

number of leading ministers were appointed chaplains, and accompanied the troops. For about three weeks they remained here, busily engaged in drilling and preparing for an advance into England. The leaders took care to advise the English people as to the purpose of their invasion. Two papers in particular were widely circulated. One was entitled "Six Considerations of the Lawfulness of our Expedition to England Manifested." (1) Another was styled "the Intentions of the army of the Kingdom of Scotland declared to their brethren in England." Private correspondence also went on, of which we have instances in such matters as "The Saville Letter". Charles answered these manifestoes by issuing a royal proclamation, in which he declared the Scots to be rebels and their declarations to be false and treasonable.

Notwithstanding all their preparations, the Scots army was too short of money, food, and clothing to allow of a confident advance into England, and Rothes, Loudon and Warriston were sent to Edinburgh to ask for further contributions. They succeeded better than they had expected. The preachers took up the plea, and H. Rollock spoke so "sweetlie" to the people on the Sunday that the women of the town on that very afternoon and on the following day provided a store of coarse cloth sufficient to make tents for the whole army. (2) This was specially sought to prevent the men from cutting down the young plantations of the English in order to build huts. The local Englishmen were very proud of these plantations, and it was a happy indication of the good feeling of the Scots that they forbore to destroy them. On the Monday a meeting of the men folks was held in Edinburgh, and they ad-

(1) Printed in Peterkin's Records, pp.297-299.

(2) Baillie, Letters, 1,255-256.

vanced "verie fair soumes of monie" on security, so that on the Tuesday the deputation from the camp carried back with them over a hundred thousand pounds Scots and a good hope of almost as much more to follow shortly. The sum levied on the people came in very slowly, and they had no hope of receiving anything from the friends in England till they went to fetch it, so this advance must have proved helpful, though it did not go very far to meet the upwards of 20,000 merks which their army cost every day.

The army passed the Tweed at Coldstream on the 20th of August, the cavalry standing in the water to break the current, while the infantry with the water up to their middle crossed over. It fell to the lot of Montrose's detachment to be in the van that day, and the Earl himself was the first man to cross on foot. Having thus encouraged his men, he returned for them, and led them through the dangerous ford with the loss of a single man. From Frewick the Covenanters sent a letter to Lord Conway and another to the Mayor of Newcastle, stating the purpose of their advance, and requesting a free passage through the town that they might submit their grievances to the King, but neither gave them an answer, returning their missives unopened.

On the 27th of August they were at Newburn on the banks of the Tyne, about five miles from Newcastle, and where the river is fordable at low water. Conway had been sent forward with a force of several thousand men to hinder their passage, but with orders not to engage if it could be avoided till the King's army came up. (1) The troops were well accoutred and the cavalry well mounted. An entrenched position had been prepared on the south side of the river, at apparently the only place where the Scots could cross. At

(1) Rushworth, III, 1236.



Newburn the Tyne is shallow, the south bank is a flat haugh, with a hill about a mile back from the river; the north bank is steep, so that the Covenanters overlooked and to some extent commanded the enemy's position. The English evidently considered that with artillery and field works they could hold the ford against a much more numerous force if it were unprovided with cannon, which the Scots gave no sign of possessing. But this was only one other of the military artifices which Leslie had learned in the continental wars. Cannon of a peculiar kind had been made. Apparently they had a tin ("white metal") core which was covered with leather and stoutly corded. Such guns were easily transported owing to their lightness, though they could only stand being discharged a few times. Some of these were hidden among bushes and some were mounted on the strong, squat tower of Newburn Church. When the Covenanters began to cross the river about four o'clock in the afternoon of the 28th of August, the enemy's artillery and musketry began to play upon them though with little effect. To the great surprize of the English their fire was returned by much heavier artillery than their own. The shock of this surprize, trying enough for veterans, completely demoralised the raw recruits of the King's army - according to their own commander, "most of them the meanest sort of men about London". The foot at once fell into confusion, and the Scots passed safely over. Some of the horse made a better fight, driving some of the enemy back to the river, but they too fell into disorder, and many were taken prisoners. Leslie had no desire to shed unnecessary blood, and no pursuit followed. The loss on neither side was heavy: the estimates of from one to five hundred killed on the English side, of which Baillie

writes (1), were probably exaggerations, while those of a modern writer of forty to fifty English and about a tenth of that number of Scots (2) is probably too low. The battle was a small affair in itself, but it had a great influence on all the Civil War which followed.

On the next day Newcastle was surrendered to the victors of Newburn, and shortly afterwards Durham, Tynemouth and Shields were given up with their provisions and shipping. The English advanced army had been in occupation of Newcastle for about a month, and had accumulated considerable stores of provisions and warlike materials, but why they were not prepared to stand a siege is not clear. The Scots, according to the English tradition, were a race of fierce marauders, and the Highlanders especially a source of terror, so that Baillie probably explains the matter when he tells "the souldiers and chief citizens had fled out of it in great haste." (3) The poorly disciplined London men could not abide the approach of the "salvages" from the north, and fled in panic. A number of the principal citizens had done the same by land and sea, with or without bag or baggage. According to their custom, two of the Covenanting ministers, Cant and Henderson, preached in the churches of the town they had occupied. The cavaliers who had been taken at Newburn were held to ransom, but the common soldiers, being mostly pressed men, were set free. Fugitive citizens were invited to return, good order was maintained, the miners were allowed to go on with their work and to export coal to London, whatever was requisitioned for the use of the army was paid for in cash or in promises, though extortionate prices were charged. (4)

(1) Letters *I*, 257.

(4) Balfour, *II*, 393.

(2) J. Hill Burton. *Hist.* *VII*, 108.

(3) Baillie, *1*, 259.

Though successful so far, and now well provisioned, the Covenant chiefs did not feel assured of their position. Owing to the former scarcity of food and the strictness of the military discipline to which they were unaccustomed and which they resented, many of their men had deserted, and Leslie had to decimate the deserters. They were disappointed at not receiving help from the English (1); they were still short of money; and they feared a rising of the people if they troubled them. Their intelligence department was defective: they neither knew with any certainty where the King was nor what force he commanded. They were concerned as to the whereabouts of the 10,000 Irish, against whose expected invasion Argyle and Eglinton had been appointed to guard, as a rumour was current that they had been transported to England. On the 31st Dunglas Castle, which contained a large supply of gunpowder, was blown up, and the Earl of Haddington and some eighty others killed in the explosion. It is uncertain whether this was due to accident or design, but Baillie appears to have no doubt that it was the deliberate crime of an English page of the Earl. On the other hand, they had some encouragements. On the day they crossed the Tyne the strong fortress of Dumbarton had capitulated owing to the severe losses the garrison had sustained by disease; and an attack made by the garrison of Berwick on their leaguer at Dunse had been repulsed. On the 15th of September that 'thorn in their foot' (2), Edinburgh Castle, was to be removed by the surrender of the fortress, whose garrison, to the great annoyance of the Committee at Newcastle, were allowed to depart with the honours of war. But the people of Edinburgh had suffered much from their guns, and feared the loss of the

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1,258. (2) Ibid. 260

regalia, which was in their hands, so that they were glad to get rid of them on any terms. Soon after Caerlaverock and Thrieff capitulated, all Scotland was in their hands, (1) and the men who had been fighting enemies at home were now free for work elsewhere.

At the beginning of September considering themselves in a good position to treat with the King, they sent Mr. Hew Cathcart to his Majesty with a humble supplication, asking if he would be pleased to hear and remedy their grievances. Being forbidden to address such papers directly to the King, they did so through the Earl of Lanark, the brother of the Marquis of Hamilton, the newly appointed Secretary for Scots Affairs. (2) The document is couched in humble terms, which seem strangely submissive in men who have just met and defeated the King's troops in the field of battle. At first reading it seems the production of men in grievous straits, regretting and apologising for what has just happened. They had been on a peaceable journey to present their grievances to his Majesty, paying their way and injuring no man, till they were pressed by strength of arms to put an opposing force out of the way, and as some of their antagonists themselves confessed when at the point of death (3), they had been resisted at Newburn by men who had sinned against their own consciences and brought their blood upon their own heads. Loyal and humble subjects as they were, they still insisted in the same submissive way of petitioning, and "most humbly praying his Majesty would in the deepness of his royall wisdom, consider at least some of our

(1) Baillie, Letters, 1, 260

(2) Peterkin, Records, 299-300.

(3) Balfour, Annales, II, 394.

pressing grievances, prouyde for the repairing of our wronges and loss, with the adwysse and consent of the estaites of the kingdom of England, conweinet in parliament, sattle ane firme and durable peace, against all innouations by sea and by land." (1) There is probably evidence here that there was some understanding that there was a common cause between the English Parliament and themselves. Charles must have been made to pause at the reading of this sentence, bidding him do what he had so long declined to do. But notwithstanding the humility of their supplication and the strength of their profession of loyalty, the Covenanters had made it plain that it was their intention to march on York if something were not done soon. (2)

About the same time a petition was signed by twelve English peers asking that a Parliament be called "within some shorte and convenient tymes". (3) They state some of the great grievances under which the people lay; beg that the authors and counsellors of them be brought to legal trial; and that the present war be brought to an end. To the English petition the King replied that he had summoned a great Council of the peers to meet at York on the 24th of September, to consider what was fittest to be done for his own honour and the safety of his Kingdom. To the Scots petition a short answer was received from Lanark, asking them to forward the particulars of their demands. Sir William Fleming was sent to York on the 8th of September with a letter from the Committee explaining what they sought in seven articles. The first six deal with sundry grievances which they require to be redressed. The last even more plainly

(1) Balfour, Annales, II, 395 (2) Baillie, I, 263.

(3) Balfour, Annales, II, 400.

than their supplication of the beginning of the month shows that the Covenanters and the English Parliament were now consciously at one in striving to achieve a common end. "Seventhly: That the Declaration made against us as Traytors may be recalled, and in end, by advice and consent of the Estates of England convened in Parliament, His Majesty may be pleased to remove the Garrisons from the Borders, and any Impediment that may stop free Trade, and with their advice may condescend in all Particulars, which may establish a stable and well-grounded Peace".(1) An earlier article besought that their countrymen in Ireland and England might be permitted to subscribe the Covenant.(2)

The meeting of the English lords was duly held at York on the 24th of September, and they were informed that the King had decided to summon a Parliament for the 3rd of November. At the Council they advised him to negotiate a treaty of peace with the Scots, and for this purpose a meeting of commissioners from both parties was arranged to be held at Ripon on the first of October. The Covenanters demanded a safe-conduct for their representatives signed by the Lords of the Council as well as by his Majesty, but were told that this was not the custom of England(3), and they agreed to accept that of the King alone. Several additions were made to the eight representatives originally appointed, and amongst those who carried on the negotiations were Rothes, Dunfermline, Alexander Henderson and Johnston of Warriston. The King proposed Traquair, Morton, and Lanark, Sir Henry Vane and Sir Louis Stewart, as being familiar with Scottish affairs, to act as advisers to the English Lords, but the Covenanters, according to

(1) Burnet, Hamilton, p.177. (2) Ibid.

(3) Balfour, Annales, II, 407.

their instructions, declined to have Traquair, "debarring of the rest from the tretty" . (1) As the English Parliament was to meet on the Third of November, it was agreed that the commissioners should transfer their deliberations to London. But before this was done the Scots insisted on provision being made for the support of their army in England. They had exacted £200 a day from the city of Newcastle, £300 from the County of Northumberland, and £350 from the bishopric of Durham, but now the delegates were instructed to ask £40,000 a month. Finally it was agreed that they should receive £850 a day, which the English Parliament agreed to pay for two months in order to ease Newcastle and the northern counties who complained of the burden. It was afterwards arranged that the Scots army be paid £25,000 monthly till peace was concluded. The English parliamentary party agreed to this all the more readily as the Scottish army at Newcastle was entirely in their interest, and a powerful weapon in their hands in their contest with the King. It was for the time as their own, (2) and an effective counterpoise to the army which the King still kept in being.

Alexander Henderson, Robert Blair, George Gillespie and Robert Baillie were desired by the commissioners to accompany them to London to act as their chaplains and to enlighten the English people as to the benefits of Presbyterianism. These were probably the most learned and able of the Scottish clergy, and well qualified to discharge the duties entrusted to them. Blair's special task was to satisfy the minds of those who were inclined to Independency rather than Presbyterianism: Gillespie was to cry down the English

(1) Falfour, Annales, II, 413.

(2) Baillie, Letters, 1, 280.

ceremonies, and Baillie to refute Arminianism. Baillie in his letters to his wife gives an account of his November journey to London, which helps us somewhat to understand the conditions of travelling in England about the middle of the seventeenth century - the bad roads, the cold, the exorbitant charges of the fine inns at which they ate and slept, and such-like details. On their arrival in London they lodged in a rather crowded fashion in Covent Garden, but in a few days they were invited to become the guests of the City, and were sumptuously entertained in a house adjoining St Antholin's Church. Those Scottish commissioners were persons of great importance at this particular time in virtue of the army which lay in the north, and were eagerly courted by both parties in England. Bearing in mind their military power, we do not wonder that they should be so hospitably received by the then Puritan and largely Presbyterian London, or that they who had so recently been denounced by the King as rebels should now be admitted to kiss the Queen's hand.

The Church of St Antholin was assigned to them as a place of worship, and it at once became a great centre of attraction to thousands of the citizens. From early morning till late in the afternoon on preaching days the church was packed, and the many who could not obtain admittance by the door crowded round the windows in hope of hearing what was said. The sermons and lectures delivered were no doubt largely controversial, and dealt with matters then stirring the public mind, and as the men who spoke were masters of their subject, they could not fail considerably to influence those who heard.

While the Treaty was being discussed other important events were happening in London. Strafford was



imprisoned and brought to trial, several items being inserted in the indictment to please the Scots. He was charged with imposing unlawful oaths on the Scots in Ireland, and with endeavouring to foment strife between England and Scotland, but these did not greatly count. The Commons felt he was too dangerous, and so he fell. Pym originally moved the impeachment for high treason on the eleventh of November; the trial dragged on; but finally the Lieutenant was condemned, and on the 12th of May he was beheaded. He had aided and abetted Charles in his despotic struggle for the royal prerogative, and he had to die as a public enemy. On the 17th of December 1640 the Scottish commissioners presented some papers against the Archbishop of Canterbury, which again were not of great importance compared with the English charges. Pym again impeached, and Laud was committed to the Tower, to await the fate that tardily befell him in 1645.

In the meanwhile the negotiations on the main treaty between England and Scotland dragged slowly along, but peace was finally concluded on 7th August 1641. The principal terms agreed upon were: That the Acts of the Edinburgh Parliament of June should have the full strength of law and be published by the King's authority; that Edinburgh Castle and other fortresses should be used for the defence of the kingdom with the advice of the Estates; that no one should be employed by the King in any office who should be adjudged incapable by Parliament; that as unity in religion and church government had been desired as a means of preserving peace between the two kingdoms, his Majesty with advice of both Houses of Parliament approves of the desire, "and as the Parliament has already taken into consideration the reformation of church government, so they will proceed therein in

due time, as shall best conduce to the glory of God, the peace of the Church, and both kingdoms". In addition an Act of Oblivion was passed, and £300,000 (1) was paid to the Scots in the name of "brotherly assistance". "And the men who had delivered England recrossed the border and dispersed to their northern homes."(2)

(1) Peterkin, Records, p.291

(2) S. R. Gardiner, "The Puritan Revolution", p.114.

## CHAPTER X.

### The Solemn League and Covenant.

Before the treaty was finally concluded both the General Assembly and the Parliament had met. The Assembly was convened for St Andrews on 20th July. Southesk was originally suggested as the Royal Commissioner, but Wemyss was appointed as a man more acceptable to the country. The members were most anxious that Henderson should be Moderator, but there was a difficulty owing to his not yet having returned from England. (1) This was happily overcome by acting on a precedent cited by Warriston. The Assembly transferred to Edinburgh, and Henderson having by this time returned, was duly elected. For a time the Assembly and the Parliament each sat for half of the day, so that those who were members of both might attend to their duties in both.

A good deal of business was transacted at this Assembly, but the two outstanding matters were (first) the suggestion by Henderson that a Confession of Faith, a Larger and a Shorter Catechism, and a Directory of Church Government and Worship, should be prepared for the use of the Church. Though Henderson made the proposal, he expressed his anxiety to escape the task of preparing those important works. (2) The idea was heartily taken up, and the duty of preparing the proposed books was laid upon the proposer, though the Assembly promised him every facility for doing so. His intention was that they should be of such a nature that they would be acceptable to worshippers on both sides of the Tweed who inclined to Presbyterianism. We

(1) Eailie, Ip. 359 . (2) Ibid I, 365.

know that there was a considerable amount of friendly intercourse between the Scottish ministers in London in connection with the treaty and English Puritan divines, and this was the inspiration of the present proposal. Henderson was eager for a uniformity of church government and worship in the two countries, and this was a step in that direction. The Independents were already making headway in England, and the Presbyterians sought to anticipate them by having a Presbyterian Church in being. We see this all the more clearly from the second matter of chief interest at this Assembly. The Moderator submitted a letter from several ministers in London congratulating the Scottish Church on the attainment of their object, and expressing a hope that Presbyterianism would yet be established in England, asserting that some of their brethren, who were for "Independencie of congregations", were great hindrances to that design. They went on to insinuate that some of the leading Presbyterian ministers in Scotland were of the same way of thinking.(1) They were certainly misinformed so far as Scotch ministers were concerned, for the Assembly instructed Henderson to write them a courteous reply, pointing out that they not only rejected Independency as contrary to the National Covenant, but that all their members were heart and soul against both Episcopacy and Independency.(2) There was thus a real basis for union between them.

Dr. Ross, in his History of Scottish Congregationalism, affirms, "So far then, as the polity of the Reformation Churches in Scotland during the first few years of their history was concerned, it was distinctly Independent and Congregational".(3) He admits, however, that it was different from "the Independency

(1) Peterkin, Records, 295. Baillie. 1, 364.

(2) Peterkin. 295-7. (3) Ross. page 6.

which was known in England in Reformation times, and that which found a place in Scotland at a later period.<sup>(1)</sup> The early Scottish Reformers regarded as a true kirk that in which there was a faithful preaching of the Word, a right ministering of the sacraments, and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, but affirm nothing as to the spiritual standing of those composing it. While agreeing to the three "notes" of a true church here indicated, the Independents laid the chief stress on the spiritual character of the members. Dr. Ross further admits that the Independent polity of the early Reformed churches in Scotland was very soon, though gradually, changed into Presbyterianism. Calderwood tells us something of an attempt which was subsequently made to introduce Independency into Scotland.<sup>(2)</sup> Robert Brown, the founder of the sect of the Brownists, who had been driven by persecution from England to Holland, in the year 1584 came to Dundee, accompanied by a number of his followers, in hopes of spreading his views in Scotland. He displayed no undue modesty in declaring them. He was well received by Andrew Melville, who gave him a letter of commendation to one of the Edinburgh ministers. In Edinburgh he had a meeting with a number of the Presbyters, in the course of which he did not hesitate to denounce the slackness of their discipline. He did not win their favour, nor apparently had any success in the country, for we hear of no churches being formed as a result of his visit. Soon afterwards, to escape persecution in England, John Penry, who was to be the first martyr for Congregationalism under Elizabeth, came to Scotland, but though he remained in the country for some four years, we have no information that he

(1) Ross. p.6.

(2) Calderwood. Hist. IV. 1 et seq.

accomplished anything for the advancement of Independence. Other visitors of like opinions are known to have been in the north during following years, but they do not appear to have won converts. It is clear, however, that the doctrines of Independence were familiar to many of the Scots, though not accepted by them. It was an age of preaching and pamphleteering, and of late intercourse with the English Puritans, would tend to make the teaching of the Sectaries, which both English and Scottish Presbyterians regarded as dangerous heresies, familiar.

The absence in England of a considerable army of the Covenanters, of course, weakened their position in Scotland, and provoked some restlessness in the non-covenanting districts in the north. The Committee of Estates acted promptly. A small army under the command of General Munro, a veteran of the European wars, was sent to assist their friend, the Earl Marischall. Munro was a man of a low type, and acted ruthlessly. The malignants of the district who were physically fit he sent south to join the army there, and he seized all weapons and tools likely to be useful in warfare. On the west Lord Eglinton had a force ready in Ayrshire to meet the expected invasion from Ireland. Argyle, with an army of 4,000 men, was in Argyleshire for the same purpose, but no invasion happening at the time, he took the opportunity, in the name of religion, of raiding the lands of his feudal enemies who were on the other side. He held a warrant from the Committee entitling him to use "fire and sword" against certain named enemies of the Covenant, and he did not fail to use it. According to Spalding's account, it was a sore time of rapine and bloodshed in the north. This was over, and Argyle had gone to London to be at the close of the treaty, and all remained apparently peaceful while the King was in Scotland.

For some time Charles had purposed to visit Scotland, and immediately after the conclusion of the treaty he set off for Edinburgh. London was no pleasant place of residence for him now. A petition for the abolition of bishops with over 15,000 signatures had been presented; the city was seething with discontent; the Commons were strong and antagonistic; ballads which he must have deemed seditious, were sung in the streets; the men who had been imprisoned and maimed for non-conformity were now the idols of the populace; everything seemed hostile; and his Majesty must have been glad to leave the city. He arrived at Edinburgh on the 14th of August, and was received with every outward token of loyalty. On the following day, a Sunday, he attended service in Holyrood Chapel, when Henderson preached from Rom. XI, 13. In the afternoon his Majesty played golf, for which he was taken to task by Henderson. Forgetting the lessons of the Book of Sports, Charles expressed his regret, promised to avoid such offence while in Scotland, and kept his promise. He was a different man from what he had been in 1633. He had not now come to impose his will upon an unwilling people: he had come to try to win them to himself, and to this end he was prepared to do things most unpleasant. One object of his visit was to obtain proof of the treasonable correspondence which was going on between the Covenanters and the English malcontents, but the most eager purpose of Charles was to secure the command of the Scottish troops. If he could gain the Scots, of whose loyalty he still had hopes in spite of what had happened at Dunse and Newburn, he might resist the English Parliament. Failing that, he might hope to create dissension in the Covenanting ranks, and weaken their power. In this last he succeeded.

The Scottish Parliament, re-modelled by the exclusion of the eldest sons of peers and other changes, met on the 15th of July, it being understood that no business was to be entered upon till the King arrived. A proposal was made that commissioners from the General Assembly should have seats assigned to them in the House so that they might hear the debates, but this was opposed by Argyle as opening up the way for the admission of churchmen into Parliament. On the 17th of August Charles opened Parliament by a very gracious speech from the throne. He had come amongst them, he said, to perform what he had promised - to quiet distractions, to give contentment, and to settle what concerned religion and the just liberties of "my country". All the Acts which Parliament had passed were ratified. The King was liberal in his bestowal of honours on the men who had defeated his army. Argyle was created a marquis, Alexander Leslie, Earl of Leven, Loudon was elevated to the Chancellorship, with a pension of £1,000 Stg. a year, Johnston was knighted and made a Lord of Session.<sup>(1)</sup> More material rewards were given to others. Henderson was given the rents of the Chapel Royal and Gillespie a pension. In thus attempting to win over his enemies he neglected his friends, and rendered some of them indifferent to his cause. By this Parliament the Universities shared in what was left of the revenues of various bishoprics. Argyle, however, managed to secure those of the Isles for himself. It is said that when Charles left the country he was a contented King leaving a contented people, but this was hardly the case. He had not secured the evidence of treason which he sought, nor had he gained control of the Scottish army - the disbanding of it all but three regiments was a bitter

(1) Peterkin, p.317.



disappointment. Nor yet had he won the Covenanters to his side: he had indeed planted the seeds of division amongst them which were afterwards to bear fruit, but not to his own profit. Several untoward events occurred before the King was able to go south again.

Among the covenanting party factions had now begun to show themselves. Montrose was a cause of disunion. He was barely thirty years of age, and of an ardent and ambitious spirit. He had already distinguished himself in the service of the Covenant. He had done a good deal to bring the North into subjection, and had fought well in the Bishops' Wars, but he had now brought himself under suspicion. Various explanations are given of his change of sides. One is that he was disappointed in not obtaining the command of the Scottish army, another is that he was jealous of the growing influence of Argyle, his hereditary enemy, and yet another is that Charles had won him over when he went with the Scottish commissioners to interview the King at Berwick. His own explanation is that he left the Covenanters because they had departed from their original and true position and usurped authority not belonging to them. It is certain that he was in secret correspondence with the king as early as the autumn or winter of 1639, and Baillie expresses doubt as to his loyalty to the Covenant in the same year. Now the charges against him were the sending of a certain letter to the King and being a party to the Cumbernauld Bond. The inner meaning of this document is difficult to fathom. In its terms it is strictly loyal to the Covenant, "which we have so solemnly sworn and already signed",<sup>(1)</sup> but a reference to "the particular and direct practices of a few" seems to indicate a dissatisfaction with some

(1) Baillie. II, 467.

of their fellow Covenanters, against whom they were prepared to act if occasion arose. The Bond evidently meant more than it actually expressed. There was at the time a suspicion in some quarters that Argyle had designs upon the throne, and the Bond may have had some reference to this which was understood by the signatories. Baillie certainly knew something when he styled it a "damnable band". In any case the Estates regarded the signing of another Covenant by Covenanters as an offence against the National Covenant; and Montrose, Lord Napier, Stirling of Kier, and Sir Lewis Stewart were committed to prison. The paper had been signed by other nineteen lords and barons, but the Committee thought it safer to have these four "Incendiaries" as some styled them, under lock and key.

From his prison Montrose communicated to the King that he could reveal divers secrets affecting the safety of his person and throne; and on the 11th of October he again wrote to the same effect, but afterwards on being examined by the Committee, declared that he had no particular persons in mind and only spoke in general terms. The second of his letters to the king was produced, and bears this out. What the first letter contained we do not know.

In October there occurred one of the most mysterious events in the history of the country, and which is known as "The Incident".(1) On the 11th General Leslie sent for Hamilton and Argyle - former foes but meanwhile friends - to come to him with all secrecy. They found him in the company of a Colonel Hurry, who told them that they and Lanark (Hamilton's brother) were that night to be invited to Holyrood, where they would be seized and stabbed or carried prisoners

(1) Balfour, Annales, III, 94. & seq.

to the King's ship, which then lay off Leith. Such is the substance of the story as told by Lanark. Another version is that on the removal of the three victims Montrose was to have control of the Castle, and that the garrison of Berwick and a force of borderers were to march upon Edinburgh. On learning of the plot, the nobles concerned retired to their own houses, where they made themselves secure for the night. Next morning they wrote to the King, explaining their absence.

They then made their way to Hamilton's house at Kinneil in Linlithgowshire. That day Charles was escorted to Parliament by a large bodyguard, in which were the sworn enemies of the fugitives. When the Estates heard of the matter, they immediately demanded an enquiry. The King with tears in his eyes asked for a public investigation, but the Parliament insisted on leaving it to a committee to consider in private. What secret knowledge Charles had of this affair we shall probably never know. Clarendon's story of an interview between the King and Montrose, in which the latter offered to give proof of the treachery both of Hamilton and Argyle, and of his willingness to kill them both, has the grave objection that Montrose was at the time a prisoner in Edinburgh Castle. Such an interview might have been arranged, but we have no evidence that it ever took place. The parliamentary enquiry came practically to nothing, as was probably intended.

Great excitement prevailed in Edinburgh at the time. There was suspicion of plots and fears of invasion, but all this unquiet was soon overshadowed by the terrible news which the King himself communicated to Parliament, when making a plea that they should speedily conclude their business that he might return

(1) Hist. Rebellion, I, 394.

to London. The news of the massacre was told in very mild language by his Majesty, but probably he had not as yet anything like full particulars. But horrible stories of the rising of the Irish Catholics and the massacre of thousands of Protestants in Ireland soon spread. Shocking tales of outrage were speedily current of burnings and slaughter, of women stripped naked, and turned out into the wintry weather to die of cold and famine, that others had been driven into streams and drowned, of little children killed with savage cruelty, of men crucified for their faith. Rumour no doubt exaggerated, but the lowest estimate of victims that had credit in England was 40,000. (1) Both England and Scotland soon had crowds of refugees to tell the story of their wrongs, and to beg for help, which was not denied them, as extant Session Books still bear witness. A wild cry for vengeance went up from the country, but how could Parliament entrust an army to the King, whose first act would almost certainly be to use it for their destruction? He was altogether untrustworthy, and some man or body of men must be found to act in his room. The revolt of Parliament was hastened and helped by the outbreak across the Irish Sea.

The Grand Remonstrance followed as a result. It was an indictment of Charles' actions from the beginning of his reign. Exaggerated and untrue in many respects, it yet shows what the Puritan public was thinking at the time. When it came before Parliament, from early till after midnight the debate in the Commons went on, speaker following speaker in strong expression of what he felt, and at last a majority of eleven votes was given for the Remonstrance, or in other words, for "no confidence" in the King.

Five days afterwards Charles returned to the City.

He submitted to listen to the reading of the Remonstrance, but gave no promise that he would act otherwise in the future than he had done in the past. In another month (4th January 1642) he attempted to arrest the five members of the House, <sup>whom</sup> he accounted traitors, and so Civil War was made more sure.

Scotland was at the time actively co-operating with the King and the English Parliament in suppressing the Irish rebellion, and had by the beginning of 1642 sent 10,000 men to assist in the work, and though not as yet directly concerned in the quarrel between Charles and his Parliament, it regarded the approaching conflict with interest and anxiety. Its two commissioners in London were to see to the carrying out of the treaty of 1641 and the Irish business, but they had also a mandate to do their utmost to keep a right understanding between the King and his Parliament, and between the two nations. This attempt at peacemaking was not a success, and provoked a rebuke from the King. In April both sides made an effort to secure the good-will of the Scots, and the Privy Council was thus placed in a difficult position. Chancellor Loudon was sent to York in April, but he made no speed. (1) Charles had hoped to win the Scots, and their continued neutrality was displeasing to him. A meeting of the Council was called for the 25th of May, and the royalists gathered in large numbers, trusting to secure a vote for the King. The Chancellor read two communications from his Majesty, rebuking the Council for their action and indicating the course he wished them to follow. Warriston, who had been sent from London by his fellow commissioners, brought a letter from the Parliament, thanking them for the good advice they had given the King, and asking them to resist the efforts of those who would

(1) Baillie, Letters, 107.

persuade them to interfere in the quarrel, or endanger the peace of the two kingdoms. A largely signed petition was presented, reminding the Council of the recent peace between England and Scotland, and beseeching them to make no engagement with the King that might endanger peace. Scotland was still neutral, but such neutrality was becoming more difficult to maintain.

While the contest between the King and the Parliament was thus surely and nearly drawing to the final appeal to arms, an Assembly was held at St Andrews. It met on the 27th of July 1642. The Earl of Dunfermline was the royal Commissioner, and read a gracious letter from his Majesty. (1) Charles clearly meant to keep on good terms with the Scots if it were possible. He promises to govern them by their own laws, and the Kirk by its own canons and constitution. Where anything is found to be amiss, he will endeavour a reformation in a fair and orderly way. He will defend its peace and liberty from all troubles from without and all heresies, sects and schisms from within. He trusts they will abstain from everything that may make new disturbances. The English Parliament also sent a declaration to the Assembly (2), protesting their desire for peace, and for "such a Reformation of the Church as shall be most agreeable to God's Word." "Out of all which, there will most undoubtedly result a most happy and stable Union between the two kingdoms of England and Scotland." The receipt of these communications from the two contending parties was very gratifying, and helped the Assembly to realize its importance. "We thought ourselves much honoured by the respectful letters both of the King and Parliament to us.

(1) Peterkin, Records, p. 320.

(2) Ibid p. 323.

It seems it concerned both to have our good opinion." (1) A letter from a number of ministers in England who (2) had adopted Presbyterian principles, was also read. The hopes of a uniformity of doctrine and government on Presbyterian lines were clearly rising. This had for some time been the eager desire of many who felt it their duty as religious men to do their utmost to this end. The bishops claimed Episcopacy to be apostolical, and the Scots ministers now began to claim Presbyterianism as alone divine. This being so, they regarded it as their bounden duty to destroy every other form of church government, and to establish their own everywhere. It certainly was wrong to force Episcopacy on the Scottish people, but in their thinking there was no wrong in forcing Presbyterianism on the English.

Replies to the three letters were duly sent, and in them we can trace something of the dreams that many of the Covenanters were now cherishing. In that to the King (3) they declare that their hearts "were filled with great joy and gladness" at hearing his Majesty's letter, but they practically deny their satisfaction by demanding uniformity of church government in the two kingdoms, praying that the King, "in a happy conjunction with the Houses of Parliament, will be pleased to settle this blessed Reformation." In spite of the earnest appeal of the Commissioner that they would not answer the Parliament without consulting the King, they did so at length and in uncompromising terms. (4) They urged that uniformity of ecclesiastical government must come first. But the Prelatical Hierarchy being put

(1) Baillie. II, 45.

(2) Peterkin. 329.

(3) Peterkin. 323.

(4) Peterkin. 324-6.

out of the way, "the Work will be easie, without forcing of any conscience, to settle in England the government of the Reformed Kirks by Assemblies." And finally they express their willingness to perform all that is required of them to further the work of uniformity. The Assembly backed up their demand for religious uniformity by petitioning the Privy Council and the Conservators of the Peace to do their utmost for this end, and by appointing a committee with almost unlimited powers for the same purpose. (1)

The Scottish Covenanters had themselves secured from the King what they demanded, but they knew that it had been granted with no good will, and some feared that what had been yielded in a time of weakness would be taken away in a time of strength. So all their sympathies were with the Parliament, whose views and claims were so much akin to their own. Others, however, thought differently. They had still feelings of attachment to the King. By the Scottish Parliament of 1641 a large committee had been appointed to act as Conservators of the Peace Treaty, and this body, in September 1642, (2) under the influence of Hamilton, asked that Queen Henrietta, who had gone to Holland, should return and act as mediator, pledging themselves that if this should fail, to support the throne. Among the signatories was Alexander Henderson, who now gave clear evidence that he no longer supported the extreme men of his own party. Finally, Charles would not agree to this and the scheme came to nought.

The inevitable war began when the King raised his standard at Nottingham on 22nd August 1642, the incidents of which in so far as they concerned the Scottish Covenants, will be briefly dealt with in the following chapter.

(1) Peterkin, 328. Baillie, II, 45-54.

(2) Burnet, mem. of Hamilton, 201.



The disappointing beginning of the campaign naturally made the parliamentary party more anxious for the help of the Scots. They sent an agent to Edinburgh, and followed up this with a Declaration to the people of Scotland. On this the King sent a counter Declaration. The Privy Council met on the 20th of December, and the two Declarations were submitted. Hamilton urged that they only publish the King's, but Balmerino held that if the one should be published so should the other. Lanark, who brought the King's Declaration, said he had his Majesty's orders for its publication. Hereupon arose a rancorous debate, but finally it was voted by a majority that the King's should be published and the other suppressed. This was the occasion of a rupture between Argyle and Hamilton, who for some time had been close friends, but who now found themselves in opposite camps. The decision of the Council was strongly objected to by the country. Many protesters, especially from Fife, came into the Capital, meetings were held, and a petition was sent, urging that the Parliament's letter as well as that of the King should be published. (1) The Conservators of Peace endeavoured to meet the objection by stating that the publication of the King's letter should not be accounted an approval of it. Hamilton and Traquair tried to secure peace by a petition to the Council, in which they asked them not to commit themselves to anything which might imperil the peace of the Church and the country. This was designated at the time the "Cross Petition", (2) and it was signed by many men of influence, but was bitterly denounced by most of the clergy. Later the Council gave way, and published both Declarations.

(1) Baillie. Letters, II, 59.

(2) Peterkin. Records 386. Burnet, Hamilton's  
Memoirs.

The Council gave no direct reply to the royal Declaration, but resolved to send commissioners to meet the King to offer to act as mediators between him and the Parliament. There were also sent commissioners from the Church, who were instructed to ask Charles to establish uniformity of religion in his Majesty's dominions. Their stay at Court was very uncomfortable and even dangerous. In February they had a number of meetings with the King, but he declined the proffered mediation, denied all their requests, and refused them permission to go to London, fearing their association with the parliamentary leaders. Though Charles at first refused to summon a Parliament, he was compelled by force of circumstances to promise to sanction it, provided they kept within certain prescribed limits. The Convention declined the conditions, and declared itself free to act as it saw fit, as had been deemed legal in the time of James V.

The General Assembly, the real representative and governing body in Scotland at that time, met in Edinburgh on 2nd August 1643. The King sent a letter by his commissioner, Sir Thomas Hope, in which he expresses his affection for the Kirk, and urges them to preserve peace and quietness. A deputation from the English Parliament arrived at Leith a few days later, and presented their credentials to the Assembly. (1) They had been so long delayed that Baillie says the Assembly was "ashamed of waiting". They expressed their thankfulness that the Scots had been preserved from the subtle attempts and practices of the Papists and Prelatists, and had secured the necessary reformation of the church discipline in the kingdom, and at the more near union of the Churches of the two countries. They also invited

(1) Peterkir, Records p.347.

the Assembly to send representatives to take part in the deliberations of the gathering of divines which the English Parliament had called to Westminster, and so advance the interests of the Churches of the two countries. Some seventy of the English clergy sent a letter craving the union of the Protestants against the attacks of the Papists.(1) The Westminster Assembly, which had now been in session for a full month, also sent a letter expressing their views in a business-like manner, declaring a nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland to be desirable, and inviting their "godly brethren of the north" to help them to set their afflicted ark upon the mountains of Ararat.(2)

The application for help was eagerly discussed in committees of the Estates, the Assembly, and with the commissioners from England.(3) Some thought to meet it by an offer of mediation, but this was shown to be hopeless when Warriston had spoken on the matter.(4) A serious difficulty soon arose. "The English were for a civill League, we for a religious Covenant."(5) On this point the Scots would not give way, and finally a religious basis was agreed upon. The draft of such a proposed Covenant was submitted by Henderson. This was strongly Presbyterian, and the visitors were desirous that an open door should be kept in England to Independency. The Assembly would have none of this. "Against this we were peremptor", says Baillie.(6) Their Dream of a Presbyterianism extending over both countries must not be so limited. Presbytery, and Presbytery alone they would have. In the end after considerable

(1) Peterkin, 348.

(5) Ibid.

(2) Ib. 351-3.

(6) Ibid.

(3) Ib. 353.

(4) Baillie, Letters, II, 90.

debate the consciences of the proposers were satisfied by the insertion of two expressions explaining that the reformation which was intended was to be "according to the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches." Vane is sometimes held to have been the suggester of this modification, and so to have tricked the unwary Presbyterians and safeguarded Independency. But it is probably more in accordance with fact as well as with charity to believe that at the time both parties were perfectly sincere in their endeavour after peace.

The proposed Covenant was "for the Reformation and Defence of Religion, the Honour and Happiness of the King, and the Peace and Safety of the three Kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland," and is entered into by the Noblemen, Barons, Knights, Gentlemen, Citizens, Burgesses, Ministers of the Gospel, and Commons of all sorts in the three kingdoms, "wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most high GOD, do swear". Here follow the six articles of the Covenant. 1) The preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, according to the Word of God and the example of the best reformed Churches; and shall endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion - confession of faith and church government. 2) To endeavour to extirpate Popery, Prelacy, superstition and schism. 3) With their estates and lives to preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments, and the liberties of the kingdoms; and defend the King's person in the preservation and defence of true religion, and

liberties of the kingdoms. 4) The conviction and punishment of all who hinder the reformation of religion, divide the King from his people, one kingdom from another, or make factions amongst the people. 5) Endeavour to preserve peace between the nations. 6) Mutual assistance and defence of those who take the Covenant. Finally, the document concludes with a confession of sins, and a promise and prayer for amendment of life.

On the 17th of August 1643 the Covenant was passed not only with unanimity but with enthusiasm by the Edinburgh Assembly; and on the afternoon of the same day the Convention of Estates passed it with the same cordial unanimity. (1)

Eight commissioners were appointed to proceed to London to negotiate the Covenant - Ministers, Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Samuel Rutherford, George Gillespie and Robert Baillie; elders, the Earl of Cassillis, Lord Maitland, and Johnston of Warriston, but neither Cassillis nor Douglas went. Maitland, Henderson and Gillespie set off for England with the English Commissioners immediately after the General Assembly rose. Warriston, Rutherford and Baillie followed about a month afterwards. Several changes in the Scotch commissioners took place during the sitting of the Assembly. The Earl of Loudon, Sir Charles Erskine, Balmerino and Argyle all sat for a longer or shorter period. Robert Meldrum, a political agent, was also present from the first.

The first of the Scottish commissioners were heartily received on their arrival in London, where they met the Assembly for the first time on the 15th of September. Those brethren had travelled by sea, but a copy of the Covenant had been sent express by

(1) Baillie. II, 90. Peterkin, 353.

land, and had not only reached the Capital, but had in part been discussed before their arrival. The other deliberations of the Assembly having been suspended for this purpose. Several alterations had indeed been already made. The English had included Ireland in the Covenant. Henderson was at first displeased that any alterations had been made, but at a conference held in Fym's house the Scots were satisfied that the changes were really for the better. Various difficulties arose. Some of the English ministers would not absolutely abjure Episcopacy, as they had sworn to obey the bishops in all things lawful, but this position was outvoted. Others were wishful to accept a primitive Episcopacy. When the Covenant was read in the House of Lords by Calman he was careful to explain that only the form of Episcopacy therein condemned was intended. Finally, after consideration, the Solemn League and Covenant - "League" was added on the suggestion of Vane - was received in St. Margaret's church on the 25th of September by the Parliament, the Assembly divines, and the Scottish commissioners.

It was a lengthy ceremony. Mr. Whyte, one of the English divines, prayed for an hour, and then Mr. Nye preached at even greater length. Henderson followed with a long speech in favour of covenants, showed how evil counsels had prevailed with the King, and declared the resolve of the Scottish Estates to support the English Parliament. The Covenant was next read from the pulpit, article by article, from a parchment roll, while all stood uncovered with uplifted hand, so taking the oath. Dr. Gange concluded by asking a blessing on the Covenant, and the wearied congregation was at liberty to retire. On the following Sunday it was administered in a similar way in all the churches

in the city and throughout the kingdom, to the Elector Palatine and to the English abroad, and to the army of the Parliament. On the 13th of October it was sworn in St. Giles, Edinburgh, by the Commission of the Assembly, the Committee of Estates, and those English commissioners who still remained in Edinburgh. Eighteen Privy Councillors were present, and the rest concurred on the 2nd of November. Printed copies were circulated through the Presbyteries, and men and women everywhere swore to it with solemn prayer and fasting.

The Westminster Assembly was appointed by the Parliament on the 12th of June 1643. Having found Prelatic government to be pernicious, Parliament resolved "that the same shall be taken away, and that such a government shall be settled in the Church as may be most agreeable to God's holy Word, and most apt to secure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearest agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other Reformed Churches abroad. And for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the Church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit to call an Assembly of learned, godly, and judicious divines to consult and advise of such matters and things touching the premises as shall be proposed to them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and to give their advice and counsel therein to both or either of the said houses, when and as often as they shall be thereunto required." This Assembly was to all intents and purposes a Committee of Parliament, the majority of the members of which at the time were Erastian, and had here acted in an Erastian way, yet not provocatively. The State was the controlling power,

trolling power, yet it did not usurp the function of any religious institution. There was no compulsion on any one to attend. Parliament nominated all the members, including the Prolocutor, but it was open to them to attend or to stay away. The Assembly was composed of 30 laymen and 121 divines. Ten of the former were peers, and the remaining score members of Parliament. Of the clergy most were Puritans, some were Episcopalians, five were Independents, but their number was afterwards increased. No Baptists attended. It was a body of highly cultured men. Many of the clergy were graduates of distinction, and a number later were awarded high academic posts.

The meeting of the Assembly was forbidden by Charles on the 22nd of June as illegal, but though this no doubt hindered some of the Episcopalians from sitting, the majority resolved to continue their work. The first meeting, when "69 or thereabouts" (1) were present, was held on Saturday, the 1st of July. On this day they considered the rules prescribed by Parliament for their guidance. One of them, which shows the spirit both of the Parliament and the Assembly, runs: "What any man undertakes to prove as necessary, he shall make good out of Scripture". Another rule allowed the choice of Assessors to act in the absence of the Prolocutor, for which post Dr. Twiss had been appointed. It was permitted him to speak and give his advice when he should think fit. On the following Saturday, the 8th, the oath was taken by the members, both lay and clerical. "I, A.B., do seriously and solemnly protest, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly, whereof I am a member, I will not maintain any thing in matters of doctrine, but what I think in my conscience; or in point of discipline, but what I shall conceive to

(1) Lightfoot.



conduce most to the Glory of God, and the good and peace of his Church."

Following out the instructions they had received, the Assembly at its earlier sittings had dealt with the 39 Articles of the Church of England. This had been interrupted by the consideration of the Solemn League and Covenant, but resumed, and by the 12th of October they had discussed the first fifteen of them. On this date they were ordered by Parliament to frame, in place of the discarded hierarchy and the Liturgy, a policy and order of worship more agreeable to God's holy Word." They accordingly proceeded with the preparation of "The Directory for the Public Worship of God."

For a very graphic account of their proceedings we are indebted to Robert Baillie, who joined the Assembly in November 1643, after he had procured "Causey cloathes", suitable for such company. The Kilwinning minister was much impressed by the Assembly, as he might well be. At first they met in Henry VII Chapel, but as the weather become colder they adjourned to the Jerusalem Chamber. Along one end and both sides of the room low stages were erected, with seats to accommodate 100 or 120 persons. At the open end was a raised seat for the Prolocutor, before which on the ground level were chairs for the two assessors, Dr. Burgess and Mr. Whyte. In front of these was a long table, at which sat the scribes, Byfield and Reborough. The chamber was well hung and had a good fire, "which is some dainties at London". At the Prolocutor's right hand, on the lowest level, sat the Scottish commissioners, and the members of the House of Commons behind them. Opposite them, and round the end, sat the English divines. The Lords of Parliament sat on chairs about the fire. The Assembly met every week-day except Saturday,

and usually sat from nine in the morning till one or two in the afternoon. The Prolocutor opened each day's proceedings with a short prayer. Dr. Twiss was "very good, beloved of all, and highly esteemed", but he did not impress Baillie as to his capacity as a chairman, in which respect Dr. Burgess as far as was decent (1) supplied his deficiency. Usually about three score of the English divines were present. These were divided into three committees, of one of which every one was a member, but no one was excluded who chose to come to any of the three. In various respects they followed the English parliamentary forms. They conducted their debates "in a most grave and orderlie way." No one was called upon to speak, but when any one rose of his own accord he was allowed to speak as long as he pleased without interruption. If several rose at the same time, he spoke who was most loudly called for. All addressed themselves to the Prolocutor, as members of the House of Commons now do to the Speaker. The members of the Assembly prepared their speeches, and spoke greatly to the admiration of our Scottish divine. Many of them, too, were excellent extempore speakers. "I doe marvell at the very accurate and extemporall replies that many of them usuallie doe make". (2) They voted by saying ay or no; only when the votes were nearly equal they stood up and were counted, a great saving of time compared with the Scotch way of calling the roll. When a question was once ordered that was supposed to be an end of the matter, but if any man would "vaige", Mr. Assessor soon called him to order. Many of their ways were good in the eyes of Baillie except their longsomeness, which he considered deplorable in that crisis of the national affairs. And he was right.

(1) Baillie. II, 108. (2) Baillie. II, 109.

On their arrival in London the northern commissioners were invited to become members of the Assembly, but they prudently declined. Since they came as commissioners for their National Church to treat as such for uniformity, they demanded to be regarded as such. They were quite willing to sit as private men, and give the best counsel they could on debated points; but as for uniformity, they demanded the appointment of a committee of the Parliament and Assembly to treat with them on that point. After debate this was agreed to, and a committee of Lords, Commons and divines was nominated to treat with them.

When Baillie and some of the other commissioners joined the Assembly they found them at work on the Directory, and engaged on a hot debate on the office of Doctor. Several of the Independents were very able men, and were contending for the divine institution of a doctor in every congregation as well as a pastor. Others held the opposite. Henderson, who all along continued to take an active part in the debates, through the appointment of a committee for accommodation, secured agreement that when two ministers could be secured for one congregation, one should apply himself most to teaching and the other to exhortation according to Scripture. The next point was that of ruling elders. Many able speakers argued strongly against this institution. Henderson, Rutherford, and George Gillespie, a brilliant young Edinburgh minister, only twenty-five years of age, all spoke exceedingly well in favour of it. The great trouble was with the stubborn Independents. Indeed no great trouble was expected from any other section of the Assembly, and regarding them Baillie says naively, "we purpose not to meddle in haste, till it please God to advance our armie, which we expect will assist

our arguments". Finally, it was remitted to a committee, and the wishes of the majority were met. And so the three parties in the Assembly - the Puritans (mostly Presbyterians), the Erastians, and the Independents - battled on. The conflicts between the Presbyterian element and the Independents were often very stubborn. The Scots, besides taking an active part in the debates, prepared and presented to the members of the Assembly a treatise explaining the nature of Presbyterian government, with proofs from Scripture, and in February 1644 the Independents produced one entitled "An Apologetical Narration," vindicating their own position; and a regular paper war went on. Indeed the number of pamphlets issued in the country during this period was enormous, as collections of those extant, such as that in Dr. Williams' Library, bear witness. The Assembly, however, succeeded in submitting a draft of the Directory by March 1644. Thereafter from the 24th of May, for seventy sittings, they debated its contents. At length the work was completed, and it was sent to Parliament, who sanctioned it on the 3rd of January 1645. On the 3rd of February it was accepted by the General Assembly. Baillie, Gillespie, and Warriston had come north to give any necessary explanations. The Directory and the lengthy Act of Assembly (said by Baillie to have been written by Gillespie) were both given "the strength and force of a law and act of Parliament" by the Scotch Estates on the 6th of February.

The duty of preparing a Confession of Faith suitable for the three nations had also been laid upon the Assembly, and they now proceeded to the completion of this task. First a committee was appointed to propose and arrange the main propositions, which were to be submitted to the whole company. It consisted

of seven English divines and four Scotch ministerial commissioners. The original intention of revising the 39 Articles was abandoned and a new Confession undertaken. They divided the subject first into heads or chapters, and each of these into sections. Then they divided themselves into several sub-committees, who each concentrated their attention on special points. These were then considered by the whole committee, and when they were all agreed upon any chapter it was referred to the whole Assembly. Here, as in the case of the Directory, the Scots took a leading part. The passing of the Confession occupied nearly a year, but on 26th November 1646 the Assembly was able to enter on its minutes: "The Confession of Faith was finished this day". The "Act of Approbation of the Confession of Faith" was passed by the General Assembly on 27th August 1647.

A somewhat similar plan was followed in the preparation of the Catechisms. It was attempted to proceed with the Confession and Catechisms concurrently, but this was found to be inadvisable, and the Catechisms were deferred till the former was completed. The Larger Catechism was authorized by the General Assembly on 20th July 1648, <sup>(1)</sup> and the Shorter (with proofs added) on 28th July 1648. Both were passed by the Scots Parliament on 7th February 1649. (2) (3)

The same Parliament passed an Act "anent Swearing of Religion and peace of the Kingdome," ordaining that the king or any of his successors should subscribe and promise to make all his subjects in the three kingdoms subscribe the Solemn League and Covenant, and consent to .... the establishment of Presbyterial government, etc. (1) Peterkin, Records, 496.

(2) (3) Act. Parl Scot.

## CHAPTER XI.

---

### The Civil War.

---

Before the Westminster Assembly began its wordy warfare more deadly fighting had been going on throughout the country. On 22nd August 1642 the King's standard was raised at Nottingham to summon the royalists to assist him to crush a rebellious Parliament. The war had now begun in earnest, and the nation was ranging itself into two hostile camps. On the side of the Parliament were most of the small freeholders, the merchants and shopkeepers of the towns, all the Protestant dissenters, and many members of the Church of England who still clung to the Church as it existed prior to the innovations of Laud and his followers. The municipalities with few exceptions took the same side. Of the House of Commons the majority, though not a great majority, were opposed to the King. And there was also at the outset a powerful minority of the nobles, some of them of great wealth and influence. On the royalist side was a large majority of the aristocracy and of the old landed families, who could bring large bodies of followers into the field. The Universities, the great majority of the clergy, and many zealous Episcopalian laymen, all supported the King's cause. Those who in following the promptings of their own tastes or interests were repelled by the austerity of the Puritans, artists, actors, and men of pleasure, all joined the same ranks. The Roman Catholics were entirely in the King's interest. Though Charles was probably quite sincere in declaring himself a Church of England Protestant, his Queen was a bigoted Catholic, and partly through love and partly through

fear of her he had shown himself ready to deal more tolerantly with the Papists than with the Presbyterians. Should the Parliament win in the present war the Romanists well knew that things would go hardly with them, but should the King win with their help, they might with confidence look to the reward of a fuller toleration than they had known since the Reformation.

Though it is impossible to draw strict lines of demarcation, it is clear that the Metropolis, the south-eastern counties, the industrial and more thickly populated parts of the country, important centres in the west like Bristol and Gloucester, and seaports like Plymouth and Portsmouth, were for the Parliament, while the northern counties, Wales, and the south-west, the more thinly peopled districts, were on the side of the King.

The two great arsenals of Portsmouth and Hull had been seized by the Parliament, while the King was almost destitute of artillery and ammunition, and was very scant of money. The Queen sailed for the Continent, and with the produce of the crown jewels, and the gifts of money, jewels and plate received from the Universities and nobles, purchased munitions of all kinds, and shipped them to England.

Some early skirmishes went in favour of the King. On the 23rd of October the first battle was fought at Edgehill, and though this was not a decisive conflict, the advantage was with the royal party, for the cautious Essex in command of the ~~royal~~ parliamentary forces thought it safe to retreat, leaving the way south open to the King. In hope of spending Christmas at Whitehall, Charles advanced on London, but the city train-bands under Skippon boldly stood their ground on Turnham Green. For a whole day, on the

13th of November, the two armies were face to face, but the King feared to attack, and at last gave orders to retreat, probably losing such an opportunity as he never found again.

During 1643, though they won no decisive battle, things had gone well for the royalists. The King's plan of campaign was to converge on London with armies from the north and west, and from the centre at Oxford, and thus totally crush the parliamentary forces. During the year he had made considerable progress in carrying out his scheme. As the result of a number of victories won by the royal armies, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, and the north of Hampshire were now in the King's hands. The very important city of Bristol also fell, and the royalists laid siege to Gloucester with every hope of success. The Earl of Newcastle was master of all the north. Had Charles now been able to concentrate his forces and advance on London, the victory would probably have been his, but the local feeling among his troops was too strong, and they would not move.

Something like a panic prevailed in London. Fears of a halter or a scaffold haunted the leaders, the parliamentary lords seriously debated the question of peace, women clamoured at the door of Parliament crying for peace, six of the few peers still remaining at Westminster fled to the camp at Oxford. Gloucester, however, still maintained its brave defence - a defence which it is perhaps not too much to say meant the salvation of the cause of the Parliament. Charles advanced against the city in person, and Essex hastened to its relief. The garrison was almost in extremities, but the advance of the parliamentary army compelled King to raise the siege. After this success Essex retired on London, but the royalists tried to bar his way at Newbury, where an indecisive



battle was fought, and the parliamentary general was glad to be allowed to continue his march.

Only in the eastern counties were things prosperous for the Rounheads. In August 1645 the troops of the Eastern Association were placed under the command of the Earl of Manchester, but Oliver Cromwell, the member of Parliament for Cambridge, was the strong man and leading spirit. He had realized what was the weak point of the parliamentary army. Quite early in the war he said to Hampden, who was so soon after to fall on the field of Chalgrove, "Your troops are most of them old decayed serving men, and tapsters, and such kind of fellows, and their troops are gentlemen's sons, younger sons, and persons of quality; do you think that the spirits of such mean and base fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen, that have honour and courage and resolution in them?" Hampden thought this good but impracticable. In spite of these doubts Cromwell determined to carry his idea into execution. He would pit religious enthusiasm and principle against the natural courage and spirit of the Cavaliers. He began as the captain of a troop of horse, and would be followed by none but men of the right stamp. His Ironsides may not all have been the men Macaulay (1) claims them to have been, but there is no doubt that they were the best disciplined soldiers and the best fighters in either army. Again and again they proved themselves more than a match for the aristocratic Cavaliers.

On the day that Essex returned to London the Solemn League and Covenant was signed. This meant speedy help for the Parliament. Pym had at last resolved to come to terms with the Scots. The bargain for Unity in Religion was made, and a Scottish army was promised. The triumph of Parliament was necessary as well for

(1) History, Vol. I, 112.

the Scots as for the Parliament itself, the victory of the King would mean ruin for both. The action of Charles helped to join the two more closely together in self-defence. His policy in seeking alliance with the Papist Irish rebels to reinforce his armies in England and to aid in the rising under Montrose in the Scottish Highlands, in spite of their part in the horrible massacre of 1641, wrought his cause much hurt. It lost him many supporters in England, and led to the signing of the Covenant, and the making of a treaty between the Covenanters of the north and of the south.

By the treaty between the Scottish Covenanters and the English Parliament the Scots were to provide an army of 18,000 foot, 2,000 horse, 1,000 dragoons, and a train of artillery. For this their allies were to pay £30,000 a month. The chief command was naturally given to Leven, who was called from a not very successful campaign in Ireland against the rebels there. General Baillie commanded the foot, David Leslie, nephew of the chief, led the cavalry, and Sir Alexander Hamilton the artillery. The demand of the Parliament for help was urgent, and in a few months the promised army was in the field.

Newcastle, a strongly fortified city, held out for the King, but it was of great importance that it should be captured for the Parliament, and for this purpose the Scottish army marched south, sometimes up to the knees in snow, crossing the frozen Tweed on the 19th of January 1644. On the 4th of February they were at Sunderland, but the royalist army which was posted there retired without fighting. Newcastle was then invested, and on the 24th the castle capitulated. In March Leven joined the parliamentary armies under Manchester and Fairfax, and besieged the Marquis of Newcastle at York. Prince Rupert

advanced to the relief of the beleaguered city, and the battle of Marston Moor was fought on 1st July 1644, in gaining which victory the Scots played a very important part.

For some time past neither side seems to have placed much trust in Montrose, though his sympathies were clearly with the royalist party. He offered, if a commission were granted him, to raise an army for the support of the King in Scotland, but Hamilton prevented this being granted. Still, Montrose kept up a Scottish party for the King. The Covenanters, learning of this, were anxious to regain him. They offered to pay his debts and promised him a post in their army subordinate only to Leven himself, but expecting more from the King, he dallied with their offers.

The Covenanters soon had reason to wish that Leven and his army were nearer home. In January 1644 Hamilton was committed to prison by Charles, and on the 1st of February Montrose received the commission he so eagerly desired, and was now at the head of an army fighting for the King. His plan of campaign was to enter Scotland from the English border, recruit such of the lowland Scots as were willing to serve the King, and, advancing north, to rouse the Highlanders. With such forces and the Irish brigade furnished by the Earl of Antrim, if not able to conquer Scotland, he would yet draw off for the defence of the country the army under Leven, which was so helpful to the Parliament and so hurtful to the King. His first attempt was entirely unsuccessful. With about a thousand men he advanced as far as Dumfries, but was there forced to make a hasty retreat to Carlisle, which was still held for Charles. He then made his way to Rupert, but he would not part with any of his men for a fresh attempt.

Still confident in the readiness of the Highlanders to fight for the Stewarts, he made his way north in disguise. The intelligence he there received was very discouraging. At length he learned of the arrival in Argyleshire of some 1500 Irish infantry under the command of Alasdair Macdonald, a Catholic and a devoted adherent of the King, and a sworn foe of Argyle, the hereditary enemy of his clan. In Ardnamurchan, <sup>he</sup> received no local support, the smaller clans being afraid of the Campbells. Montrose summoned him to Blair Athole, where the royal standard was set up and the fiery cross sent through the glens. Very soon he was at the head of 3000 men.

The Highlanders of that time were a semi-savage race, accustomed to tribal wars, hardy and capable of enduring great privations in time of need, and extremely mobile. The Irish auxiliaries, though better drilled, were still more savage, esteeming human life as of no more value than that of beasts. They were Catholics, and many of them had taken part in the atrocities of 1641. It is considered a slur on the memory of Montrose that he was willing to lead such savages against his own countrymen. Charles had proposed to do the same in the Bishops' Wars and Argyle had sent a body of Highlanders to the army at Dunse, but these instances hardly extenuate his offence. The fact is that the King was always ready to take the nearest way out of a difficulty without any regard to the morality of his action, and here the lieutenant thought himself warranted in following the example of his sovereign. Arrayed in highland costume he marched on Perth at the head of this savage host.

The citizens under Lord Elcho gathered an army on Tippermuir, some four miles from the city, to do battle for their lives and goods. It is estimated they were in number twice as many as the enemy, but

they were only an untrained mob, and quite incapable of resisting the fierce charge of the Highlanders. It was rather a butchery than a battle. It is estimated that two thousand fell in the attack and in the pursuit which followed. The surrender of Perth, which immediately resulted, was no great gain for Montrose. "The Fair City" in those days stood second only to Edinburgh for wealth and population. For three days the plunder went on, and then a great part of his army made for the glens with the booty. Some recruits indeed came in from the Ogilvies and the royalists of Angus, but Argyle with a large force was on his track and he could remain at Perth no longer.

He resolved next to attack Aberdeen. The unfortunate city was defended by a force of 2000 foot and 500 horse under Lord Balfour of Burleigh. The Marquis sent a demand for surrender, warning them that "no quarter" was the alternative. The only reply was to slay the drummer accompanying the officer who bore the message. This utterly unjustifiable act maddened Montrose, who swore that he would give up the city to pillage. The covenanting force was totally defeated on 13th September, and Aberdeen was soon the scene of horrible carnage. The wild Highlanders and the still wilder Irish of Macdonald revelled in butchery. Well dressed burgesses were stripped to save their clothes from being spoiled with their blood, and then murdered. Women were violated and slain. Houses and shops were sacked. And the city which Montrose had captured in 1639 for the Covenant was by the same leader made a shambles in name of the King. The next day Montrose with all his army, except some of the Celts who remained to complete the plunder, marched west. Huntly's own attempt at a rising had proved abortive, and he would not join Montrose, whom he had never

forgiven for his violation of the safe conduct which led to his imprisonment in 1639. Macdonald with 500 men had in the meantime left his chief in order to secure recruits in the far north-west, and Montrose was in command of an army of 1500 foot and 50 horse.

Serious danger now threatened in his rear. Argyle with a large force was slowly following him up, ravaging all hostile territory as he went. Montrose then marched up the Don valley, and turned down by the Spey into Blair Athole, doubled back into the wilder Highlands, and came into contact with Argyle at Fyvie Castle in October. At the first attack Argyle was repulsed, and before he could rally his men for a fresh assault the enemy had disappeared. Never able to bring his wily foe to a decisive engagement, Argyle in discouragement gave up his command to General John Baillie, and received the thanks of the War Committee for his exertions.

Macdonald had now gathered a large body of western Highlanders, and rejoining his leader, an invasion of Argyle's country was decided upon. Through glens believed to be impassable, and trusted in as such by the Campbells, the invaders were soon before Inverary Castle. The usual scenes of horror marked their route. Empty byres, burning houses, and bloody corpses showed their track. For five weeks the plunder and murder of the unfortunate Campbells went on. Argyle himself fled in a fisher's boat, and left his clansmen to endure all the horrors of the time.

Montrose next sought to capture Inverness and rouse the surrounding clans to the King's support. His route was through the Great Glen. Here a force under Lord Seaforth barred his way, and he learned that Argyle with 3000 Highlanders and two lowland

regiments was on his rear. With his usual daring - the daring that won him so many successes - Montrose doubled back by a parallel route, and fell unexpectedly on Argyle at Inverlochy. The attack was perfectly successful. The slaughter was heavy, some of the Lowlanders received quarter, but the Celts who had taken refuge in Inverlochy Castle were led out and slain. Argyle escaped in his galley.

The next move of the royalists was a descent upon Dundee at the beginning of April. Their stay in the town was brief, but it was a period of horror. Hill Burton supposes that had we a minute chronicler of events like Spalding in the case of Aberdeen, we should have an even drearier picture of pillage and cruelty. (1) The Committee of Estates was now seriously alarmed, and they brought over General Wm. Baillie to meet the danger. Montrose retired on Auldearn in Aberdeenshire and fortified the village, where he was attacked by Colonel Hurry on the 9th of May. By mistake or treachery, one of Hurry's subordinates gave the Marquis an opportunity of making an attack, and throwing forward his whole force, he was able to break and scatter the Covenanting troops. Hurry then fell back upon Baillie, and the two marched up the valley of the Don in pursuit of Montrose, but choosing a favourable position on a low ridge westward of the village of Alford, he was able to meet and defeat his pursuers.

This unbroken series of victories won by Montrose made him an object of terror to the Covenanters throughout the whole country, and it was clearly realized that strong action must be taken. One army was gathered in Fife and another in the west country. The best plan for Montrose was therefore to strike at each separately, and quickly. The

(1) History. VII.

scene of the war was consequently moved nearly 200 miles southward from the last battlefield. The fame of his victories had brought him many recruits from the north, and he was now in command of a larger army than ever before. Keeping close to the Campsie Hills, in which if needs be he could find a refuge, he took up a position at Kilsyth. Here he was attacked by Baillie, who, against his own judgment, was ordered to do so by the Committee of Estates. The result was the same as in former battles. The wild rush of the Highlanders broke the ranks of the Lowlanders, and a rout and great slaughter followed. Indeed, the royalists boasted that not an unmounted Covenanter escaped. (1)

The cause of the King was now apparently triumphant in Scotland, but the Covenanters were by no means utterly vanquished. The fortresses of the country were still in their hands. The raw levies who had been scattered like chaff, were not their only fighting men. The Lowlanders of a former day had often defeated superior forces of Highlanders, but that was because they themselves had been accustomed to the use of arms. Circumstances were now changed. Peace had long prevailed in the lowlands, and men had got out of the use of weapons, especially in the towns. Some of those who were sent to fight Montrose had never blown the match of a firearm till they went into battle. The Highlanders, on the other hand, were accustomed to fighting amongst themselves. Even so, it is difficult to account for the great disparity in the casualties on the different sides according to the reports which have been handed down to us. Nevertheless, however heavy their losses in Scotland, the Covenanters had in England an army equal to half-a-dozen of any they had yet

(1) J. Hill Burton. Hist. VII, 194.



brought against Montrose, and now they recalled a sufficient number of them to deliver the country from the ravages of the northern Highlanders and their Irish allies.

To save time a considerable body of horse under David Leslie was despatched north from Hereford before which the Scottish army now lay. At Berwick Leslie learned the exact state of affairs, and accordingly moved on towards Gladsmuir, where he expected to meet the enemy. The Capital having surrendered, and a number of the King's friends who had been imprisoned there set at liberty, Montrose was now en route for the borders, where he expected to meet the King, and be joined by royalists from both sides of the Tweed. In this he was foiled, as Digby utterly failed in his task of joining forces with him. The plan of their chief, however, was not acceptable to the Highlanders who preferred to be near their own mountains, to which they could retreat in defeat or bear their booty in success, and many of them deserted. Those of them who still remained with him, the Irish, who could not desert, and a body of mounted Cavaliers, had encamped at Philiphaugh, a level plain about a mile and a half in length and a quarter of a mile in breadth on the banks of the Ettrick. Here some earthworks were thrown up, and the infantry lay in fancied security, while the chief and his horsemen took up their quarters in the adjoining town of Selkirk. They were in a hostile country, but their intelligence department was badly served, for they were totally ignorant that Leslie was within four miles of them. Their scouting, too, was bad, for the next morning - 13th September 1645 - Leslie advanced through a thick mist, and took them completely by surprise.

The ground was unfavourable for highland warfare, and the dreaded cavalry were soon in their midst. At the first alarm Montrose rushed down to the river, and vainly attempted to organize the defence. The rout was thorough. Cutting his way through the enemy, Montrose and some of his mounted followers escaped northwards. Quarter was promised to the prisoners, but there was a savage slaughter both of combatants and camp-followers. The covenanting troops were filled with a wild desire for vengeance on the Irish murderers and on the men who had killed and plundered so cruelly in their own country. They are said to have been urged on by the ministers, and to have followed the custom of the time, but to us of to-day nothing can excuse the gross breach of faith, of which this was not a solitary instance in these civil wars. Later, under the form of law, a number of the gentlemen captured at the battle were executed.

Montrose made an attempt to carry on the war, but General Munro, a soldier of fortune, was sent against him by the War Committee, and he had to take refuge in the mountains. In 1646, when Charles surrendered to the Scots, and at his request, twice repeated, Montrose disbanded his army, and went to Norway. His brilliant campaign had lasted for a year and twelve days, during which he had won six victories, but had really accomplished nothing except to lengthen the war, to embitter both parties, and to add to the miseries of his fellow-countrymen. There is force in Lauderdale's view that his successes were the ruin of the King. They encouraged him with hopes of such a rising in Scotland as would enable him, with the royalists in England, to overcome the Parliament, and so hardened him against accepting terms of peace.

After the death of Pym in December 1643, a body styled the "Committee of the Two Kingdoms" was appointed to carry on the war and manage foreign affairs. Three armies were raised - a total of some 50,000 men. That of the centre, under Essex was to face the King at Oxford, and to follow him if he advanced against the Scots, as was expected. On the west Waller was to watch Prince Maurice. The force which had been raised in the eastern counties was to unite with Fairfax and the Scots, and to operate in Yorkshire. This strategy threw the King on the defensive, and allowed the parliamentary leaders - Waller in the south and Fairfax in Cheshire - to meet and cut in pieces the Irish royalists who had crossed to England. Oxford was invested, but the King escaped, and, waiting his opportunity, attacked Waller, and drove his defeated army back on London. He followed up this success by a decided victory over Essex, who had marched to the west. The infantry were surrounded, but the cavalry cut their way through.

The news of the victories of Montrose in Scotland and his own successes filled the King with hopes of triumph everywhere, and he boldly marched on London, but a parliamentary army lay in his way at Newbury, where a second battle was fought. Manchester, like Essex, shrank from inflicting too heavy a defeat upon the King, who was suffered to withdraw his beaten army to Oxford. This led to a quarrel between Cromwell and Manchester. Cromwell fought to win. "If I met the King in battle," he said, "I would fire my pistol at the King as at another." He thought the present leaders "affaid to conquer", and demanded a more vigorous prosecution of the war. This led to the "Self-denying Ordinance", by which

all members of Parliament were prevented from holding commands in the army. The principle on which Cromwell had formed his Ironsides was extended to the "New Model" army, Godly men were excused from signing the Covenant: liberty of conscience was allowed. Cromwell did not care much what a man's opinions were if he made a conscience of what he did, and served the army faithfully.

The peace party and the Scotch commissioners in February 1645 opened negotiations with the King at Uxbridge. These were prolonged for six months, but Charles thinking that the New Model had weakened the army of the Parliament, and that Montrose was about to master all Scotland, and come to his assistance, as he boasted he would, suddenly broke them off, and marched north in hope of joining his lieutenant.

Cromwell, who had received the permission of Parliament to retain his command for a few days longer, joined Fairfax, and was received by the troops with cheers. The King had won some successes, but Fairfax leaving the blockade of Oxford, hurried after him, and the armies met at Naseby, on the 14th of June 1645. After a fierce battle the royalists fled from the field, and artillery, baggage, and even the private papers of the King, fell into the hands of the Victors.

The war was now practically over. After Naseby the troops of the Parliament went on from victory to victory. Several months were yet to elapse before all the royalists forces were all cleared off the field and till Raglan Castle, the last of their strong places, was captured, but the Parliament had won the long-protracted war. When Sir Jacob Astley was defeated and captured in his desperate attempt to relieve Oxford, he said to his captors, "You have

done your work, and may now go to play, until you fall out among yourselves." Herein lay the danger.

The Parliament was largely Presbyterian, and, in terms of its treaty with the Scots, it was endeavouring to impress the Covenant, and make the country Presbyterian. Sir Harry Vane, Breton, Algernon Sidney, and others, supported by many of the new members elected to take the places vacated by the royalist members, advocated toleration, but a majority of both Houses still stood out for uniformity of faith and worship. The army, on the other hand, stood for liberty of opinion. Many of the men had suffered for their views - and some of these were outré enough - and now that they were free to express them, they were determined to secure full liberty of conscience for all. Between an army so composed and with many of its soldiers already inclining to republicanism and a conservative Puritan Parliament, differences were sure to arise sooner or later.

With the royalist armies driven from the field and their other forces cooped up in Chester, Newark, and Oxford, and some isolated fortresses, Charles was driven to greater efforts at negotiation. He loved absolute power as much as his father had done, he believed as strongly in the divine right of kings, and was even more firmly convinced that he was indispensable to the country, and in these beliefs played his "game" with his opponents, the game of setting the one against the other. The Parliament, the Army, and the Scots - with which of the three would he make terms? He negotiated with all three, but had no mind to submit to the demands of any of them. Had he been prepared to make concessions to the Parliament, he would probably have received their support. Had he granted the universal tol-

eration demanded by the Independents, he might have secured that of the Army. Had he accepted the Covenant, he would have obtained that of the Scots. He distrusted the democratic tendencies of the Army, and underestimated the attachment of the Scottish and English Presbyterians to Presbyterianism, but he had no intention of granting the conditions of any of them. His hope was in a quarrel between them, when he might possibly come to his own. On the 26th of March 1646 he wrote to Digby, "I am endeavouring to go to London, so that the conditions may be such as a gentleman may own, and that the rebels may acknowledge me King, being not without hope that I shall be able to draw either the Presbyterians or Independents to side with me for extirpating the other, that I shall be really King again." (1)

The siege of Oxford was meanwhile being pressed, and Charles considered it was time for him to escape, and on 27th April 1646 he left the city disguised as the servant of John Ashburnham. (2) At first he rode towards London, but turned northwards at Harrow-on-the-hill, and reached the Scottish camp on the fifth of May. Here his Majesty was received with every token of respect, but at the same time a close guard was kept over him. The Covenanters at once broke up the siege of Newark, and retired to Newcastle, carrying the King with them. This city was strongly fortified, and here they decided to await the result of negotiations.

On the 14th of July the proposals of the Parliament were submitted to the King. He was to surrender the control of the militia for twenty years, he was to take the Covenant himself, and to support the Presbyterian order of things in the

(1) Carte's Ormonde, III, 452.

(2) Ashburnham's Account, ~~Besebel~~ Tracts.

Church. This he was not yet prepared to do. He wrote to the Queen almost as frankly as he did to Digby, "All my endeavours must be the delaying of my answer till there be considerable parties visibly formed." That is, till Presbyterians and Independents were ready to fight. After a time, however, he offered certain terms to the Parliament and the Scottish commissioners, but these proved unacceptable. For months Charles continued to dally with the Parliament and the Scots, but would give no satisfaction to either. Montereul, the agent of Cardinal Mazarin, the Duke of Hamilton, and other friends of the King also busied themselves in efforts at a settlement, but all were futile.

Having obtained the upper hand in the civil strife, the Parliament was anxious to get rid of the Scots. The Covenanting army had doubtless saved the Parliament, but the Parliament being saved, they were regarded as a costly encumbrance. On 6th July 1646 it was voted that they had no longer need of the Scots, and requested them to return to Scotland. (1) By the end of November the arrangements for paying off the Scottish claims had been completed. Their original demand was for £2,000,000, but finally they agreed to accept £400,000, in instalments, as full satisfaction. Weary of the obstinacy of the King in declining to sign the Covenant, and in view of the refusal of the General Assembly to receive an uncovenanted King, and after a last effort to induce him to accept their terms, the bargain with the English Parliament was concluded. Thirty-six carts of coin were despatched from London in payment of the first instalment of £200,000. By 11th February 1647 the Scots had handed over their royal prisoner, evacuated Newcastle and the other fortresses they held in England, and recrossed the border.

(1) Rushworth, part IV. Vol. I. p. 306.

Royalist writers were wont to compare this surrender of the King to the act of Judas in selling his Lord for money, but most modern authors are coming to a more sane and just consideration of the incident. As Dr. Gardiner points out:

"The despatches of Montreuil and Bellievre tell us a very different tale. They show beyond possibility of dispute, that the Scottish leaders, soldiers and civilians alike, would willingly have renounced the English gold and have defied the English army to do its worst, if Charles would have complied with the conditions on which alone - even if they had been personally willing to come to his help without them - it was possible for them to raise forces for his defence."(1)

One of two other courses might indeed have been taken by the covenanting leaders . 1) They might have suffered him to escape to the Continent. But this would only have been to place an almost certain cause of strife between England and the Powers. 2) They might have taken him as a king to Scotland. But this would have meant civil commotions. The clergy would not have received him unless he signed the Covenant. Very probably it would have caused war with England, against the Parliament of which Charles would have been certain to plot, and if possible use the Scots, for the recovery of his throne there. Charles had selfishly played his own game in placing himself in their hands, and imposed on them the necessity of acting as they did.

The Parliament and the Army were becoming more and more estranged. The Army had not fought simply for the supremacy of Parliament: it had fought for civil and religious liberty, and constituted as the New Model was, it would not suffer itself to be disbanded till that was won. The King and the Presby-

(1) Gardiner. CIVIL WAR. III, 189.



terians were drawing more closely together, and on 12th May 1647, Charles had accepted, though with considerable modifications, the terms of the Parliament, one of which was that he was not to sign the Covenant. Presbyterianism was accepted for three years, but liberty of opinion was not yet granted, and with less many of the soldiers would not be satisfied. There was a fear, too, that the King might be placed at the head of a parliamentary army or one of invading Scots, and they were determined this should not be. They took matters into their own hands. On the night of 3rd June, by instructions of Cromwell, Cornet Joyce, with a large body of horse, representative of the army, appeared in front of Holmby House, and carried off Charles as a prisoner.

Meanwhile the Levellers in the army were growing more numerous and becoming more extreme in their opinions and demands, some declaring the King to be a man of blood and insisting that he should be brought to justice. It was even said that some had determined to take his life. Warned, truly or falsely, of this, the King became alarmed, and escaped from Hampton Court, where he was now lodged, to put himself into the most unwilling care of Col. Hammond, the Governor of Carisbrooke Castle. Here he continued to treat with the Parliament on the basis of the Four Bills, but his inclinations were now toward the Scots. In dealing with the Scotch commissioners at London he does not appear to have considered that they represented only the nobility of Scotland, not its Church, which was then so powerful.

Not recognising the importance of this distinction, he entered into an agreement with them on the 26th of December 1647, known as "The Engagement". He was willing to confirm the Covenant by Act of Parliament, so as to give security to those who had already accepted it, but henceforward no one was to be

compelled to take it. For the rest, he still adhered to his offer of 12th May. He would do the utmost in his power to suppress Independency, all other sectaries, and all heretical opinions. On this basis the Scots were to support his demand for a personal treaty in London, and the disbandment of the armies in order to secure a peaceable decision. Failing the granting of a personal treaty in London, the Scots were to issue a Declaration asserting "the right which belongs to the Crown in the power of the militia, the Great Seal, bestowing of honours and offices of trust, choice of Privy Councillors, the right of the King's negative vote in Parliament". Upon the issue of the Declaration a Scottish army was to be sent into England to secure a lasting peace. And that "a speedy period be set to the present Parliament, and that the said army shall be upon the march before the said peaceable message and Declaration be delivered to the House". The Engagement was accepted by the commissioners on the 27th, and the King need no longer play with the English Parliament or its commissioners, so he sent a written communication definitely refusing the Four Bills. When the fact of this Engagement became known to the English Parliament, though they did not yet know the details, they were greatly provoked, and by 141 votes to 91 the House of Commons agreed that no further addresses should be sent to the King and that no message should be received from him.

The Scottish commissioners left London on 2nd January 1648, and on their return to Edinburgh Lords Loudon and Lauderdale gave a full account of the concessions granted by the King, but without mentioning what they had conceded, both to the Committee of Estates and to the Commission of the Church. A sub-

committee of the Estates was appointed to confer with the churchmen, but did not satisfy them, and, though not unanimously, a declaration against the terms of the King, which they thought too limited, was drawn up. A new Parliament met on 2nd March. The representatives of the shires and boroughs were nearly equally divided between Hamilton and Argyle, but the nobles showed a large majority for Hamilton. The aristocracy were now returning to their old alliance with the Crown. They had supported James in establishing Episcopacy, then they had, in their anger at the arrogance of the bishops and the Act of Revocation, supported the Covenant, now the austerity of the ministers was provoking their antagonism. On the 9th of March the Commission of the Church submitted to Parliament a draft of their declaration, and were asked not to issue it till it was considered by the House. On the 10th, when they learned that 2000 copies were already printed, the Parliament again applied for delay. This was only extended till the 13th, when it was issued with orders that it was to be read from the pulpits on the following Sunday. This was the beginning of trouble between the Parliament and the Church.

The Estates occupied so much time in the vain attempt to secure the co-operation of the clergy that the work of the Engagement moved very slowly. On 17th of March the warlike intentions of the Hamilton party were foreshadowed in the appointment of a committee to concert measures for the seizing of Carlisle and Berwick under the pretence of danger from "malignant sectaries" in that quarter. Argyle and other supporters of the Church protested by leaving the House in a body, and Hamilton, knowing their strength in the country, thought it expedient to ask them to return.

On the 11th of April 1648, the Scottish Parliament made a move that pointed in the direction of war. An Act was passed which declared that there was (1) "not one article of the Solemn League and Covenant which hath not been sinfully and dangerously violated before God, angels, and men", and demanded that Presbyterianism should be established in England and all heresies suppressed; that the King should be brought in honour, freedom, and safety to one of his houses in or near London; that the sectarian army should be disbanded; and that none but Covenanters should henceforth be employed as soldiers. A letter conveying this resolution, and stating that the messenger would wait fifteen days for a reply was sent to the English Parliament, and was received by them on the 3rd of May. On the 6th both Houses expressed their willingness to join with the Scots in presenting to the King the Presbyterian Propositions already laid before him at Hampton Court, but said nothing about enforcing the Covenant, or removing Charles to London.

In the meantime the Scottish Parliament had called up levies and made other preparations for war. They were resolved to keep the Engagement. On 9th June they gave full powers to the Committee of Estates, and adjourned for two years. Hamilton was now supreme, and able to defy Argyle and the clergy, but they still had influence in the country, and they did not fail to use it. The ministers generally, and George Gillespie in particular, thundered from their pulpits against the action of the Government, and their publications were strong. Many of the officers supported the Church in this dispute, and a number resigned their commissions rather than serve in this campaign. Nor was this the only

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VI, pt 2, p. 23.

difficulty. As a result of the opposition of the Church, Hamilton had considerable trouble in raising men for his army. In some places the levy was openly resisted, and at Mauchline there was a pretty severe skirmish, but the victory was for the Parliament.

Scotland was now split into two hostile parties, and great evil to the country was to follow. The General Assembly met on the 12th of July, and by its actions made the division all the more manifest. Hamilton was denounced as a traitor to the Covenant. It was clear that his expedition would mean an alliance with those they deemed prelatical malignants, and they not only refused to support, but declared it to be sin.

The army had already crossed the border on the 8th of July. It was far from prepared to advance, but the move had been forced by the urgent appeals of the English royalists who chafed under the long delay. There had been outbreaks in Wales, Kent and Essex, and Sir Marmaduke Langdale, with the connivance of the Scots, had seized Carlisle. An army of 30,000 men had been voted by Parliament, but barely a third of that number were at first able to march, and those miserably appointed. Burnet (1) gives a strong picture of their unfitness. Nearly all the infantry were quite untrained, and though the cavalry were well mounted, they were entirely undisciplined. They had no artillery, and insufficient horses to carry their very limited supply of ammunition. The Duke, too, was so short of money that the soldiers were driven to plunder the people in the north, and so irritated those whose help he had hoped to receive. The enemy was active. Lambert, with a much smaller force, hung on the rear, but was able to do more than merely engage in an occasional skirmish. On

(1) Burnet. Mem. Hamilton, p. 355.

the surrender of Pembroke Cromwell pressed north to meet the invaders, and on the 17th of August he was able to deliver his attack. Hamilton's army was widely scattered in the neighbourhood of Preston, and though much more numerous than the enemy, owing to bad tactics and lack of co-operation between the different commands, was unable to make even such a fight against the English veterans as it might otherwise have done. After a three days battle Hamilton surrendered with most of his army, and only Munro with his trained troops, who had been recalled from Ireland, contrived to retreat through Northumberland in safety.

Though the Engagers had not sent the 30,000 men they purposed into England, the large number they had sent, especially as many of the officers were men of great influence, had seriously weakened their position in the country. And when news of the disaster of Preston arrived, the strict Presbyterian party, considering that the Malignants had betrayed the Covenant, and presuming on their own strength, gathered forces to take the government into their own hands. Argyle, Eglinton, Cassillis, and Loudon - the last of whom had signed and now forsaken the Engagement - and others like-minded, threw all their weight into the scale. Most of the ministers also vigorously supported the movement. There was, especially in the west, a renewed enthusiasm for the Covenant. Leven and Leslie offered their swords for the cause. The Covenanters in military array marched on Edinburgh, gathering recruits as they went, and entered the city on the 5th of September. This movement was known as the "Whiggamore Raid."

Lanark, the much more capable brother of Hamilton, now took the lead on the royalist side. He urged the Estates to secure Stirling and Perth, and with

Munro's troops as a nucleus, to raise a new army in the north. They were too discouraged to fight under present circumstances, but for their own protection agreed to recall Munro, though they would not allow any English royalists to enter Scotland. When Munro joined him at Haddington, Lanark had an army of 5000 men, with which he withdrew to Stirling, closely followed by the Whiggamores. After much wrangling and some fighting, the two parties came to terms on 26th September. It was agreed that Munro and his army should return to Ireland (which they were unable to do as the English had seized the ports there) and that all who had taken part in the Engagement should resign whatever posts they held.

Cromwell meanwhile had marched into Scotland. When he crossed the border he and Argyle held a friendly conference at Mordington, after which he paid a visit to Edinburgh, where he was lavishly entertained. Leaving Lambert with two regiments of cavalry and two troops of dragoons to protect the new Government till they could raise a new model army of 4000 men, he set out for England on the 7th of October.

Thus, by the help of English Independents - the "Sectaries", - the extreme Presbyterian party was now in power in Scotland, and the theocratic experiment would be tried.

While the English army was fighting royalist risings in various parts of the country, the Parliament was again negotiating with the King. Charles was once more playing his old game of trying to wear out his opponents, or to divide them. He had no real intention of coming to terms. He had fresh hopes of receiving aid from Ireland or from Holland, and finally planned an escape to the Continent. The Queen was all the time planning for a renewal of the war.

The Army was now becoming more and more impatient, and about the middle of October a long manifesto, known as the Remonstrance of the Army, was issued. It showed the danger of any longer treating with the King, who had already stirred up a second war and invited the Scots to enter England. They could no longer depend on any form of words he might use. They urged the justice of bringing him to trial. The citizens of London, on the other hand, now began to move for the return of the King to power on the basis of his letter of 12th May. Taking advantage of the disorders which ensued, the Army took military possession of the city on 7th August. The Common Council had surrendered peaceably, and after a march through the streets, all, except a sufficient force to protect the Tower and Westminster, withdrew to Croydon. Clearly the Army, though in such a decided minority, was master of the situation.

The men were determined that the double-dealing of the King must be ended. They were wearied with the dilatoriness and the futile negotiations of the Parliament, and resolved to take possession of the person of Charles. They removed him as a prisoner to Hurst Castle, a block-house on the Hampshire coast. His Majesty was greatly alarmed at this, fearing that his assassination was intended. The soldiers, however, had no such intention, for their intention was to bring him to trial in the form of law. Before this purpose could be carried into effect it was necessary to overcome the resistance of Parliament, and this they did in a drastic fashion by what is known as "Pride's Purge." On 6th December Colonel Pride, with a military guard, took up his post at the door of the House. From a list of the members provided, he refused admission to those who



were regarded as objectionable. Those who made no resistance were simply turned back, while those who did were imprisoned. In all 96 members were excluded, the number of those left to vote being some 50 or 60. This selected House obeyed the orders of the military, and on the 13th a resolution was passed that Charles should be brought to justice. The Lords refused to take any part in the matter, but on 1st January 1649 a High Court of Justice was appointed for the trial of the King.

After several preliminary meetings, the trial began in Westminster Hall on 21st January 1649. Of the 135 judges only 68 were present, of whom Cromwell was one. Bradshaw, a lawyer, presided. On grounds narrated, "Charles Stewart, King of England" was impeached "as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public and implacable enemy of the Commonwealth of England", but this was later phrased that he was guilty of "divers high crimes and treasons". Charles, as was to be expected, denied the authority of the Court, and refused to plead, but the trial went on, and on the 27th January, 67 of the Commissioners being present, he was condemned to be "put to death by the severing of his head from his body." (1)

On the 30th he laid his head on the lowly block on the scaffold in front of the Banqueting Room at Whitehall, one strong blow of the sharp axe, and all was over.

(1) State Trials. IV, 1128. (Cobbett)

## C H A P T E R XII.

### Charles II. The Commonwealth in Scotland.

In England it was evident that only a small minority were in favour of the execution of the King, as only a small minority had brought it about. There can be little doubt that if it had been possible to take a plebiscite of the country at the time, it would almost certainly have been in favour of the restoration of the Crown, and the choice of Prince Charles to succeed his father on moderate conditions. But as things were, self-preservation required that the leaders of the Commonwealth should do something to make their present position regular, and establish a form of government that would secure their safety. They essayed this by resolving on 1st February that no member of Parliament who had voted on the 5th of December that the King's offer afforded a ground of settlement, or had been absent when the vote was taken, should be allowed to take his place till his dissent from that resolution was recorded. On the 6th it was agreed without a division that the House of Lords in Parliament was useless and dangerous, and ought to be abolished, and on the following day it was resolved, also without a division, that the office of a King was unnecessary, burdensome, and therefore ought to be abolished. On the 17th and 19th March Acts to this effect were finally passed. (1) As a constructive measure it was next agreed that a Council of State of 41 members should be appointed to manage home and foreign affairs. It should however, be under the control of Parliament, and be terminable at the end of the year unless it were otherwise decided by Parliament.

(1) Commons Journal, VI, 166-8.

In Scotland Argyle had summoned a Parliament for 4th January 1649. The burghs and shires chose his partizans, but of the nobles only sixteen, and all of them supporters of Argyle, attended, as compared with the fifty-nine who were present in the Parliament of 1648. They at once set about establishing their position as far as legislation could do it. All who had supported, or had not opposed the Engagement, were, on 23rd January, according to their social and political position, divided into three classes, and respectively excluded from Parliament or holding office for life, for ten, or for five years. A fourth class of the excluded was that of immoral or scandalous livers. They were at first excluded for one year, but the exclusion was to be continued till they gave evidence of reformation. This was probably drawn up by Johnston of Warriston, and was known as "The Act of Classes".<sup>(1)</sup> It was so far good in the sight of the covenanting clergy, but Argyle's alliance with the sectaries of the English army gave great offence, and they denounced him furiously.

The Covenanters were now in a difficulty. Hitherto, in spite of provocations and temptations, they had kept the treaty and maintained friendly relations with the English Puritans. They had sent an army to Ireland to help them to fight the rebels there, and many of their soldiers had been allowed to die of famine; the Parliament had guaranteed to protect the Scottish coast, but by their neglect Colkitto and Montrose had been allowed to come in to slay and work havoc. They had magnanimously given up their old forms of faith and worship, and accepted from the Westminster Assembly of Divines a Confession of Faith and a Directory of Public Worship. When Hamilton had invaded England, the General Assembly had helped

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VI, 2<sup>d</sup> part, 143 &c.

the Parliament by condemning the Expedition, and threatening with excommunication all who took part in it. Through all this the Covenant had been professed by both, but now the King was beheaded, the Sectaries were in power, toleration was granted to all save Romanists, and the Covenant was ignored! What were they to do? What was their duty to the Covenant? Were they to unite with this new phase of Puritanism, or stand fast by the Covenant, with its vow of allegiance to the King, and take the consequences?

A thrill of horror had run through the country when the tidings of the tragedy of Whitehall had arrived, but it does not appear that except in some fervently royalist circles it had excited any intense sorrow or passionate longing for revenge. In fighting the King they had no desire to destroy him, they would not have put him to death, they did not approve of others doing it, but after all, the disposal of a Sovereign so obstinate, so faithless to the Covenant, and so attached to Prelacy, and thus make way for a youth who might not be so perverse and more ready to accept their terms, was perhaps not an unmixed evil. They could not unite with the Commonwealth which slighted the Covenant, granted toleration, and killed its King. They were not republicans: they were royalists, and were prepared to extend their loyalty to their lawful King. Le Roi est mort, vive le Roi. Charles was dead, but his son was alive, and their allegiance was ready for him if he would accept the Covenant. On the 4th of February the news of the execution of Charles reached Edinburgh, and on the following day the young Prince was proclaimed as "King of Great Britain, France and Ireland"<sup>(1)</sup>. The proclamation, however, was conditioned, according to an Act passed on the 7th, by his satisfying the

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VI. pt. II. p. 157.

country concerning religion, the union of the Kingdoms, the good and peace of Scotland, "according to the (1) National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant."

At this time the new King was living at La Hague, where he learned of his father's death on the 4th of February. On the 7th Sir Joseph Douglas was sent by Argyll and the Commission of the General Assembly to him, with a letter urging him to avoid both Malignants and Sectaries, to establish Presbyterianism and the Covenant, and to promote uniformity in his dominions; and informing him that commissioners were being sent to convey the resolution. (2) Charles, though barely nineteen years of age, was too shrewd, in view of his negotiations with other parties, to commit himself to Presbyterianism just yet, told Douglas he would give his answer when the commissioners arrived.

He had already been invited to go to Ireland to take part in an invasion of England which Ormond hoped to carry through on behalf of his father. The question with him was thus whether he should profess Presbyterianism and join with the Scots, or go to Ireland and join with those whose hope was to restore an Episcopacy such as prevailed before the war, but granting toleration to the Irish Papists. His counsellors were sharply divided on the matter.

In the meantime his Majesty had taken a step which to some extent committed him. The news of the execution of Charles had come to Montrose as a terrible shock. His attachment to the late King was exceedingly strong. Charles had won his whole heart, and some one speaks of the affection of Montrose for his sovereign as a love passing that of women. When he first heard of the tragic ending of his idol, he swooned.

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. Vol. VI, pt. II, p. 157

(2) Peterkin, p. 563.

and for two days shut himself up and would see no one. This indulgence in his grief was followed by a wild craving for revenge which he expressed in somewhat turgid verse.

" I'll sing thine obsequies with trumpet sounds,

And write thine epitaph with blood and wounds." (1)  
 Charles was carried away by the passion of the man and the usual selfish-Stewart desire to further his own ends at whatever cost to others. Montrose had done great things before, and he might do great things again. By his warlike prowess he might save his King from the conditions of exiled English royalists, stern Covenanters, and Scotch Engagers, and enable him to rule untrammelled, and by his ius divinum alone. So he gave him a commission as Lieut-Governor of Scotland and Captain-General of all forces raised in Scotland and of all others which might be brought thither out of England or Ireland." The King thus gave his sanction to a possible royalist revolt in any of the three kingdoms.

The negotiations between the Scottish Parliament and the Prince began early, but were prolonged. Their commissioners in London were instructed to protest against the execution of the late King, and then to proceed to La Hague to treat with Charles. On the 24th of February they made their protest in very forcible terms, and demanded that there should be no change in the fundamental constitution and government of the kingdom by King, Lords and Commons, and the King. "upon just satisfaction given to both kingdoms, was to be admitted to the exercise of his government". The Commons were naturally angry, seeing to what such an attitude might lead, and the commissioners were arrested at Gravesend on the 26th while on their way to Holland, and sent back by land to Scotland under guard.

(1) Napier, Memoirs of Montrose.  
 II. 692.

Meanwhile the government at Westminster had either received information, or had sapiently guessed where the real danger lay. Rupert's occupation of Kinsale seemed to indicate that Ireland rather than Scotland was to be the base of a royalist invasion of England. Consequently, an attack on the King's supporters in Ireland was a wise act of defence. Matters there were in a critical position for the parliamentary forces, and only the quick, strong action of Cromwell, who, after some hesitation, had accepted the command of the army of invasion, saved the situation. By his ruthless operations "he subjugated Ireland as Ireland had never been subjugated during the five centuries of slaughter which had elapsed since the landing of the first Norman settlers." (1) But this parliamentary conquest and occupation proved for the good of the country, and material prosperity speedily followed on the awful ravages of massacre and war.

Soon after the tragic death of Charles I. two prominent Scottish leaders shared a similar fate. On his surrender at Uttoxeter after the battle of Preston, Hamilton was promised quarter by Lambert, but the English Parliament took a different view, and he was put on his trial. His pleas were repelled, and on the 9th of March he was beheaded. He was a weak, easy, good-tempered man, devoted to the King, anxious to please everybody, but not successful in pleasing anybody for long. He had been at strife with the early Covenanters, and was for a time imprisoned by the Court. An incompetent General, he bungled the invasion of England, and so met his fate. The other victim was the second Marquis of Huntly. He had been betrayed into the hands of the Covenanters, placed on trial, condemned, and was executed at Edinburgh on the 22nd of March.

(1) Macaulay, Hist. of England, I, 121.

The Scottish commissioners secured their first interview with Charles on the 27th of March. He refused to grant any of their requests till he had heard the whole of their proposals, but despite their annoyance at this attitude, the negotiations were continued. On the 5th of April they asked the acceptance by the Prince both of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant, and his assent to the Acts of Parliament which imposed them on England and Ireland. In hope that they would be content with less, he delayed to give any promise. On the first of May the commissioners pressed for an answer to their demands. Charles submitted this to his Council, and on the 29th he informed the commissioners that he was willing to accept the Scottish Acts relating to the National Covenant and the Presbyterian doctrine and discipline. He could do nothing with regard to England and Ireland, except with the consent of their national Parliaments. So far as the Solemn League and Covenant was concerned, he would adopt anything that was for the good of Scotland, without prejudice to the other kingdoms. The commissioners treated this as a declination of their demands, and returned to Scotland.

Charles had had a hope that the continental monarchs would assist him in his action against the English Republic, which had killed its king, as their successors attacked the French Republic of a century and a half later, but the political conditions on the Continent were not favourable. The nations were exhausted by war, and still too jealous of one another to take up arms in favour of an exiled prince. Cromwell's vigorous action in Ireland had destroyed any lingering hope of success in the proposed Irish adventure. And, fearing that his negotiations with the Scots would prove abortive, the King now turned to Montrose, and Mont-



rose was ready to do and dare anything for him.

After the break of the negotiations between Charles and the Scots in May, there was a pause for several months. Argyle would probably have preferred an understanding with the English Parliament, but as this, in existing circumstances, seemed impossible, he sought to renew negotiations with the King. Taking occasion of the absence of a number of the extreme partizans of the Church, he obtained the assent of Parliament, and an envoy was sent to Holland on 11th October. (1) At length, on 11th January 1650, Charles wrote to the Committee of Estates, inviting their commissioners to come to Breda on 15th March, to treat of the just satisfaction of his Scottish subjects, of assistance to be given for bringing to justice the murderers of his father, and the restoration of his own rights. At the same time he continued in correspondence with Montrose, believing that his known preparations for war had induced the Scots to approach him as they had done. He was now showing some of the duplicity which had characterized his father. (2) He carried on the treaty with the Scottish commissioners, but on some good news from Montrose he was prepared to make an end of that. On the 21st of February the Estates met to discuss the result of their embassy's mission, and finally they decided to demand much the same conditions as they had done a year before. Charles pleaded hard but vainly for some modification, but as all his other hopes were vanishing away, he at last agreed to all the demands of the Covenanters, except the tacit re- pudiation of the Irish treaty, which he promised to insert after his landing in Scotland if the Parliament should insist upon it. The commissioners professed themselves satisfied, and formally invited him

(1) Falfour. Annales, III, 432.

(2) Napier. Montrose, II, 756.

to Scotland.

In a letter dated 11th January, and which reached Montrose on the 23rd of March, Charles had advised him of his intention to treat with the Covenanters, but assured him that nothing in the treaty was intended to be "the least impediment to your proceedings ... We require and authorize you therefore to proceed vigorously and effectually in your undertaking." His idea in this was to use Montrose as a means to make the Covenanters modify their terms. Montrose was much hurt by this letter. He saw that he was doomed to failure. If the Scottish royalists hesitated before to join him, they certainly would not now take part in an expedition, which was only meant to frighten the Scottish government into a relaxation of their demands. On the 26th of March he sent a dignified letter of thanks to the King for the Garter which he had sent, warned him to give heed to the counsels of his devoted friends, professed his absolute devotion to the royal cause, and went on with his preparations. On the 3rd of May Sir William Fleming was commissioned to explain to Montrose why the King had come to terms with the Covenanters, because of the hopelessness of receiving aid from the European Powers, the failure in Ireland, and the smallness of the force which the Lieutenant himself had been able to bring into the field, and to request him to disband his troops. This was the understanding with the government, as the condition of Montrose, his troops, and the Scottish royalists in Holland should receive a complete indemnity. (1) Charles, however, was not quite sure of the Covenanters, as it was possible, in his opinion at least, that the understanding might only be a trick to get Montrose and his army

(1) S. R. Gardiner. Commonwealth I, 206.

out of the way. So six days later Fleming was instructed that, if when he arrived in Scotland he considered this to be the case, or if the Scottish royalists thought it advisable, Montrose was still to remain in arms.

Fleming was too late: Montrose had already been hopelessly defeated in the far north. Having assembled at his base in Orkney a force of about 1200 foot and 40 horse, he invaded Caithness about the middle of April. The men of Caithness not only failed to join him as he expected, but fled at his approach. His winning star had set. The government had sent a well-equipped army to meet the danger, under the command of David Leslie, who, on the advance southwards of Montrose, sent Colonel Strachan with a detachment, mainly of cavalry, to deal with the invaders. At Carbisdale on the 27th Strachan surprised and totally routed them. About a hundred scattered fugitives escaped, but the remainder were killed or captured. Montrose and a few others fled up Strath Oyckell, but most of them succumbed to famine or fatigue. After nearly a week's wandering among the hills, Montrose surrendered to Macleod of Assynt, expecting he would enable him to escape. Macleod had now joined the government side and had been appointed a deputy sheriff, and, as his duty was, gave up his prisoner. With every circumstance of ignominy he was led a prisoner to Edinburgh, which he reached on the afternoon of the 18th of May. He had been excommunicated by the Kirk, and was already condemned as a traitor by the Parliament, so that no further legal proceedings were necessary to secure his condemnation. He was now bitterly hated by the Covenanters. The former friend and champion of the Covenant, he had become its fiercest and most

implacable enemy, who had defeated its armies, and robbed and slaughtered its adherents. To the Covenanters he was an apostate, traitor, "Judas"! They spared no effort to show their hate. His entry into the city had been so organized as to inflict the utmost degradation upon him. He was taken to the Tolbooth in a mean cart driven by the hangman. The widows of men slain by his followers were hired to accuse him in the streets, and it was expected that there would be an outburst of public execration, but his enemies were greatly disappointed. The calm dignity of the prisoner disarmed every foe, and the eyes of men who hated him were moist. Not a missile was cast. Argyle, his son, and his son's wife were not ashamed to sit on a balcony to gloat over his great rival's fate, but they could not bear his gaze, and shrank back into the house.

Sunday, the 19th, was hardly a day of rest for Montrose. Several ministers and Parliament men visited the prisoner, and warned, threatened, and exhorted him, "but they got no advantage over him." (1) On the following morning several ministers, who had been appointed by the Commission of the General Assembly, waited upon him, and tried to bring him to repentance. One of them was James Guthrie, who was afterwards to meet a similar fate. They charged him with the breach of the Covenant, and he replied:—"The Covenant which I took"—the National Covenant—"I own it and adhere to it. Bishops, I care not for them." And he retaliated upon them for their opposition to the King, after he had granted all their desires. Failing to bring him to submit to them, they sorrowfully left him "unto the judgement of the great

(1) Contemporary Pamphlet, quoted by Napier,

'Montrose and the Covenanters', II, 536.

God", and quitted the prison.(1)

Later in the forenoon he was called to the bar, and formally sentenced to be hanged and quartered. After being sentenced, another clerical deputation was sent to him by the Commission of the Assembly to endeavour to bring him to full repentance, that the sentence of excommunication might be removed. "Eut", says Trail, "we found him continuing in his old pride, and taking very ill what was spoken unto him, saying, -"I pray you, gentlemen, let me die in peace." (2)

On the 21st all the hideous details of the execution were carried through. Had he satisfied the kirkmen, his dismembered trunk would have received burial in Greyfriars Church-yard: as it was it was carried by porters to the place of execution on the Borough Muir, and buried there.

Till the very eve of the day fixed for his departure for Scotland Charles was under the impression that the modifications suggested to the commissioners would be ratified by the Parliament at Edinburgh, but now he learned the contrary. On the 18th of May the Parliament sent additional instructions to their commissioners at Breda, requiring them to insist on a definite repudiation by Charles of the Irish treaty, his signature of both Covenants either before or at his landing in Scotland, and the exclusion of sixteen of his principal friends. These demands reached the King at Terheiden, just as he was preparing to embark, and without waiting to discuss them he hurried on board, accompanied by a number of followers prohibited by the terms of the treaty. The commissioners, some of them against their will, were persuaded to sail with him, though they had received no satisfaction(3)

(1) Quoted from statement by Simson - Wodrow.

(2) Napier. Montrose and the Covenanters, II, 544.

(3) Select Biographies. Livingstone, I, 178-183.

Some of the commissioners were willing to forbear to press their new instructions till Charles had arrived in Scotland, but the majority decided to carry through their mission. Charles was inclined to revolt, but his friends persuaded him to give way, and on the 11th of June, while his little fleet of three Dutch vessels lay in the roads of Heligoland, detained by contrary winds or the fear of English cruisers, he changed his mind, and expressed his willingness to sign the treaty, just as the commissioners were about to break off negotiations. The Covenants were still a difficulty, and not till the 23rd, when the vessel had cast anchor at Speymouth, did he agree to accept them. Charles made one other attempt to save his credit with the Englishmen who accompanied him, but had to be satisfied with the insertion of a clause in the margin, pledging him to assent to "Fills or ordinances passed or to be passed in the Houses of Parliament". He thus bound himself to give a legal position to Presbyterianism in England and Ireland immediately on his restoration to England. Charles signed, "forswearing himself before God and man". (1)

He was conducted south to Falkland Palace, where he learned that Parliament would ratify the treaty agreed to at Heligoland, but, on the other hand, had decided that with nine exceptions his following must leave the country. One of the nine was that profligate buffoon, the Duke of Buckingham, but Burnet (2) gives the probable explanation when he says that the Duke "took all the ways possible to gain lord Argyle and the ministers", and that "he advised the King to put himself wholly into their hands." Charles did not find his new surroundings congenial. He was in a different climate morally as well as physically.

(1) S. R. Gardiner. Commonwealth, I, 238.

(2) "Hist. of his Own Times", I, 35.

The austerity of the life he had to lead, and Presbyterian services and Presbyterian preachers wearied him. His hopes were in the south. Could he but draw the English army and its renowned leader to the borders, the risings that had been planned to take place in England would begin. All that was necessary was the landing of 2000 foreign troops in Torbay, with arms and munitions for the English royalists. Presbyterians as well as cavaliers were to take part, otherwise the Scots would not fight for him. Catholics also would be welcome, and were assured of relief from penalties. Anything or everything to put Charles on the throne.

The authorities at Westminster had some knowledge of what was going on. The negotiations had put them on their guard. The likelihood of a war with Scotland was ever growing plainer. Early in April the Parliament asked the Council of State to prepare for invasion from abroad and tumults at home. Fairfax was asked to take command, but declined, holding, among other grounds, that a war would be a breach of the Solemn League and Covenant. To this it was replied that the Scots had already broken the League by their invasion of 1648. Clearly the Solemn League and Covenant between Scotland and England was now a thing of the past. Fairfax was not to be moved, and there was nothing else for it but to appoint Cromwell Captain-general and Commander-in-chief, and on the 28th of June he set out for the north. On the 19th of July he was at Berwick with an army of 16,000 men.

Thus thrown upon their defence, the Scots were not idle. Leven was the nominal commander, but the work fell on David Leslie, his lieutenant-general. By the end of July he had an army of over 30,000 men. Though Burnet asserts (1) that this army was one of the best that ever Scotland had brought together, it has to be

(1) "OWN TIMES", I, 35.

borne in mind that most of them were unwilling conscripts dragged from their homes to engage in a war which stirred no enthusiasm in their breasts. Numerically much superior, in all soldierly qualities they were inferior to the men led against them. There was division in the country, and the Parliament was divided. The lords had urged that a general levy be made at once, but the lesser barons and burgesses carried their wish that the army be purged from all Engagers and men of doubtful morals and piety. A committee was appointed for this purpose, and the work went on till over eighty officers and several thousand men were struck from the muster-roll. (1) Whatever the moral effect, it is certain that in this way some of the best fighting material in the land was lost. Of the officers left Sir Edward Walker declares that they were mostly "minister's sons, clerks, and other sanctified creatures, who hardly ever saw or heard of any sword but the sword of the spirit." A number of the excluded lords and gentry offered their services to hang upon the rear of the invading force, seeing they were not allowed to fight along with their countrymen, but this was forbidden, as the ministers declared that any compliance of this kind would bring down the judgements of God upon the country.

Leslie's plan of defence was to concentrate his troops in a strongly entrenched position round Edinburgh, and to lay bare the open country between Berwick and the Capital, as had been done in the old wars. "Every article of subsistence had been removed or destroyed, and in his progress towards the capital, not a man was to be seen". (2) Cromwell had thus to de-

(1) Balfour, *Annales*, IV, 89, "more than 80 Officers. Sir Edward Walker, *Historical Discourse*, 4000. Peterkin, 620.

(2) M. Laing, *History*, III, 453.



pend on the supplies furnished by the fleet which accompanied his march. He reached Musselburgh on the 28th of July, and on the 29th he succeeded in occupying St Leonard's Hill, but he was speedily driven off.

On the same day, at the invitation of Lord Eglinton and some other officers, Charles came to Leith. He came gladly, for his great object was now to gain the support of the army and become free from the control of the Kirk. The Committee of Estates took alarm at this action, and on the plea of the danger to which he was exposed, induced him to leave. The object of his visit being thus defeated, he withdrew to Dunfermline on the 2nd of August.

On the 29th the Scots were repulsed in a counter-attack they made on Musselburgh. There was then a lull in the fighting, and frequent written communications passed between the two parties. In one letter Cromwell wrote: "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken".(1) His main ground of appeal was that Charles was no suitable King for a religious nation. The Covenanters, however, do not appear to have thought it possible for them to be mistaken.

The English were finding great difficulty in securing provisions. A westerly gale prevented the fleet from reaching Musselburgh, and they had to fall back on Dunbar. On the 11th of August Cromwell again advanced to Musselburgh. His great aim was to get Leslie to fight, but that cautious general was not to be drawn from his trenches. On the 14th he made a movement to this end. He swept round the south of the city in an attempt to reach Queensferry, whence with the help of the fleet he would be able to operate on either side of the Firth. He could thus cut off the supplies from Fife, of which Edinburgh was beginning to be in need.

(1) Letter CXXXVI.

Cromwell's writings to the Scots had not been altogether in vain. They had widened the breach which already existed between the different sections of the Covenanters. A number of the more rigid Presbyterians had always been distrustful of Charles, and were not in favour of the present war. Now they had to meet the reproaches of the English leader for supporting such a King as Charles, and they attempted to do this by demanding on the 11th of August a declaration from the King of his desire "to be deeply humbled and afflicted in spirit before God", among other things, for his father's opposition to the work of the Reformation, and for his mother's idolatry, and for its toleration in the royal household." He refused to sign it, and the commissioners of the Kirk, with the approval of the Committee of Estates, issued a declaration protesting for themselves and for the nation that "They will not own Him nor His interest otherwise than with a subordination to God and so far as He owns and prosecutes the Cause of God". A copy of this was sent unofficially to Cromwell, but in his reply to Leslie he showed that it had in nowise tended to peace - the Scots had made their country a centre of malignant action and the war would not be ended till security had been given that it would be so no longer. (1) Several English and Scottish officers had a conversation while the Commander was writing this reply, but though the latter distrusted Charles, they still failed to regard him and the Covenant as by nature incompatible, and admitted that it was only because he refused to sign the declaration that they had "thoughts of relinquishing him, and" of acting "upon another account". That this did not necessarily imply an accommodation with Cromwell is clear from a letter which the officers sent to the

(1) Letter CXXXVII.

Committee of Estates upon the 15th, in which they state "that they espoused no malignant quarrel or party, nor acknowledged the king or his interest, otherwise than in subordination to God, but would vindicate themselves from the aspersion, that they owned and supported his majesty in all the proceedings of the late king". (1) They requested that the Court and army should be further purged, and declared that they would fight "merely upon the former grounds and principles in defence of the cause, Covenant and kingdom". Charles seemed to have been afraid they would come to terms, and when some of its phrases had been modified, he signed the paper on the 16th of August.

Cromwell had taken up a position on the Braid Hills on his way to Queensferry, but this move was met by Leslie transferring his artillery to the north-west of the city, and occupying a commanding station at Corstorphine. On the 27th Cromwell was again checked in an advance towards Cogar. The weather had been cold, wet and stormy, and disease broke amongst the English troops. This, together with the lateness of the season made Cromwell hopeless of success in that campaign, and he resolved to retreat. Shipping his sick at Musselburgh, he continued his retreat to Dunbar, Leslie slowly following. The English held the town, and Leslie took up his station on Doon Hill overlooking it. He also sent on a detachment to hold a defile at Cockburnspath, and so block the way to Berwick. And so for two days the armies were face to face.

The Scots held the superior military position, but it was not one which it was easy to hold for any length of time. The weather was very wet, the men were much exposed, and food was scarce. Cromwell's

(1) Quoted by M. Laing, History, III, 455.

position was even more difficult. He was now hemmed in at Dunbar, and could hardly possibly escape by land or sea in face of the Scottish army. Still Leven and Leslie hesitated to attack, and only when the order was given by the Committee did Leslie leave his position. Probably it was only his belief that Cromwell had shipped his heavy artillery and a portion of his army as well as his sick at Musselburgh, and intended to escape by sea or cut through with his cavalry, and so play into his hands, that induced him to obey the Committee.

On the 3rd of September the battle was fought. Cromwell had about 11,000 men, and Leslie practically double that number, but the English troops were well-disciplined veterans and the Scots mostly untrained men, and badly led, for most of the capable officers had been "purged". The Covenanters lost the advantage of numbers and of ground, and were thoroughly defeated. About 3000 were slain in the fight and pursuit, 10,000 were taken prisoners, and the guns, camp, and a great store of arms were captured. Cromwell besought humanity for the captives, but many of them perished from hunger and exposure. The surviving prisoners were after a time transported to New England, where after a short period of servitude they were set free, and placed on terms of equality with the other colonists. (1) This defeat meant the end of the dominion of the extreme covenanting party.

Cromwell followed up his victory by occupying Edinburgh, except the Castle, which still held out. On the 14th he advanced against Leslie, who, with the remains of his army and some recruits, held a strong position at Stirling. This was considered too strong to be attacked, and Cromwell returned to the siege of Edinburgh Castle.

(1) Carlyle. Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.

The disaster of Dunbar failed to restore unity to Scotland. There were still the extremists, headed by Gillespie of Glasgow and James Guthrie of Stirling, who would tolerate no dealings with the Engagers, and who were suspicious of the King, and who attributed the defeat to the sins of the people, and the allowing of a number of the unpurged followers of Charles to take part in the battle. And there was a moderate party, who were willing to receive those who had signed the Engagement on a profession of their repentance. Such regarded the desperate condition of the country as a justification for receiving for its defence all who would take part on this condition. Besides these there were many, especially in the north, who cared not for Kirk or Covenant, but who were devoted to the king.

In the extreme party were a number of officers who declined to serve under Leven and Leslie, whom they regarded "as natural graceless men whom the Lord would never bless with success,"(1) and they asked and received permission from the government now established at Stirling to raise an army of their own, of the true Covenanting type, in the south-western counties. Their first commander was Colonel Strachan, the victor of Carbisdale.

This movement was viewed with great suspicion by Charles and the Court party. The King was led to believe that Strachan, with the connivance of some of the Committee of Estates, intended to kidnap him, and hand him over to the English, and on October 4th, he rode off to Dudhope, near Dundee, to join a rising of royalists, which had been planned in the north. Next morning his purpose was shaken, and by the advice of friends, he returned to Perth with Montgomery, who had been sent after him with 600 horse. The govern-

(1) Row's Continuation of Blair, p. 240.

ment had some trouble with those who were implicated in the matter, but with the concurrence of the Committee of Estates, a full indemnity was granted to all concerned, and they laid down their arms on the 4th of November.(1) This episode was known as "The Start."

Though closely engaged in the siege of Edinburgh Castle, Cromwell was watchful of what was going on in the country. He had hopes that the western leaders would come to terms, and he paid a visit to Glasgow and several other towns on the receipt of a letter from Strachan, but nothing came of it. Learning that Leslie purposed attempting to raise the siege, he hastened back to his task at Edinburgh.

After "The Start" the western party felt emboldened to issue on the 17th of October from Dumfries, to which their army had withdrawn, a lengthy "Remonstrance" to the Committee of Estates.(2) Patrick Gillespie is the reputed author, and Warriston the reviser of the document. It deals with the sins of the commissioners and Parliament in treating with the King, though it was manifest that he was still a Malignant at heart, and gives instances to prove it. The signatories then declare: "wee disclaime all the guilte and sin of the king and of his housse, both olde and lait; and declare, that wee cannot owen him and his intrest in the stait of the quarrell betuix ws and the enimey, against quhom (if the Lord will) we are to hazard our liues." They go on to rebuke the members of the Committee for their faults, above all for their slackness in enforcing the Act of Classes; and petition that not only Malignants and Engagers, but all who had suggested a union with such should be removed from

(1) Peterkin, Records, p. 608.

(2) Balfour, IV, 141. Peterkin, 604. Baillie, III, 110.

the Committee of Estates, the army, the Court, and all places of trust. The conclusion of the paper, as coming from a body of men in arms, is suggestive. "wee shall, to the wttermost of our power, endewor to gett these thinges remedied according to our places and callinges". This reached the Committee of Estates on October 22, but they delayed answering it. At length on November 25th, just prior to the meeting of Parliament, they denounced it as scandalous and injurious to the King and dishonourable to the nation.

Strachan refused to sign the Remonstrance as it seemed to point to war. Colonel Ker succeeded him, but the continued inactivity of the western army annoyed the government, and Colonel Montgomery, with a large body of horse, was ordered to supersede Ker. As soon as Ker heard of this he resolved to anticipate him, and early in the morning of 1st December he attempted to surprise General Lambert at Hamilton. Though successful at first, his army was totally routed and scattered, and himself wounded and taken prisoner. Strachan in vain attempted to rally them, and then surrendered himself to Cromwell. On the 24th of December Edinburgh Castle capitulated, and except for a few guerilla bands, Cromwell was master of all the country south of the Forth.

There was a growing feeling that something must be done if the country were to be saved, and on the 4th of December the matter was brought before the Committee of Estates, but it was realized that the consent of the Church must be obtained. At the request of the Committee, the Moderator summoned a meeting of the Commission, to be held at Perth on the 14th. The question submitted to them was: "What persons are to be admitted to rise in arms, and to join with the forces of the kingdom, and in what capacity,

for the defence thereof, against the armies of the sectaries, who contrary to the Solemn League and Covenant and treaties, have most unjustly invaded, and are destroying the kingdom. (1) The Commission answered that in this case of so great and ardent necessity they could not oppose the raising of all fencible persons, except the excommunicated, the notoriously profane, and the professed enemies of the Covenant. This implied that all who submitted to the Church would be allowed to enlist, and soon the churches were filled with mock penitents. Nobles and captains as well as privates put on sackcloth, avowed repentance, and were received. On March 19th the Commission had another question submitted to them by the Estates as to whether it was lawful to admit to the Committee of Estates those who had formerly been debarred, but now consented to the Covenant. The Commission replied that they desired the Parliament to admit to the Committee all save a few prime actors against the state. (2) This was all the Estates required, and on June 2nd the Act of Classes was repealed.

The Commission had been by no means unanimous in passing their resolutions, and the Church was now divided into two contending factions: 1) the Resolutioners, the moderate party, who had given affirmative answers to the questions of the Estates: 2) The Remonstrants, or Protesters, as they were afterwards called, the extreme party, who were in opposition to them. Feeling between the two was strong, and many papers were published by both, in favour of their own and attacking the views of the other party.

It was decided that Charles should be crowned at Scone on the first of January 1651. The usual preliminary fasts were held, and the ceremony took place as

- (1) Ealfour, IV, 197.  
 Wodrow, "Sufferings", I, 2.  
 (2) Ealfour, IV, 270.



arranged. Douglas preached at great length. The King swore to both Covenants and subscribed them, promising to give his "royal assent to acts and ordinances of Parliament passed or to be passed, enjoining the same in his other dominions". Then the ancient ceremonial, with the exception of anointing which was deemed superstitious, was gone through. Argyle placed the crown upon the royal head, and the nobles touched it as a token of their allegiance. Charles addressed the ministers present, protesting his sincerity, and with consummate hypocrisy, besought them that if ever in the future they ever saw or heard of his breaking the Covenant, they were to remind him of his oath.<sup>2</sup> And this was the Covenant he was resolved to break whenever he was powerful enough to do it.

Some of the Remonstrants, still a considerable minority of the clergy, held, and occasionally expressed, the view that it would be better to close with Cromwell than to engage in a war which would give the enemies of the Covenant, as they reckoned them, the control of the country. Even some of the gentry and nobles appear to have been of a somewhat like mind,<sup>6</sup> and the Earl of Roxburgh and Sir Alexander Hope, though at different times, both suggested to Charles that he should arrange with Cromwell that he should retain the northern part of the Kingdom, and abandon all south of the Forth.<sup>(1)</sup> We can imagine how this would appeal to the King who believed himself to be the King of England de jure, and was determined to make himself so de facto as soon as he possibly could.

The repeal of the Act of Classes was regarded by the King as enabling him to appoint not only Engagers, but even open despisers of the discipline of the Kirk to his service. The Remonstrants still held out, but the Resolutioners accepted all professions of repentance as genuine, and so the ranks were filled. There was no more word of "purging", and by the middle of

(2) Remonstrants  
S.M. 1629  
1.256

(1) Balfour,  
IV, 238-249

June an army had been assembled at Stirling. (1) The basis of the Scottish opposition to Cromwell in the present war was not as it had been to Charles I in the Bishops' Wars, "Christ's Crown and Covenant", but "Charles and his Crown". It was not a struggle for religion in which the whole nation was united, as in 1639, but a political warfare in which the King, nobles and gentry were alone concerned. There was little discipline or enthusiasm among the men who had been dragged from their homes to fight.

Cromwell had been seriously ill in the earlier part of the year, but he was now sufficiently recovered to lead his army, and he marched against Leslie. The latter had learned his lesson, and would not be tempted from his coign of vantage at Torwood. Having command of the sea, Cromwell now sought to cut off the supplies from Fife, and soon he had 4500 men under Lambert strongly entrenched at North Queensferry. Leslie, underestimating this force, sent 4000 men under Sir John Brown to drive them off. North of Inverkeithing they were met by Lambert, and in the battle about half of them were killed and 1500 captured, including Brown himself. The next move of the invaders was made on Perth. The expected reinforcements from Huntly and supplies were now cut off from the royal army in every direction, and they were left with but three alternatives - to starve, to disband, or to march south. The last, desperate as it was, was chosen, and they marched on England, some 20,000 strong. Cromwell had already despatched Harrison with a force to harrass them if they did make this move, and after the capture of Perth, which he effected in a single day, (2) he followed in pursuit, leaving Monk with 5 or 6000 men to besiege Stirling.

(1) Balfour, *Annales*, IV, 308.

(2) M. Laing, *History*, III, 468.

Scarcely an Englishman joined the Scottish army on the march - they were decidedly unpopular. Hamilton urged Charles to make straight for London, but he declined, holding it safer to remain near the Welsh border, from which recruits might be expected. On 22nd August his army, wearied and dispirited by their long march, reached Worcester. The Council of State meanwhile made preparations for the defence of the Capital, the militia responding readily to the call. Some fighting had taken place in the north, but here the few royalists who came forward were badly beaten by the parliamentary troops. Cromwell had now effected a junction with Lambert and Harrison, and having received considerable reinforcements, was now at the head of an army of 28,000 men, while the Scots were (1) certainly under 16,000, probably not more than 14,000.

The great superiority of numbers, as well as their greater esprit de corps, made it easy for Cromwell to dispose his army according to his mind. One force blocked the way to London, and another prevented a retreat being made, or assistance being received from the west. Victory over the dispirited army of Charles was a foregone conclusion. On September 3rd - the anniversary of Dunbar - the battle was fought, and was, to use Cromwell's own words, "as stiff a contest for four or five hours as ever he had seen".<sup>(2)</sup> Charles and his advisers watched the combat from the Cathedral tower, but descended at a critical moment, and fought gallantly with his men. The slaughter was terrible. Many of the Scottish leaders were captured, and Hamilton was so seriously wounded that he died a few days afterwards. The fugitives were cut down or captured by the countrymen, even the cavalry did not escape, and Charles' army was an army no longer. The King escaped from the city, and after long and weary

(1) Laing. III, 471. (2) Cromwell, Letter  
CLXXXII.

wandering in disguise, and after several very narrow escapes from capture, he contrived to reach the French coast. His venture was made, and he had lost.

Monk lost no time in executing the task set for him by Cromwell. On the 14th of August the Highland garrison of Stirling compelled the governor to surrender the Castle. Monk then advanced on Dundee, where many refugees from Glasgow and other towns had gathered. Before the siege had actually been commenced he received a report that Leven and the Committee of Estates had met at Alyth to concert measures for the relief of the town, and on the 28th Leven and about thirty of the principal nobles and gentry were captured and sent to England. When Dundee was formally summoned to surrender, Robert Lumsden, the governor, sent back an insulting message, demanding that the English troops should submit to the King. After bombardment the walls were breached, and on September 1st it was stormed and captured. Exaggerated stories of the massacre of the townsmen who had assisted in the defence were current, but it is certain that for twenty-four hours the town was given up to loot, and that the captors secured a rich booty. Scenes like those witnessed at Drogheda were not necessary to overawe the country. Most of it was already in Monk's hands, and northern towns like Montrose and Aberdeen speedily surrendered. Huntly disbanded his force towards the end of November, Dumbarton Castle capitulated in January 1652, and Dunottar, the last of the strongholds, on the 26th of May.

Having thus established peace in all the lowland country, the Commonwealth Government tried to treat Scotland fairly, as they deemed fairness. They passed an ordinance of indemnity, excepting the royal family and some persons of note. This was at the same time

a declaration of peace between the two countries. The English Parliament at first had thoughts of treating Scotland as a conquered country, but better counsels prevailed, and they decided that the people of Scotland should be "made equal sharers with those of England in the present settlement of peace, liberty, and prosperity, with all other privileges of a free people."

In January 1652 eight English commissioners took up residence at Dalkeith to arrange with the Scots for a union to England. The national feeling was hostile to this. The Resoluti~~o~~n~~e~~r~~s~~, after their late earnest support of the King, could hardly be expected to agree, while the Remonstrants were in distinct opposition to any Government which did not accept the Covenant. Nor would the latter agree to toleration. It was from the royalist gentry that the commissioners received their chief support. They were now to a large extent in alienation from the Church, whose stern discipline they not only disliked but hated. The commissioners, however, were not wishful to depend wholly on them, and sought to secure the support of the people as a whole. They issued a proclamation declaring that they were resolved to provide for the administration of justice and to oppose the exercise of any authority not derived from the Commonwealth. The royal arms were torn down from public places. A direct appeal was also made to the material interests of the people. The estates of those who had taken part in the invasion of England in 1648 and 1651 were confiscated to meet the expenses of the war, and were to be leased at moderate rents to farmers, who would thus be delivered from the oppressions of the past and enabled to live more comfortably. Deputies were summoned to meet with the Commissioners to settle how matters

could be best carried through. The order met with no cordial response. The clergy protested against it. A number of the burghs and shires declined, or at any rate neglected to send delegates. On March 18th the English Parliament introduced a measure for the incorporation of the two countries, and on April 19th it received a first and second reading. It was then hung up to allow of the selection of the proposed committee. On the 21st intimation was made at Edinburgh Cross, but no popular satisfaction was expressed, to the astonishment of the English, who seem to have thought that they were doing a generous thing.

Argyle had not joined in the expedition which ended so disastrously at Worcester, but had fortified himself in his castle at Inverary. Here he purposed to hold a sort of meeting of Estates, but Huntly and other royalists had not accepted his invitation. Ever since the Worcester fight he had been endeavouring to secure that under his own influence Parliament, or some other body, though in close association with the English, might obtain for Scotland independence in her domestic government, but this the English government was determined not to allow. The Highlands were still very unsettled, and Colonel Deane, who had taken the place of Monk, who was now assisting in the war with the Dutch, was appointed to establish peace. On August 12th 1652 he took a step in this direction by entering into a treaty with Argyle at Inverary.

The English were meanwhile doing their best to keep their bargain and conciliate the people. Customs ceased to be levied at Berwick and Carlisle, and Free Trade prevailed from the Shetlands to Land's End. Excellent discipline was maintained amongst the troops, and the people suffered very little from their presence. Justice, formerly so corrupt, was

impartially administered by English judges.

A drastic piece of work was still to be done. The Resolutioners and Remonstrants, as they were now generally called, were fighting as fiercely as ever, and disturbing the peace of the country. An Assembly had met at St Andrews in July 1651, but adjourned to Dundee on account of the English victory at Inverkeithing. Here an attempt was made to exclude the members of the Commission from the Assembly, but totally failed. Rutherford handed in a protest against the Assembly itself signed by 22 persons, who then withdrew. At this Assembly Guthrie, Gillespie, and Simpson, three leading Protesters, were deposed. Another Assembly was held in July 1652, and a bitter conflict was waged. The Resolutioners were the more numerous, and claimed the right of calling, constituting, and conducting it, but were opposed by the Protesters. They issued a new Protest, signed by 63 ministers and about 80 elders, and after a fortnight's fierce wrangling the Assembly was dissolved, and none of its Acts were recorded. Another Assembly was appointed to be held in Edinburgh in the July of the following year, and though the members did meet, the gathering came to an untimely end. Robert Baillie, who was himself present and suffered the same indignity as the others, tells the story. (1) On the opening day, just as Dickson the Moderator had finished his prayer, the church was surrounded by a troop of horse and a company of Musketeers, and colonel Cotterell entered and asked if they sat there by the authority of the Parliament of the Commonwealth or any of the English authorities in Scotland. "The Moderator replied, That we were ane ecclesiasticall synod, ane Spirituall court of Jesus Christ, which meddled not with anything civill; that our

(1) Baillie, Letters, III, 225.

authoritie was from God, and established by the lawes of the land yet standing unrepealed; that by the Solemn League and Covenant, the most of the English army stood obliged to defend our Generall Assemblie." The Colonel had not come to discuss the matter, and said his order was to dissolve them, and commanded them to depart. There was nothing for it but to make a protest and obey. Surrounded by soldiers they were led for a mile out of the town, and given orders not to meet again more than three in number, and to be clear of the city by eight O'clock next morning. It is said that Lilburne gave this order on his own responsibility, having heard, truly or falsely, that the ministers were in correspondence with the royalists in the Highlands. No other General Assembly met from 1653 till after the Revolution.

The spirit of the Scottish royalists was not wholly quenched by the defeat of Worcester, and within a year we find them urging Charles to authorize a rising in Scotland on his behalf. At this time he was deeply interested in the quarrel between the Commonwealth and the Dutch Republic, but an outbreak of this kind could do him no harm, and might possibly have a favourable issue. So on 15th June he granted a commission as his lieutenant-general to Middleton, who had escaped from the Tower. While in Holland, endeavouring to obtain support for the undertaking, he fell seriously ill. The Highland chiefs became impatient at the delay, and besought the appointment of another commander to act in his absence. This was the great difficulty. The adventure had been suggested by the first campaign of Montrose, but with hopes of a better ending, but there was no Montrose to unite the jealous chiefs. At length the Earl of Glencairn was chosen at the known wish of the King. During the rest of the year there was a number of



skirmishes, but no very serious fighting.

Argyle remained loyal to his treaty, though his son, Lorne, vainly tried to rouse his father's clan in favour of the king. It was indeed mostly younger sons who flocked to the royal standard, for the elder brothers, even if they secretly favoured it, remained at home to protect the family estate. Exaggerated reports of royalist successes were sent to the Continent, but Middleton, when he came to Scotland at the end of February 1654, partially dispelled the illusions formed. Still, Lilburne, the Commonwealth commander, though he had at first treated the rebellion lightly, now began to find his position serious though he had an army of 12,000 men, a larger and better equipped force than the Covenanters ever put in the field against Montrose. He was, however, magnanimous enough to realize that Monk would be likely to make better headway than himself, and he wrote to Lambert to that effect. Monk came north in April to control the military and civil government of Scotland.

He had two proclamations made at Edinburgh Cross. The first was to announce the establishment of the Protectorate, and the second to intimate that Scotland was now to form an integral part of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, that the authority of her ancient kings and Parliament had now ceased, and that she was for the future to send thirty members to the Parliament at Westminster. Next day stern warning was given to all enemies of the Commonwealth. Pardon and grace were promised to the people of Scotland with respect to all acts of war, except to 24 named persons— all save three of them Lords of Parliament or their sons — whose estates, save a provision for their wives and children, were forfeited. On 73 others fines, ranging from £500 to £14,000, were imposed. All who had taken part in the present

rising, from 1st May 1654, were exempted from the benefits of this ordinance. All who had connived at the rebellion of their brothers, or did not secure their surrender within twenty days, were to be imprisoned. On every Presbytery from which rebels had gone forth, and upon every parent whose son had taken part in the outbreak, a fine was to be imposed. Most unworthy of all, was the price of £200 set on the heads of Middleton, Kenmore, Dalziel, and Seaforth respectively, an insulting offer never claimed.

Monk made his military preparations deliberately, and carried out his operations ruthlessly. Middleton was diligently raising a force of cavalry, for which he was receiving volunteers from the north of England and the lowlands of Scotland. Monk set about making a barrier between the Highlands and Lowlands, which cavalry could not cross, by burning every house and crop which stood in the way. He then went in pursuit of Middleton, and at length got him into such a position that the only way by which he could reach the far north as he purposed, was through the pass which connects the upper reaches of the Spey and the Garry. Colonel Morgan, in command of a detached force, met him at Dalnaspidal on July 19th. In the battle which ensued Middleton was completely defeated, and most of his horses were captured. The loss was irreparable. The fighting was now over, but there was hunting of the fugitives to be done. In August some of the leaders were already preparing to submit, and as they were offered easy terms, the others followed. Middleton escaped to the Continent in the following spring, but the rebellion was over long before that. Many of the prisoners of lesser degree were shipped to the Barbadoes. Twenty-eight fortresses, including four new powerful forts, were built, and garrisoned by 9,000 well-disciplined soldiers, served completely to overawe the country.

Scotland was now conquered as it never had been conquered before by Roman general or English King, and some have wondered why a nation which had fought the War of Independence and won it under Bruce, should have so submitted. But we have to bear in mind that the drain upon the country during the last few years had been exceedingly severe. The population probably was not greatly <sup>under</sup> a million, and yet, besides the heavy casualties in the wars with Montrose, it is calculated that she had lost during the last three years, by slaughter and the banishment of prisoners of war, no less than 40,000 of her most virile sons. Financially, she was in a most depressed condition, and most of her nobles and many of her traders were deep in debt. Many of the natural leaders of the people were dead, or banished, or in hiding. The unity which had given strength to the nation during the Bishops' Wars, was now shattered, and the clergy were separated into bitterly hostile bands. But, perhaps, the chief cause of all was the lack of the strong man beloved of Carlyle. It was a time of mediocrities. Exhausted and depressed as Scotland was in 1654, there was still enough of vitality in the nation, if wisely and strongly led, to regain and secure her freedom and independence. Says Carlyle: (1) "The faults or misfortunes of the Scotch People, in their Puritan business, are many, but properly their grand fault is this, That they have produced for it no sufficiently heroic man among them." He imagines what might have been if Cromwell had been a Scotsman and with "a unanimous Hero Nation at his back". "With Oliver born Scotch, one sees not but the whole world might have become Puritan." It was not to be. For a season she must remain under the heel of the Protectorate, and later of a still more hateful tyranny.

(1) Letters and Speeches, III, 3.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### The Social Conditions.

In the course of the narrative we have had occasional glimpses of the condition of the people of Scotland in the days of the Covenant, but I purpose in the present chapter to give a brief but more connected sketch of the state of the country in that period. We have to remember that the whole history of the people is not written in the records of the religious struggles of the time. They had entered into a mingled heritage of good and evil, and lived their lives, and had interests, and fears, and hopes, and joys and sorrows apart from these. Rightly to understand the historical setting of the Covenants we must know something of them.

Any estimate of the population must be largely a matter of guess-work. It has been supposed that in the reign of Queen Mary it was little in excess of half a million, and at the Revolution of 1688 approximately a million and a half, so at the middle of the seventeenth century we may believe it to have been well under a million. Robert Chambers, on the basis of the militia arranged for in 1645, at the rate of one militia man for every sixty of the population, estimates the total at 706,320, (1) which is probably not very far wide of the mark.

Mr. Hector Macpherson perhaps writes too strongly when he says: "During the pre-Reformation period Scotland was not a nation; it was a collection of warring atoms." (2) There had been something

(1) "Domestic Annals of Scotland", II, pp. 162-3.

(2) "Intellectual Development of Scotland", p. 6.

approaching unity in the prosperous days of Alexander III, and the common disaster of Flodden had effected something more. The great event of the Reformation had done still more in the same direction; but there yet remained the great distinction of Highlanders and Lowlanders, speaking different languages, living a different life, and cherishing different ideals. We therefore cannot definitely speak of Scotland in the days of the Covenant as a unity. There were marked differences among the people, which have not yet wholly vanished, though they have largely disappeared under the influences of a common civilization and a common religious faith.

The very aspect of the country has greatly changed since then. Its bareness of timber was then extreme, as it was more than a century later. The Privy Council in 1608 declared to James VI that there was not in the country as much "as may serve the hundredth part of the necessair vseis of the same!"<sup>(1)</sup> About the same time the use of timber in smelting iron was forbidden. Little of the land was enclosed, and tracts now covered with highly cultivated farms were then bogs and heaths. There was little of the country under cultivation, and the agriculture carried on was very primitive. The implements employed were clumsy and the returns small. There were no efforts made to improve the breed of the cattle, which were all of a small class. Some improvement had taken place on the union of the crowns, when the superior condition of English farming was made known, but no great advance was made till the following century.

The improvements in artillery had rendered the castles of the middle ages futile, and they were gradually being replaced by more commodious mansions,

(1) *Privy C. Regr.* VIII, 543.

and those in Scotland were usually of a distinctly national type. In the course of the seventeenth century a number of notable buildings were erected in different parts of the country. But the abodes of the people showed little improvement since the fourteenth century. Dr. John Ray, the naturalist, visited Scotland in 1661, and notes: "The ordinary country houses are pitiful cots, built of stone, and covered with turves, having in them but one room, many of them no chimneys, the windows very small, broken, and not glazed." This is fully corroborated by the accounts given by other contemporary writers. Till a later period the parish manses were usually incommodious, thatched dwellings.

The towns at the beginning of the century were very poorly built, many of the houses were of timber and thatched. When a fire broke out every habitation in the neighbourhood was liable to be reduced to ashes. Many disastrous instances in various towns are on record. On 17th July 1652 a fire broke out in one of the narrow lanes opening off the east side of the High Street of Glasgow, and before the conflagration could be extinguished, about a thousand families were rendered homeless. There were then no fire insurance companies, and so the loss fell wholly on the unfortunate owners and tenants. During the century considerable architectural improvements were made in some of the principal towns. In Edinburgh thatch was recognised to be dangerous and not decent to be seen in the chief city of the kingdom, and it was ordered to be replaced by lead, slates or tiles. In 1681 Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee, and Stirling, ordered that all houses that were built were to be so covered. In some of the larger towns, and in their principal streets, at any rate during winter, some attempt at lighting by oil lamps

was made. Still the town streets and closes remained abominably filthy. The reports of travellers have made us familiar with the shocking condition of the streets of the Capital, but other towns, such as Dundee, Perth, and St Andrews, were but little better. Efforts at improvement were made from time to time, but they had little success. During the seventeenth century the country was intersected by green roads ("Drove roads"), on which the sheep and cattle might feed and rest. The roads provided for the transit of passengers and goods were in a deplorable condition, and in winter nearly impassable. The bridges, whether of stone or timber, were usually narrow, often in bad repair, and dangerous. During the reign of Charles II great efforts were made for the repair and improvement of roads and bridges, but without any great good effect. By the Acts of 1617 and 1669 something of the nature of a corvee was instituted, but without much success. An example of the actual state of a road is given in the Privy Council Register of 15th June 1680. The first four miles of the road from Edinburgh to London - from the Clockmill Fridge to Magdalen Bridge - are described as being in so ruinous a state, that passengers were in danger of their lives, "either by their coaches overturning, their horses falling, their carts breaking, their loads casting, and horse stumbling, the poor people with their burdens on their backs sorely grieved and discouraged", also "strangers do often exclaim thereat." A toll of a halfpenny for a laden cart, or a sixth of a penny for a laden horse, was authorised in order to get this piece of road kept in repair. In other parts of the country and earlier in the century we should not expect the roads to be any better. Under such circumstances there would be no unnecessary

travelling. At the end of the sixteenth century Mary of Guise and the English Ambassador had coaches, but these were then very rare. During the seventeenth century the number of family coaches increased considerably, but till well on in the following century sedan chairs were the usual means of conveyance in the towns.

Early in the seventeenth century there was an elementary sort of postal service in different parts of the country, but not till 1635 was there a constant service between Scotland and England. Then an arrangement was made for a post between Edinburgh and London, by which an answer could be obtained in six days. During the rule of Cromwell intercourse between the two countries increased, and in 1658 a fortnightly stage coach was running between the Capitals.

The furniture of the houses of the people was in keeping with the exterior, scant and mean. Many sumptuary laws were passed, some of them minutely detailing the material and ornamentation which might be worn by the different orders of society. These limited the peasantry to plain attire, but they liked it to be good. The highlanders wore kilts of the tartan of their clans. In the lowlands the persons employed on a farm were clothed by its produce - its flax, wool, and leather. The lowland peasantry of the seventeenth century, though meanly housed, and though they ate of the coarsest food, yet dressed neatly. Dr. John Ray, already quoted, remarks on their fondness for good clothing. He says: "On Sundays a fellow that has <sup>scarce</sup> ten goats besides to help himself with, you shall see come out of his smoky cottage, clad like a gentleman". The country gentry dressed well, and the courtiers saw to it that their habit was as costly



costly as their purse could buy or their credit secure.

The nobles and chiefs maintained a considerable state, and showed a liberal hospitality in what would now be reckoned a rude way. The viands were piled upon the board at the beginning of the meal, and there was no waiting in the modern sense of the term. At their feasts venison (variously cooked), mutton, goat's flesh, salmon, poultry, and game of many kinds were lavishly provided. Domestic account-books show that many foreign dainties also found a place. Comfits, sugar candy, aniseed oil and coffee came from Flanders, marmalade from Spain, vinegar from Bordeaux, olive oil and wine from France and Spain. Tea was introduced by the Duke of York in 1682, and it was only slowly received. But the tables of the bonnet lairds and agricultural classes provided a much more limited menu. Salted beef and herrings, porridge and milk, and broth, appear to have been the regular dishes. While the tables of the wealthy had appointments of silver and glass, those of the others rarely rose above wooden and coarse crockery vessels and horn spoons.

All classes were considerably given to drink. The upper classes drank the wines of France and Spain. Taverns were numerous, and the custom of eating and drinking in them appears to have increased. Among the lower classes beer was largely drunk, but strong waters were also much used. Drink money during the seventeenth century was a recognized institution, the allowance made for it to craftsmen being about an eighth of the stipulated remuneration. But the frequent excesses of all classes led to the Church setting a determined face against the practice, and we have frequent references in

Kirk Session books of fines and punishments imposed. But the custom seemed to increase rather than to diminish. Even when the power of the Church was at its maximum, it was unable wholly to curb the popular tendency to drunkenness.

As we might expect from the insanitary conditions under which the people lived, - the filth, the bad feeding and housing, the undrained lands - disease was rife and the mortality high. Epidemics were common. "The Pest" was a dreaded visitor to the country, of which we often read. From the thirteenth to the seventeenth century upwards of thirty plagues swept over Scotland, some of which decimated the people. Other diseases were chronic. There was much madness. This was largely, but not exclusively, due to malaria, for it is now known that blood so poisoned may affect the brain. It may taint a family for generations, if the conditions under which it was generated persist. There can be little doubt that many of the confessions of of sorcery and witchcraft which were made at this period were due to the accused suffering from this disease. In rural districts, in flat and undrained places, cutaneous complaints, rheumatic and pulmonary ailments, and intermittent fever were common. The length of human life was considerably shorter than at present. In the carse lands of Stirling and Menteith, the inhabitants usually died at the age of forty or fifty, while those who survived this age were diseased and feeble. Large families were the rule, but the rate of infantile mortality was terrible. By the introduction of better drainage ague has ceased, and rheumatic and pulmonary complaints have proportionally decreased. In the towns, fires, calamitous though they often were, helped to purify the place and reduce the death-rate. The country was poor, Many of the nobles and

gentry were deeply in debt, and among the mercantile class large fortunes, though not unknown, were rare. A considerable proportion of the population was little above the poverty line. That beggars were very numerous we have abundant evidence in Kirk Session and Presbytery books and in Acts of Parliament. There was no statutory poor rate, and the burden of maintaining the poor fell upon the Church, which did its best to relieve distress, not only among the local poor, but also in other deserving cases. The people appear to have been truly generous in proportion to their means. Sometimes, however, Kirk Sessions got exasperated at the claims made upon them by outsiders. At one time, after 1649, the Dunfermline Session procured a wheelbarrow, in which the sexton might transport beyond their bounds all aged and infirm persons who had no claim upon their funds. But as there were many sturdy beggars roaming the country, Parliament had several times to come to the assistance of the ministers and elders. Drastic Acts imposing penalties on wandering mendicants and those who harboured such vagabonds were passed.

A certain amount of trade had been carried on by the Scots with foreign countries for a considerable time. It consisted chiefly in the export of raw materials, and in the import of manufactured articles. Hides, wool, salted fish, various kinds of live stock, and even a limited quantity of cloth of a poor quality, were exported to the Low Countries and the Baltic. Wine, cloth of a superior quality, weapons, etc. were imported. In Scotland trade was always deemed honourable, and was resorted to by men who held it to be no disgrace to their lineage to do so. There were many hindrances to

Scottish trade. Exports of some and imports of other goods were prohibited. The union of the crowns under James did not help Scottish commerce, as it involved the country in English antagonisms to foreign countries with which it had formerly traded in friendly relations. The same thing prevailed during the temporary union with England during the Protectorate, while taxation was heavy, and restrictions were imposed upon its foreign trade in the interests of English manufactures. "The Restoration brought with it, and even intensified the old system of restriction. The Scots were, moreover, hard hit by the English Navigation Laws against the Dutch, which debarred Scottish ships from any share in the English carrying trade." (1) Some efforts were made to introduce manufactures into the country during the seventeenth century, and some little progress was effected, but the troubles in the country through persecutions by the Government and the imposition of military law greatly hindered these. By the beginning of the century coal mining had become one of the recognized industries of the country, but till a later period it was not carried on to any great extent.

The Scots had long been noted for their quick tempers and violent acts (2), and there were still many crimes of violence perpetrated in the country. Murder and manslaughter were common. Among the nobles and Highland chiefs feuds and vendettas, accompanied by murder and outrage, were frequent. Men of high position in the country were often guilty of deeds of violence as well as those of humble rank. Crimes of dishonesty were common.

(1) Socl. and Industl. Hist. of Scotland, by James Mackinnon Ph.D., D.D. p.128.

(2) Actors in the Puritan Revoln., Payne, §, 216.

Cattle-stealing was rampant. No herd of cattle or flock of sheep within twenty miles of the Highland border was secure against plunder. The only way to avoid loss was by paying black-mail to the reivers. This was indeed a regular institution - an illegal tax which the owners were compelled to pay. Thefts on a smaller scale were few or many according to the probability of detection and punishment. In towns this crime had of late considerably decreased. Justice was administered by the king's judges, the hereditary sheriffs, and in some cases by the magistrates of boroughs, who claimed the power of inflicting the supreme penalty. This was inflicted for many offences which are now but lightly punished by terms of imprisonment.. Corruption was common among the judges. The parties to causes were usually attended by bands of their supporters in order, if possible, to overawe the Court. During the Commonwealth there was a great change for the better, when a majority of Englishmen were associated with the Scotch judges. The result was an impartiality in the decisions that had seldom been known in former days. But with the Restoration there was a return to the former evil state of affairs. This was well known, and not always denied. When some one praised the English judges, Sir John Gilmour, Lord President of the Court of Session under Charles II, exclaimed, "Deil speed them, for they have neither kith nor kin." The remark explains much.

Life in the time of the Covenant was no doubt a more austere affair than it is to-day, but we need not accept what Dean Stanley calls "the frightful picture" drawn by Euckle as a correct representation

of the prevailing state of affairs. No doubt some of the ministers were narrow and stern, and approximated to the portrait which he would have us believe was characteristic of all, but all the ministers were not men of this stamp, nor had they such a depressing influence on all their hearers. If we read their biographies (1), we shall find frequent traits of tenderness, which show that some of them at least were men of truly affectionate spirit. We shall find them joining in the social relations of their people, and even taking part in their more sober amusements, while ever maintaining a gravity of demeanour becoming ministers of the Gospel. Had they been the sour-faced tyrants Buckle and others would have us regard them, they would not have won from their congregations the acceptance of their principles or the affection for their persons we know many of them possessed. No doubt the losses of the Civil Wars, the resentment at the English dominion in the time of the Protectorate, and the cruel persecution which followed the Restoration, would tend to bring gloom into the lives of the people. We can well understand that the latter period - the years following 1662 till the Revolution - was one of deep depression. Men in danger of ruinous fines, of imprisonment and torture, and even of death, could not well be frivolous or gay. The Scottish people had their sports, horse-racing, shooting, fishing, and such games as shinty, golf, bowls, football, curling in winter, music, instrumental and vocal. - and these still found a place - albeit a much smaller place - amongst them through all the troubles of the time.

As we have already seen, some provision was made

(1) E.g. Select Biographies, II, p.39.

for education in Scotland even before the Reformation. The zeal of the early Reformers in this matter is well known. Their great difficulties owing to the greed of those who plundered the Church are also familiar. It "does not appear that the impropiators of churches and church property allocated even a fraction of the plunder gotten at the Reformation to the cause of Education".(1)

Still, what the Church could do in the sixteenth century it gladly did. In the seventeenth century more was accomplished. In 1616 the Privy Council ordered a school to be set up in every parish,<sup>(3)</sup> and in 1633 Parliament legislated to the same effect, but little was done. In 1636 King Charles blamed the bishops for their remissness in carrying out the orders of Parliament, and they blamed the heritors for not providing the necessary funds.(2) In 1646 Parliament again enacted that a school be provided for every parish, and under the Presbyterian regime some progress was made in this direction, though the ecclesiastical conflicts of the time and the lack of funds owing to the depressed state of the country stood in the way. In those schools the hours were long and the discipline strict. In most towns the scholars were in attendance for ten hours a day, though this was gradually relaxed. The subjects taught would no doubt vary in different schools, but there was a considerable range, including Latin, grammar, English, writing, in a few schools drawing and painting, in some music, and later geography and arithmetic. Sunday was no idle day for school children. Attendance at sermons and catechising, and learning passages of Scripture and Psalms filled up the time. The teachers likewise had a

(1) Grant, *Eurgh Schools*, p. 447.

(2) *Ibid.* (3) *Priv. C. Regr. X, 687.*

busy time. As Mr. Grant puts it, "The teacher was not only a religious drill sergeant, but was frequently required to do the duties of a detective." (1) That is, to take care that on the Sabbath Day the children should keep order when out of school, and as far as possible remain within doors.

In the seventeenth century the Scots language varied from the English, though the latter gradually came into use. A considerable amount of printing of books, pamphlets, and various manifestoes was done throughout the century. One newspaper - the *Mercurius Caledonius* - had a brief existence, being stopped after the ninth weekly issue. Little of the literature produced during the Covenanted period will live. The interest and feeling of men largely spent themselves in political and ecclesiastical controversy. Considering the troubles of the time we need not be surprised at the smallness of the production of works of fancy and imagination. The writings of the period which are now best known are those of the historians, Spottiswood, Calderwood, Kirkton, Row, and Paillie. Many works of controversial theology were issued, such as Calderwood's anonymous "The Pastor and the Prelate", Rutherford's "Lex Rex" and a "Peaceable and Temperate Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland", and George Gillespie's "A Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies" and "Aaron's Rod Blossoming", Bishop Maxwell's "The Epistle Congratulatorie of Lysimachus Nicanor" .

Libraries, when existent, were small. Many learned works of the time were written in Latin, which was then familiar to the educated men of all nations. It is interesting to read in such letters

(1) Grant, *Burgh Schools*, p. 434.



as those of Eaille to Spang, of the occasional orders for books which were sent to the Continent, especially to Holland, where many were printed and published.

Having no newspapers and very limited means of obtaining information, the people were chiefly dependent for any news of current events upon the ministers, who freely gave them what they had, and their interpretation of them, from their pulpits. The sermons then supplied to a considerable extent the function of the leading articles in our modern newspapers.

Their ideas of church architecture were limited to those of the barest utility. They had little concern for comfort, and none for beauty. Anything of the latter smelt of Popery, and Popery was abhorred. The fanes of the old faith, stripped of everything savouring of Rome, were indeed used when possible, but they were suffered to go to decay. Many of them had suffered in war, Hertford had wrought great damage about a century before, and their original owners had often neglected them badly, and the Reformed only allowed time to advance its work unchecked. More of the old buildings were indeed ruined in this way of neglect than by actual violence. Churches built in the course of the seventeenth century were usually poor, barnlike structures. The heritors had portions of the building allotted to them according to the amount of the teinds they paid. At first there were no pews, and the ordinary hearers took small stools with them to church. Pews were gradually introduced. The heritors who had not a special aisle to themselves, had four-square pews, and other pews were rented by the Session for the benefit of the poor. Those seats

were a source of much discussion and occasional fights. Parish bells were retained, but chimes were sold in some cases, as that of St Andrews, or melted down for cannon, as those of St Giles, Edinburgh. But all churches had not hung bells. In St Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, in 1622 they had but an handbell, rung by the beadle. Charles I was anxious to have bells of power provided for the great churches, but did not manage it.

Ministers were still scarce, and a number of churches were still not supplied with preachers. The clergy of the Covenanting period were sometimes of good family, and often well educated, and it is stated that eighty per cent of them were university graduates. Some, no doubt, were bad or inefficient men, but as a whole they laboured hard, and did good work in difficult circumstances. It is true they produced little literary work, but they had too much to do to find time for writing books. They had to preach at least three times a week, attend meetings of the Presbytery and Session, and visit their flocks. They certainly could not have been idle men if they made any honest endeavour to discharge the duties laid upon them. In some cases they were assisted by a reader, but this order was abolished by the General Assembly in 1645, though we know that it was practically continued much longer in a number of parishes. The ministers magnified their office, and held it both their right and duty to denounce publicly all offences, irrespective of the social position or the feelings of those who were at fault.

The services conducted by them were of the simplest. For many years after the Reformation

Presbyterian congregations kept covered except at prayer, and remained seated during the whole service. Not till early in the eighteenth century did the habit of standing at prayer become common. For a considerable time before the acceptance of the Westminster Directory for Public Worship extempore prayer had become general in Scotland: it was not therefore wholly a custom introduced from England. Subsequent to the middle of the seventeenth century the reading of Scripture was gradually dispensed with, and the prayers and sermon became longer and more tedious, at least to many. But against the omission of Scripture lessons we have to remember that the practice of private and family reading of the Bible was at this time very general. Many eagerly sought to learn to read for the express purpose of being able to read the Bible for themselves. In the praise of the Church no instrumental music was employed. Organs in churches were destroyed at the Reformation as a badge of Popery, and though Charles I in 1631 issued an edict commanding the erection of an organ in every cathedral and principal church, it was disobeyed. After the abdication of James VII, the organ which he had set up in Holyrood was destroyed by the mob. Only Psalms were sung. At first an earlier metrical version was used, but that of Francis Pous was accepted in 1649. The number of singings at each service was usually limited to two or three. The line was read, but disapproved by the Assembly in 1746. The fact that books and readers were few is some excuse for the uncouth practice. Catechising was a regular institution in the Church. In 1591 a translation of the Heidelberg Catechism was introduced, and continued with the sanction of the Assembly till 1649., when the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster

Assembly were adopted.

In addition to public, family worship was very general. In 1641 the General Assembly instructed ministers and elders "to take care that the worship of God be performed in families." In 1647 a Directory for family worship was prescribed.

Even before the introduction of Episcopacy fines, according to scale, were imposed upon those who absented themselves from the services of the Church. This was originally intended to be used against profane persons, but on the enforcement of Episcopacy, it was employed as an instrument to oppress those who were conscientiously opposed to the new ecclesiastical government, many of whom attended conventicles. Under Charles I this was enforced to some extent, but much more rigidly under his son.

At baptisms the people were much given to drinking, and in attempting to put down this abuse, the ministers will probably come under the lash of Mr. Buckle for depriving them of their holidays and amusements. According to the Book of Common Order, every child was to be presented for baptism by one of the parents accompanied by a godfather. Usually two attended, and in Presbyterian times these were regarded as witnesses. The Registers of Births which had been ordered to be kept in every parish was another weapon for the detection of conventiclers, for an Act was passed against any children being baptized elsewhere than in their own parish church.

While emphatically maintaining the non-sacramental character of marriage, the Reformers were desirous that a religious ceremony should be associated with it. At first it was demanded that all marriages were to be made solemnly in the face of a congregation, and they were usually celebrated at the

close of the Sunday morning service. Weddings on Sunday led to disorders on that holy day, and the custom was departed from, and marriages were celebrated on week-days. Such occasions were frequently abused by extravagant feasting and drinking, and different Kirk Sessions enforced different regulations in the effort to cure this evil. In some cases - e.g. Glasgow - the number present was limited, and the maximum cost of their entertainment fixed. In the palmiest days of the Covenant even stricter rules were made. In May 1649 the Assembly inhibited dancing at weddings, and made "the censure thereof the care and diligence of the Presbyteries." Several cases of discipline for "pyping at bridals" are on record. The clergy had also trouble to restrain "penny weddings", at which the guests contributed to the cost, and which were frequently scenes of riot. A curious marriage custom was that of "laying down the pawns", i.e. the making of a small consignment by two male friends of the bridegroom as a guarantee that the marriage would be solemnized. Another was the payment of a marriage tax, known as the Merchat, exacted by superiors from their vassals on the marriage of their daughters, and leviabie alike by barons from their bondmen, and from the baron by his sovereign. Weddings by Roman Catholic clergy were prohibited, and were punishable by heavy fines. The marriage of Scotsmen to English women, and Englishmen to Scottish women, was a matter for rebuke, and baptism might be refused to their children.

Poor persons were soon buried, but persons of quality might not be interred for several weeks. Sad to say, funerals were sometimes made occasions of excess. The regulations for burials given in the Directory are brief and very austere, and we may

suppose them to have been generally followed by the devout Presbyterians of the time. The dead body, decently attended, is to be taken from the house to the place appointed for public burial, "and there immediately interred, without any ceremony". All customs savouring of superstition, or which have been abused, are to be laid aside. The minister, however, "if he be present", may put the mourners in remembrance of their duty to apply themselves to meditations and conferences suitable to the occasion. But how exactly was the last sentence to be interpreted? "That this shall not extend to deny any civil respects or deferences at the burial, suitable to the rank and condition of the party deceased, while he was living."

The early Reformers were less rigid sabbatarians than their successors, but the latter fought hard for the establishment of their opinions. Judging from the number of enactments which continued to be made, Kirk Sessions must have found the enforcement of their orders a difficult task. Sunday customs, confirmed by ages of practice, lingered long in spite of all regulations. Cases of discipline for almost every kind of labour and amusement on the Sabbath Day are on record, such as, millers for keeping their mills going during the time of Divine service, a fisherman for basking his nets, a man for loading corn, farmers for feeding servants, especially of shearers during harvest, a servant lass for "shooling muck" on a Sunday morning, and other "secular exercises". Drinking in time of sermon appears to have been common, and was punishable. In some places visitors were appointed to go round the taverns to find if any

were drinking in them instead of attending church. Walking abroad, "vaiging", was reprovably. Both in St Andrews and in Dunfermline children were whipped for romping in the streets on Sunday.

Not only was attendance rigidly enforced, but decorum was strictly enjoined. Coming to church after the minister was in the pulpit, the use of "sneising tobacco" during service, and sleeping in church, were condemned. The latter was a common offence by women, who drew their plaids over their heads in the hope that they would not be detected. Very drastic measures were sometimes employed to keep drowsy ones awake. In Ayr the beadle was provided with a long rod to rouse sleepy apprentices, and in Monifieth on 17th September 1643 and in Kinghorn on 6th March 1645 the church officer was provided "with ane pynt of tar, to put upon women that held plaids about their heads."

For long subsequent to the Reformation the Communion was observed on a week-day, with the intention of dissociating it from the superstitious reverence adhering to the Roman Mass. At first the Service continued for six days, but this was reduced later, and the Sacrament observed on a Sunday. The communion elements were liberally partaken of by those present. The sacramental bread in the western churches was a friable cake, baked with fine flour and butter. In some parts of Calloway short-bread was used. In peaceable times when there was tent-preaching, great crowds of people attended, and as many as ten or twelve ministers were present and took part, entailing great expense on the resident minister. The celebration was accompanied by Fast Days, which were regarded as equally sacred with the Sunday. The Monday Thanksgiving Service

originated at Shotts in 1630, after a very remarkable Communion Service held there. The Presbyterian custom was for the communicants to sit during the service, and the insistence of James VI and Charles I that they should kneel during the distribution of the elements caused great opposition, comparatively few obeying the royal order. During the Commonwealth the observance was very irregular, sometimes being intermitted for years. During the troubled times which followed the observance was still more irregular.

None but Sunday or an appointed Fast Day was regarded by the Covenanters as a holy day. At the Reformation all church festivals were forbidden, but the practice of observing them was not readily overcome. Yule, however, was the most difficult day for the ministers. The people clung to the old tradition of the day, and we find many cases in which the Assembly and Sessions interfered. In 1645 the General Assembly forbade masters of colleges and schools to grant a holiday at Yule, and on 21 December 1649 the Kirk Session of St Andrews gave notice that work was to be done on that day as on any ordinary day, under penalty of censure.

On the restoration of Presbyterianism at the "Second Reformation", in 1638, a very strict ecclesiastical discipline was enforced, in which the civil authorities were ready to assist. Every kind of moral delinquency which came under the cognizance of the Church - that is, the Minister and Kirk Session, who were very watchful over their neighbours - was condemned and punished - the Session indeed usurping some of the functions of a police court. Absence from church, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, dishonesty, breaches of the seventh commandment,



every offence against the strictest morality, were liable to church censures and penalties. The offender could only be restored by doing penance before the congregation, acknowledging his trespass, professing his repentance, and receiving rebuke from the pulpit. The pressure of the needs of the poor led in some cases to the substitution of money penalties, and this became more and more the rule in later days.. In extreme cases and in the refusal to acknowledge the authority of the Church, the sentence of excommunication might be pronounced, which brought with it civil as well as ecclesiastical penalties. This was a determined effort to uproot grave social evils, and was most necessary, for the state of affairs in many quarters was very bad, but it is to be feared that it was administered more in the spirit of the Old Testament than of the New, and that, however laudable in intention, it often led to abuses.

Despite all the exhortations and rebukes of the Protestant ministers, many superstitious beliefs and practices, some of which had come down even from pre-Christian times, still lingered amongst the people. These were most numerous and most strongly held in the Hebrides and in the northern islands, but were by no means confined to those regions. The existence of ghosts was unquestioned. Belief in fairies and brownies was general, though some of the beliefs and practices were only local. Certain wells were regarded as possessing miraculous virtues, particularly at certain times, when they were resorted to by many. The performance of certain rites and the repetition of certain charms were supposed to give a knowledge of the future, or to effect the cure of certain diseases. This was

seen even in high places, as when on St John's day 1633, at Holyrood, Charles I touched a hundred persons for the cure of The King's Evil. Against such superstitions the clergy exerted all their power, and sometimes they were assisted by the civil authorities, and, it is admitted, with a certain amount of success.

But there was another superstition, in which the clergy fully shared, and that was a belief in witchcraft. This was no new thing, nor was it confined to any one section of the Church. Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians all shared in it. The belief indeed was general, and had been for centuries. There was, however, a recrudescence of it in Scotland during the Covenant times. It was mostly women who were charged with it, but men were also accused and punished. They were supposed to have renounced their Christian baptism, the devil baptising them to himself, that they they took part in Saturday orgies, at which Satan presided, and at great gatherings of the witches of all countries at Candlemas, Beltane, and Hallowe'en. From their master they received, it was believed, great powers; they could raise storms and wreck vessels, they could fly through the air on broomsticks, they could stop mills, cause or cure disease, foretell events, and so forth. To such things some confessed, but it can only have been done through fear, or torture, or, as we have seen, through insanity. In many cases they merely cured ailments by the use of simples, and in others they only pretended to act as fortune-tellers, charmers, or discoverers of stolen goods. As such they were resorted to by all classes, even by persons of rank. Not always

were they sought for such purposes. They were called upon sometimes by wicked persons to provide means for revenge upon their enemies - to injure the health of them or their families, destroy their cattle, ruin their crops, or work them other hurt. Consulting with witches was a common offence, and regular penalties were imposed; sometimes a public confession of repentance was demanded. Great cruelty was exercised towards those who fell under the suspicion of witchcraft. Exodus XXII, 18 - "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live", was regarded as a command binding upon Christians just as it had been upon the Jews of old, and by cruel tortures confessions were sought. In the various countries of Europe thousands of victims had been done to death, and Scotland had contributed its share. In the days of the Covenant hundreds were so doomed. In Fife alone in the course of a few months in 1643 thirty persons were executed on this charge. (1) The ministers and elders, believing themselves obeying a divine command, were zealous in furthering the work. On 5th April 1659 ten women were tried at Dumfries on different charges of witchcraft, and condemned to be strangled and their bodies burned. On the Restoration another outburst of the same kind took place, and in August 1661, Ray the naturalist, being on a visit to Scotland, discovered that during that month 120 women had been burned as witches.

When we come to enquire as to the moral and spiritual condition of the people in such an environment, we find very different opinions entertained by different writers. There are the laudatores temporis acti, of the type of Kirkton, who, writing after the Restoration, have nothing but praise for the pre-

(1) Baillie, Letters, I

ceding covenanting period. Kirkton, for instance declares: "In the interval between the two kings religion advanced the greatest step it had made for many years; now the ministry was notably purified, the magistracy altered, and the people strangely refined. . . this seems to me to have been Scotland's high noon (1) . . . At the King's return every parochie had a minister, every village had a school, every family almost had a Fible, yea, in most of the country, all the children of age could read the Scriptures (2) . . . I have lived many years in a parish where I never heard an oath, and you might have ridden many miles before you heard any (3) . . . the vintners complained that they were broke for want of customers." (4) Then there are those, who, quoting from various Kirk Session Records, such as those of Perth, printed in the first volume of the Spottiswood Miscellany, give us a deplorable picture of the conditions of the time. Disgusting immorality of every kind was prevalent, the people were degraded indeed, and the rigorous discipline of the Church was a failure. Principal Lee disposes of Kirkton's remarks thus: "Unless I were to believe that the whole records of the church courts that I have examined, were fabrications, I must look upon Kirkton's description as being something very extravagant - I would almost say a romance." (5) "I must own that I was very long disposed to believe Kirkton's description to be founded in fact; but I do not believe it to be entitled to any greater credit than is due to the vague reminiscences of a well-meaning but weak old man." (6) We have similar laudatory statements to

(1) Kirkton, History, p. 64 (2) Ibid 64

(3) Ibid 64-65 (4) Ibid. 65

(5) Lee, Lects. on Church of Scotland, II, 443-4

(6) Ibid II, 447.

those of Kirkton in the writings of some other, but not of all Covenanters, but we shall find that they usually refer to some special district. The fact seems to have been that in some parishes the state of morals and religion was fairly good, while in others it appears to have been the reverse. That there must have been a good deal of sincere religion in the country is clear from the willingness of so many to suffer persecution for conscience sake in the terrible years that followed. and in estimating the state of affairs disclosed in the Session Books we have to remember that no other ecclesiastical authority existed at the time, and that the supervisor of most parishes by the minister and elders was strict, so that very few if any scandals would escape their notice. Much that might well pass unnoted to-day would then be certain to be brought before the Session, and so parishes would appear at their worst. It was a rude age, capable to great improvement, and for this the ministers strove diligently. In any case there appears to be little reason to doubt that the condition of the people just preceding the Restoration was much better than in the years following it.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### The Restoration.

Cromwell's aim to have the country ruled by godly men was no doubt a worthy one, but the rule of the "Saints" had been too suddenly and too strongly applied. As regards the people, the reforms they effected were wholly external. It was one thing to abolish Sunday sports, to close the theatres, to prevent horse racing, bear baiting and cock fighting, and another to wean the people from the love of such sports. And loving them, they chafed under the deprivation. Men are not made godly by money penalties, and at this particular time they were becoming less godly in spite of them. There was also throughout the nation a deep resentment at the treatment of the Parliament. Men forgot the tyranny of Laud and the despotism of Charles, but they felt that of Cromwell, and they longed for the restoration of legal government and release from the grasp of brute force. Parties formerly opposed, were drawing closer to one another in their dislike of the existing government, and their hostility to it was ever increasing. In Scotland, too, the people as a whole remained sullenly opposed to the rule of the Ironsides. The vast majority of them were stanch royalists, cherishing the memory of the days when they had their own national independence, their king and Parliament. Everywhere there was a forgetfulness of the evils and oppressions of the past, a keen consciousness of those of the present, and a hope that a change would bring relief, and a consequent readiness to accept any alteration of government that might come.

Though victorious in his Continental wars, the later

years of the Protector were saddened by the knowledge of the spread of such tendencies at home. His health began to fail, and on 3rd September 1658 - the anniversary of Dunbar and Worcester - he died. The fashion of reviling him as a hypocrite and self-seeker was put to an end by Carlyle, and his true character has been admirably expressed by Principal Tulloch:- "Cromwell then was no hypocrite and no mere enthusiast. He was simply the greatest Englishman of his time; the most powerful, if not the most perfect expression of its religious spirit, and the master-genius of its military and political necessities." (1) So strong was his command over the minds of his countrymen that even a doubtful nomination given on his deathbed secured for his son a peaceful succession to the Protectorate. Had Richard Cromwell been a strong man like his father, Britain might have had a new dynasty. Many indeed who had rejected the authority of Oliver submitted willingly to that of Richard. But the son was of a very different type. He had been privately educated, was of a retiring disposition, and had neither the inclination nor the capacity to execute such an arduous task as the establishment of himself as king. He had none of the religious enthusiasm of his father, was understood to be of conservative views, and at heart a royalist. After a reign of some eight months he abdicated the Protectorate in May 1659, and retired into private life.

The Army and the Parliament were soon again at war, but the nation was sick of military rule. The troops in Scotland and Ireland protested against the action of those in England, and Monk threatened to march on London in support of the Parliament. In the meantime he gathered a convention of representative men in Edinburgh, who advanced him money and secured for

(1) "English Puritanism and its Leaders. p. 160.

him recruits. This action had the effect of rousing England against the army. The fleet also decided against it, and feeling rose so high that it had to allow the reassembling of Parliament. Monk crossed the border in the first days of January 1660, and promising a "Free Parliament", he entered London unopposed on February 3rd.

The Parliament reassembled, the members expelled by Pride returning with them, but in March, the requisite majority now having been obtained, resolved on a dissolution. On April 25th the new Parliament, or Convention as it was termed, met at Westminster. Lambert in the interval collected a military force for a final struggle, but was defeated and captured. The new Convention was of a distinctly Presbyterian character, and began by ordering the Solemn League and Covenant to be reprinted, read in all the churches once a month, and hung up in Parliament. (1) The Confession of Faith prepared by the Westminster divines was now (2) legalized with the exception of Chapters XXX and XXXI.

The leaders were bent on the restoration of Charles, and set about the consideration of terms on which this might be accomplished, but found that Monk had already entered into negotiations with the King. Charles and his counsellors, who had been keenly noting the changing opinions of the people and the contests of their leaders, anticipated the action of Parliament, and issued a declaration from Exeter, in which was promised a general pardon, religious freedom, and satisfaction to the army, and it was enthusiastically received. The Convention voted "that according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by King, Lords, and Commons." Charles was at once invited to return to his inheritance without restriction or condition.

(1) Wodrow, Sufferings, I, 11.

(2) cp Life of Blair, p. 346.



On May 25th he landed at Dover, and on the 29th - his birthday - he entered London in triumph amidst the welcoming shouts of the multitude. All through the country the news of the Restoration was received with the same frenzied and unintelligent expressions of delight. Men shouted and danced, wine flowed, and in wild Bacchanalian revels the people celebrated what they seemed to reckon a great deliverance. The army which had done great things, and which by its discipline and prowess had won the admiration of Europe, even of its foes, deceived and deserted by its general, melted away. The farmers returned to their fields and the traders to their shops, by their Puritanic righteousness of living to leaven the nation, which, in its reaction against enforced godliness was to a large extent plunging into the foul mire of vice and riot.

In Scotland there was hardly less enthusiastic rejoicing. It was regarded as the restoration of their national independence, and it was anticipated that it would prove a time of peace and prosperity. Here, too, flags flew by day and bonfires blazed at night. There was feasting, and drinking, and dancing. The thoughtless multitude were glad, and they showed their gaiety in many extreme and unworthy ways. Loose living was reckoned a sign of loyalty, sobriety of life was a token of disloyalty. "Many a sober man was tempted to exceed lest he should be condemned as unnatural, disloyal, and unsensible".(1)

But in more serious minds there were forebodings as to the future. Questions as to their friendly relations with the Protectorate just ended would trouble some. Questions as to the settlement of religion in the country would arise in many breasts, though probably few expected the issue would be quite as it proved.

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", I, 65. cp. Kirkton, p. 114.

The Scottish nobles hastened to London to pay their respects to the King, and to get whatever they might obtain. (1) Promises were freely given, but fulfilment was scant. "Alwayses at their arrival almost all hade good words. Some hade pensions never to be payed, and some who came in time had offices for awhile." (2) Among the fortunate ones were Middleton, who was appointed Commissioner, Glencairn, Chancellor, and Lauderdale, Secretary. A convenient makeshift for a government of Scotland to execute the King's will, was found in the Committee of Estates, which had been nominated in 1651, and captured by Monk at Alyth; and by a proclamation of 2nd August 1660 they were appointed to conduct the affairs of the kingdom till a Parliament should meet.

Charles was determined to be revenged on the so-called regicides, and in spite of the efforts of the Commons, and despite his own proclamation, 28 of the surviving judges of the late King were brought to trial, and 13 of them executed. Vane and Lambert who had taken no part in the death of Charles I were also executed. In Scotland there was no one who had taken part in that trial, but there those who had provoked the resentment of the King or that of his minions, and they were to be made to suffer for it. Argyle was the head and front of those offending ones. He had aroused the personal resentment of Charles. Like the other Scottish nobles he went to Court, but he was the last to go. Some have wondered why he went at all. Douglas had been warned that the King would receive him badly, and he and other friends counselled him not to go. (3) He appears to have thought that in a personal interview he would be able to satisfy the King. Some say that Charles invited him, and others that Lorne, who was well received, assured him that there was no danger. (4)

(1) Blair, 350. (2) Kirkton, 66. (3) Wodrow, I, 430.

(4) Blair, 354.

He had done much to prejudice him in the eyes of the King. He had been a leader of the Covenanters, and was still a supporter of the Covenant. He had made friends with Cromwell. But with his own hands he had placed the crown on the head of Charles. This availed him naught. Possibly the King feared as well as hated him. He was the head of a powerful clan and could influence other clans, and was looked up to by a large following of Covenanters as their leader. He might thus prove a dangerous enemy to a King who was determined to destroy the Covenant. As soon as it was known that he was in London, the King, "with an angry stamp of the foot"<sup>(1)</sup>, commanded Sir William Fleming to execute his orders, and have him committed to the Tower. Others were to follow. Argyle was arrested on the 8th of July, and on the 14th orders were received in Scotland to secure Sir James Stewart, Provost of Edinburgh, Warriston, and Sir John Chiesly.

In the changing state of affairs in the country, which had been greatly quickened by the abdication of Richard Cromwell, it behoved the Scottish clergy to look to the interests of their Church. On the 10th of January 1660 David Dickson and Robert Douglas wrote to Monk, who was on friendly terms with the Resolutioners, to "signify their entire confidence in him as to the affairs of Scotland, and the necessity of one from them to be near his person to put him in mind of what is necessary, and acquaint them with the state of things", and asking for a passport for James Sharp, Minister of Crail and Professor of Divinity at St Andrews, who had successfully represented the Resolutioners at the Court of Cromwell when he had summoned a meeting of representative Resolutioners and Protesters in 1654. Before he re-

(1) Kirkton, History, p, 70

ceived this communication he had already asked Sharp to come to London with all speed, and requesting him to mention this only to Douglas, "as the general does not desire this to be made too public"; and on receipt of their letter he wrote sending the pass, affirming that "the welfare of your church shall be a great part of my care", and promising to "promote any reasonable thing that may be for the advantage thereof". (1)

Thus encouraged, several of the Resolutioner ministers met in Edinburgh on 6th February, and agreed to send Sharp, and drew up instructions as to the lines on which he was to go. The first and most important reads as follows: "You are to use your utmost endeavours that the Kirk of Scotland may without interruption or encroachment, enjoy the freedom and privileges of her established judicatures, ratified by the laws of the land." The others are thus summarized by Wodrow:- "that he testify against the late sinful toleration, that he essay to get the abuses of vacant stipends rectified, that ministers may have the benefit of the act abolishing patronages: and that in case any commission be granted for settling ministers' stipends, he endeavour to leave it in good hands." (2)

The conduct of Sharp in carrying on the negotiations in London, and subsequently, has been differently regarded by different classes. His admirers declare that he has been misunderstood, even by many fair-minded men, and grossly slandered by others. His detractors, and they form the great majority, call him apostate, traitor, Judas, and suchlike names. It does not appear necessary, to my mind, to suppose that he went to London with any deliberate intention of betraying the Presbyterians. This seems to have

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", 1, 5. (2) Ibid,

been a later development. He had letters of commendation to some of the leading Presbyterian ministers in the City, by whom he was well received. The favour he received from General Monk also opened many doors to him, and in a letter to Douglas of 1st March he apologizes for writing so seldom, and explains that people "observing the great countenance the lord-general gives him, press him so, that he is forced to abandon his chamber all the day, and much of the night." (1) Mixing with so many people, he learned many things, and came to a pretty clear idea of the trend of public opinion. As a selfish, ambitious, worldly-minded man, Sharp was anxious to be on the winning side, whatever it might be, and seeing that the winning side was to be that of the King, he was prepared to join it.

At the beginning of May Monk, and Douglas, and probably others, induced him to visit the King at Breda. In the course of his five interviews with Charles, he seems to have been finally won over by the King, as Montrose was won by Charles I at Berwick. Douglas at any rate thought so. Burnet, however, seems to indicate an earlier perversion when he says that Glencairn recommended him to Hyde as "the only person capable to manage the design of setting up Episcopacy in Scotland". (2) All this time he continued very busy in interviewing people of influence, and writing frequently to his friends in Scotland as to what he had seen, and heard, and done in the Metropolis, and always as a good Presbyterian. But he only told part of what he knew, and did all he could to dissuade the Presbyterians in Scotland from sending any strong resolution as to Presbyterianism to London.

(1) Wodrow, Sufferings, 1, 43.

(2) History of his own Times. 1, 60.

And when it was proposed to send up a Commission to make the mind of the Church clear, he urged its inexcusable, well knowing that if Douglas were there the true state of matters would speedily be revealed. On 19th June Sharp wrote in a letter to Douglas, "I hope this week to have his majesty's letter signifying his resolution to have the established doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of our Kirk, and that we shall have a general assembly." (1)

Of late the Resolutioners and Protesters had been drawing more closely together. The Synods had met in April and May, and union between the two seemed possible. Woodrow blames Sharp for preventing this by assuring Douglas of the King's dislike of the Protesters and of the evils that were coming upon them, so that he refrained from doing anything further towards union. Sharp had also a private resentment against Rutherford, James Guthrie and Warriston to gratify. The Protesters approached the Resolutioners several times with a view to a united address to the King, but owing to the representations of Sharp, these were always coldly received. It would not suit his purpose that the Scottish Presbyterians should at this time present a united front.

The Protesters, failing to get the Resolutioners to join with them, determined on their own account, to present an address of welcome to the King. About a dozen of them met at Edinburgh in the private house of Robert Simpson, on the 23rd of August, the same day as that on which the Committee of Estates was summoned to meet. The Privy Council ordered them to disperse, but they declined. Military were then sent to arrest them, and seize their papers. James Guthrie of Stirling and Robert Trail of Edinburgh, and eight other ministers and one elder, were arrested and lodged in the Castle. Several other Protesters

escaped at the time.

That they were Protesters was their great fault. The document in itself was an innocuous, though very wordy production. The signatories profess themselves his Majesty's dutiful subjects, express their dislike of the violence of the usurpers, and their abhorrence of thi "murder" of the late King. They thankfully acknowledge God's preservation of the King and his restoration; they pray for the establishment of his just power, and the increase of the Spirit upon him; warn him of the dangers that threaten religion by the spread of Popery, Prelacy, ceremonies, and the Prayer Book; and pray him to maintain the reformed religion, and that he will fully establish Presbyterial government, the Directory of Worship, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms; and finally praying that God will make him like David and the other godly kings of Israel, they sign themselves "Your Majesty's most humble and loyal subjects." The drafts of some other papers with reference to the calling of a larger meeting at Glasgow in September were seized along with the supplication, and appear to have added to the offence. Some of the prisoners were soon released on terms, but the rest remained in confinement. Wodrow notes that this happened on the centenary of the abolition of Popery in Scotland, and that all the prisoners had maintained the King's title while he was in exile, and that some who were now opposing them, such as Sharp, had accepted the "Tender", or proposal of incorporation with England, under the Commonwealth in 1652.

Some notable proclamations were issued about this time. One, with a view of preventing any such meetings as that which had been broken up on August 23rd, was made on the following day, forbidding the holding of any "unlawful and unwarrantable meetings or conventicles,

venticles" and "all seditious petitions and remonstrances" without "his majesty's special authority". On 19th September another was published condemning as seditious and treasonable, the "Lex Rex" of Rutherford and the "Causes of God's Wrath, etc.", attributed to James Guthrie. It also ordered all copies to be delivered up to the King's Solicitor, and threatening penalties against any person having one in his possession. On the 20th a more general and sweeping proclamation was made against "all seditious railers and slanderers, whether civil or ecclesiastical, of the King's Majesty and his government." The scope of this proclamation was exceedingly wide, and covered sermons, speeches, and writings of every kind, and not only public but also private utterances. Any one who heard and did not report such expressions of opinion were to be regarded as equally guilty. Wodrow truly says: "This procedure opened a door to make many offenders for a word, and nobody against whom the present managers had a design could escape." (1) Something like a reign of terror followed. Scope was afforded for the gratification of private revenge, and it was taken advantage of. The storm first fell upon the Protesters, but the Resolutioners did not wholly escape. (2) Not only ministers, but laymen, were made to suffer. Past devotion to the royal house, and suffering under the Commonwealth on this account, were ignored, and any earnestness for the Covenants was punishable. Many were brought before the Committee of Estates, and imprisoned, or put under bonds or caution for future conduct. In the course of September a number of prominent Covenanters, Patrick Gillespie, the Principal of Glasgow University, and the Provost and Town Clerk of the city, were arrested.

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", I, 78.

(2) Ibid.



On 31st August Sharp returned from London, bringing a letter from the King to Robert Douglas, dated 10th August, and which was to be communicated to the Presbytery of Edinburgh. It is a tricky and dishonourable production. It begins by assuring the Presbytery that Sharp had faithfully discharged his commission, and how well his Majesty is satisfied with the generality of the ministers of Scotland, but a severe reference is made to those, who, under specious pretensions, have swerved from the duty of allegiance, here clearly indicating the Protesters. He is resolved to discountenance profanity, and all contemners and opposers of the ordinances of the Gospel. He continues: "we do also resolve to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland, as it is settled by law, without violation; and to countenance in the due exercise of their functions, all such ministers who shall behave themselves dutifully and peaceably as becomes men of their calling". (1) The authority and acts of the General Assembly at St Andrews and Dundee of 1651 were to stand in force till another assembly is called, which he purposes to do as soon as his affairs will permit. He expects the ministers and church courts will keep within the compass of ecclesiastical matters only, and will take special notice of such as by conventicles or preaching or in any other way transgress such limits - that is to say, Protesters and anti-Prelatists. Finally, he beseeches them to pray to God for himself and his government that they may have fresh and constant supplies of His grace. The whole paper was a miserable fraud, and is quite likely to have been the work of Sharp. The reference to the Church as it is "settled by law", seemed to Middleton as rather contrary to the restoration of Episcopacy, which had already been agreed upon,

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", I, 81.

but he was told he might rescind the laws which were at present in force in favour of Presbyterianism, and then Episcopacy would remain as the Church government "settled by law". Rough and unprincipled as he was in many respects, the old soldier in him did not like it, and he replied: "That might be done, but for his share he did not love that way, which made his Majesty's first appearance in Scotland to be in a cheat." (1) Nor had Sharp any intention that another Assembly should be called, or that Deuglas or any other Scottish minister should be sent for to advise the King. But in their innocence and ignorance a most grateful address was forwarded by the ministers to Charles in acknowledgement of the favour, and a covering letter of letter of thanks was sent to Lauderdale, which reads strangely in the light of future events. The simple-minded Presbyters did not notice the quirk, and were so delighted with the royal letter that they not only had it printed and circulated throughout the land, but ordered a silver box wherein to enshrine the precious document. Sharp was awarded twenty chalders annually as a reward for his diligence in this matter.

During the autumn preparations were made for the election of such a Parliament as would carry through the royal wishes. The Town Councils were the electors in the case of burgess representatives, and "in September 1660 the Lord Chancellor warned the Convention of Burghs that only 'such as are of known fidelity and loyalty towards his Majesty' must be appointed magistrates or councillors, and the Convention, accordingly, ordered that no person should be eligible for place or office for any burgh if he had subscribed the Remon-

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", 1, 82.

For Sharp's share in this matter, cp. Burnet's "History of my own Times", 1, 75.

strance or had been otherwise disaffected." (1) All being thus arranged, by a proclamation made on 1st November, a Parliament was summoned to meet in Edinburgh on the 12th of December, but as its business had not then been fully arranged in conformity with the plans of those in authority in London, it was adjourned till the 1st of January 1661.

The tone of this Parliament was greatly changed from that of those of covenanting days. Some honest gentlemen indeed had seats, but it was, as we have just seen, a packed assembly. Besides this, many of the nobles and barons were now alienated from the Church. Many of the old enthusiasts were now dead, and the younger generation was often of a different type. Not a few resented the disciplinary strictness of the Church which would not suffer their lewdness. Further, no indemnity had yet been granted to Scotland as it had been to England, the proclamation of 16th October, which mentioned it, only referred to those who were subservient to the measures of the Court; and as not a few of the members had been implicated with the English in Scotland, they were anxious to keep on good terms with the new authorities. A number of them, too, were the needier sons of needy sires, and, gasping for money, they were prepared to do anything that offered even a hope of getting it. Kirkton scarcely over-colours the picture when he says: "There you might have seen them who, some weeks before, were companions to owles, hydeing themselves from messengers pursueing them for debt, vapouring in scarlet and ermines, in good hopes to be all men of gold." (2) The stately "riding" and the other opening ceremonies were carried through in all their usual style. The

(1) Rait. Scottish Parliaments, p. 304.

(2) History, page 87.

resurrected "honours" were borne with all due pomp, and the work of the House began. "The Committee of the Articles was revived, and on that occasion, there being no bishops in Parliament, each of the other three estates chose its own representatives, and submitted the names for the approval of the royal Commissioner before publishing them." (1) An appropriate opening sermon was preached by Robert Douglas, but instead of leaving the future preachers to be appointed by the Commission of the Assembly, the Parliament chose them for themselves, selecting for the most part men from the north, whose views were more akin to their own.

The Parliament proved itself a busy one, and passed (2) nearly four hundred enactments before it rose in July. It began with a breach of the existing law. By an Act of 1651, passed when Charles himself was present, it was decreed that in every succeeding Parliament, before entering upon business the Covenant should be signed, and failing this the constitution of the Parliament was declared null and void. (3) The Covenant was not now signed, and only mentioned later in order that it might be abolished.

Middleton, a soldier of fortune with experience of Continental wars and who had fought on both sides in the civil wars at home, a man of overbearing temper, had been appointed Lord High Commissioner. Glencairn, the Chancellor, was chosen President of the Parliament "in virtue of his office". The Commissioner had received his instructions at Court, and was quite prepared to carry them through. The business of the House began on the 4th of January, and the first Act to be passed was one establishing the King's prerogative. In this Act an oath is inserted, in which the taker

(1) Rait. The Parliaments of Scotland, 380.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 8-9. For a/c of work done cp. VII,

(3) Wodrow, "Sufferings", 1, 91.

acknowledges the sovereign as "the only supreme governor of this kingdom, over all persons, and in all causes", denies any foreign power any jurisdiction, and declares that he will "never decline his Majesty's power or jurisdiction", as he shall answer to God. There was some debate as to the extent of this oath. (1) The Commissioner and President declared again and again "that they intended not to give his Majesty any "ecclesiastical", but only a "civil" supreme power, yet when Cassillis and the laird of Kilburnie wished this to be inserted in the Registers, it was peremptorily refused. Later when ministers offered to take the oath in this sense, adding an amendment of only one word, inserting "civil" before "governor", it was not allowed. (2) Only Cassillis seems to have refused it, and the obsequious Parliament accepted it. This practically made Charles the Pope of Scotland. The oath was required of all public officials and burgh magistrates, and Cassillis was debarred from holding any office because of his refusal.

The Acts following enlarge on the King's prerogative. He is entitled to choose the officers of State, councillors, and Lords of Session, to call or dissolve Parliaments; no convocations, leagues or bonds are to be made with the Sovereign's consent; he has the sole right of making peace and war, and he only has the right to raise the subjects in arms. The Convention of Estates of 1643, which entered into the Solemn League and Covenant with the Parliament of England, is declared null and void. The 7th Act is entitled "Act concerning the league and covenant, and discharges the renewing thereof, without his Majesty's warrant and approbation. "Any who may do so will be answerable at their highest peril". The 8th is directed against Papists, and reminds one of

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", I, 93. (2) *Ib.* 99.

*Act. Parl. Scot. VII, p. 7.*

the professions so often made by Charles I to cover up his real designs. The next Act approves of the Engagement of 1648, and reflects upon Argyle and the ministers who opposed it, and who are spoken of as "a few seditious ministers", but who were really the majority of the ministers of the time. The 11th, "An act for taking the oath of allegiance, and asserting the royal prerogative," is a most important one, which afterwards wrought much woe in the country. It is but one evidence of the hatred of those in authority for the Covenant, and was followed by others in after years. By this Act a general clause was added, requiring not only public officials to take the oath of allegiance and acknowledge the royal supremacy, but also "all upon whom the Privy Council or any having orders from them should impose it." (1) In this Act the renewing of the League and Covenant is expressly forbidden. Another Act condemned Warriston, who had now found a refuge abroad. Still another Act made the 29th of May, the date of the King's return, a holiday in perpetuity - an Act most hateful to all Puritanic Presbyterians.

But the most remarkable Acts passed by this remarkable Parliament were the Recissory Acts. These were based on two principles: 1) In some cases the meeting of Parliament was held without any lawful warrant and in contempt of his Majesty's authority. 2) In others, "'although the late King's Majesty was pleased to come into this country, and by his own presence at their pretended Parliaments and otherways to comply with and give way to many things,' yet the objects of the royal concessions were not attained, and it was, therefore, right that they should be cancelled." (2) On these principles the ratification given in 1650 to the "pretended meeting and convention of Estates

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", 1, 99. (2) *Rail* 317.

called and kept at Edinburgh in June 1643', was repealed on 22nd January, and the ratification given to the Parliament of 1649-50 on 9th February!" Encouraged by the ease with which those recisions had been obtained, the Commissioner was emboldened to introduce on 28th March the General Act Recissory, (1) the effect of which was to annul all legislation from 1633. "Decisions in private cases were wisely, if illogically, exempted from the repealing acts." (2)

Very emphatically the Covenants had now been removed from the Statute-book, however firm their hold on the hearts of the people. It has been said that this outrageous measure was proposed at a drunken bout, but as it had been inspired from London, this is hardly likely. More probable is Dr. Cunningham's suggestion that Middleton and his friends had drunk heavily to give themselves the necessary courage ("Dutch courage") to venture to submit it to Parliament on 28th March. (3) This Parliament was indeed known as "The Drinking Parliament", and Middleton was often, but not always, drunk. It may be noted that the measures against the Covenant were passed in rather thin houses, and with some dissentients.

On the day the Act Recissory was passed another Act, entitled an "Act concerning Religious and Civil Government," was adopted. (4) In it the King desires to improve the many mercies he has received, declares it is his full and firm resolution to maintain the true reformed Protestant religion, in its purity of doctrine and worship, as it was established within this kingdom, during the reigns of his royal father

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 87.

(2) Rait. Parliaments of Scotland, 318. cp. 317-8.

(3) Church History of Scot. II, 82.

(4) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 87.

Wodrow, Sufferings, I, 102.

and grandfather of blessed memory". His Majesty will encourage godliness, suppress profaneness, and give protection to ministers of the Gospel, who confine themselves to the limits of their calling and are obedient to his Majesty's authority. In the meantime he allows the present administration of the Church by sessions, presbyteries and synods. It is interesting to note that this Parliament also passed an Act against swearing and drinking.

Argyle had been brought down from London and imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle towards the end of 1660. On 13th February 1661 he was arraigned at the bar of the Parliament on the charge of high treason. In the indictment fourteen articles were alleged against him. Most of these had reference to his actions during the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth. He was accused of delivering Charles I to the English at Newcastle, protesting against the Engagement, consenting to the execution ("murder") of Montrose, corresponding with Cromwell, sitting in his Parliament, and advising him that his only safety lay in putting Charles I to death. Some of these charges he denied, in others he pleaded that he acted under the orders of the Committee of Estates, and in others he claimed that his conduct was covered by the Act of Indemnity. Certainly he had taken part against the King in the Civil Wars, but so had Monk, Middleton, most of the Judges who sat in the case, and the advocate for the prosecution. He petitioned Parliament for counsel, specially naming John Nisbet, who afterwards became Lord Advocate. Probably aware of what had been determined concerning the prisoner, Nisbet declined to act, and Parliament appointed six advocates for the defence, including Sinclair, the Dean of Faculty, Robert Burnet Jun., and Mackenzie. The Lord Advocate Fletcher, of whom Ormond



says, "At a time when bad men were common, he was one of the worst," led the prosecution.

In the early stages of the trial vigorous efforts were made in London, especially by Lorne, to render it null. Dreading their success, the royalists sent Glencairn, Rothes and Sharp to Court, nominally to report progress, but really to work to the prejudice of the accused. Burnet and Mackenzie defended him ably, and the President, Sir John Gilmour, acted fairly, and things were going favourably, when a packet of letters, which had just been received from London, was handed in. Three were addressed by Argyle to Lilburne and three to Monk, who now had an animus against the Marquis. These letters showed all too plainly Argyle's real relations to the Commonwealth and the plea of compulsory submission fell to the ground. Middleton ordered them to be read at once, and the Court adjourned till the next day. Argyle was then found guilty, young Montrose magnanimously refusing to vote. On his knees before the bar, the prisoner heard his sentence with calm dignity. "I had the honour", he said, "to set the crown upon the King's head, and now he hastens me to a better crown than his own." Contrary to the King's order that no verdicts were to be executed without his approbation, he was beheaded on the 28th, three days after sentence. He might possibly have escaped from the Tolbooth, where he was now imprisoned, by changing clothes with his wife, or, it is said, (1) by the help of friends outside, but either through fear, or lest he should be thought to have abandoned the cause he professed, he declined to make the attempt.

The personal appearance of Argyle was apt to prejudice men against him. His mean stature, his red

(1) Kirkton, 103

hair, his unprepossessing countenance, his squint eye, were all against him. He was physically a coward, as his conduct at Inverlochy and elsewhere plainly showed. Unlike Montrose, he had no personal charm to draw men to him. He was cold and cautious, and never aroused enthusiasm among the Covenanters whom he led; they rather distrusted him. He was selfish and greedy, revengeful and cruel. His own father warned Charles I against him, (1) as one having no gratitude for favours received, and likely to do him an injury. But it was noted that a great change came over him in his last days. He lost his fear of death, and became calm and brave. The time between his sentence and execution he spent as became a Christian, in settling his worldly affairs and in spiritual exercises. As the custom then was, he had many visitors, lay and clerical, during those last days. Amongst them was his counsel, Mackenzie, who said to him with brutal frankness that "the people believed he was a coward, and would die timorously". To this the Marquis replied, "he would not die as a Roman braving death, but he would die as a Christian without being affrighted." On the Sunday night he bade farewell to his wife. On the Monday he dined cheerfully with some friends, and in the afternoon walked bravely to the scaffold. Before he left the prison he had a brief interview with Guthrie, who said to him, "My Lord, God hath been with you, He is with you, and God will be with you; and such is my respect for your Lordship, that if I were not under sentence of death myself, I could cheerfully die for your Lordship". On the scaffold he displayed great calmness and dignity. Kirkton (2) briefly summarizes his speech: "He protested his innocence from treachery, double-dealing, or self-designes;

(1) Clarendon, Rebellion, 1, Bp. Guthrie.  
(2) History, p. 104.

he forgave his judges, but could not condemn himself; he justified the work of reformation, protested his adherence thereto and the Covenant; he reproved the abounding wickedness of the land, and professed his hopes of mercy; and vindicated himself of the late King's death, which was his great reproach, and so closed". Bidding farewell to his friends and distributing tokens of remembrance, he joined in the devotions of his ministerial companions, prayed for the King, Government and Council, and laid himself upon the maiden, whose heavy, sharp knife fell, and so he passed to his account. His death, both in itself and in his manner of meeting it, led many who neither loved nor admired him in his life to regard him as a martyr in his death. (1)

"nothing in his life  
Became him, like the leaving it." (2)

The next victim was James Guthrie, the minister of Stirling, admittedly a man of learning, piety and eloquence. He was a zealous Protester, and had given much offence to the royalists by his bold declaration of his principles. Perhaps above all, he had pronounced the sentence of excommunication on Middleton in 1650, an act which the soldier had never forgiven. His fate was probably determined before his arrest in August. Not till the 20th of February did he receive intimation of the heads of his indictment, nor till the beginning of his trial on 10th April, the full details. It consisted of five heads. He was charged with treasonable utterances against the Crown and Government, especially of writing the Remonstrance; writing and publishing "The Causes of God's Wrath"; calumniating the King and Government, meddling in

(1) Baillie, Letters, III, p. 466

(2) Macbeth, Act I, Sc. 4.

civil affairs, and trying to subvert the Church and State; unlawfully convening the lieges; and ignoring the jurisdiction of the King in 1651. He made a powerful defence, denying some of the charges, and vindicating himself in others, as having acted according to a conscience directed by the Bible and the Standards of the Church, the Covenants, and the laws of the land. He professed his loyalty to the King, showing how he had opposed Cromwell as a usurper and how he had suffered severely for preaching against the Tender. In conclusion he assured the House that it was not the extinguishing of him or of many others, that would extinguish the Covenant and work of reformation since the year 1638. (1) The speech so affected several members that they withdrew rather than vote against him. But sentence was not long delayed. He was to be hanged at the Cross of Edinburgh on the 1st of June, his head to be fixed on the Nether Bow, his arms torn, and his estate confiscate. At the gallows he acquitted himself with dignity and power. Burnet was present, and describes the scene:—"I saw him suffer. He was so far from showing any fear, that he rather expressed a contempt of death. He spoke an hour upon the ladder with the composedness of one that was delivering a sermon rather than his last words. He justified all he had done, and exhorted all people to adhere to the Covenant, which he magnified highly." (2) The last speeches of both Argyle and Guthrie were published, but afterwards suppressed.

At the same time perished Lieutenant William Govan, who was unjustly charged with having taken some part in the execution of Charles I. He followed Guthrie on the Gallows, and like him, died as a brave man.

(1) Wodrow, I, 172.

(2) "History of Glasgow Times", 1, 85.

It is very probable that Samuel Rutherford would have met a similar fate had he lived. A summons was indeed issued against him, but as he was lying on his deathbed at St Andrews at the time, he could not travel to meet it. To the herald he answered feebly that he had already received a summons to a higher Judicatory, which he must obey, and before their day arrived he would be where few kings and great folks come. His Lex Rex had been condemned with the "Causes of God's Wrath", and both had been burned by the common hangman in St Andrews and Edinburgh, and the only further revenge the royalists could take was to deprive him of his license, professorship and stipend, and order him to be confined to his own house.

Patrick Gillespie, who had been associated with Guthrie, had many influential friends working for him, and after making a humiliating submission, he was allowed a certain restricted liberty within a rural district. Charles was surprised at this action of the Court, and declared, "If I had known that you would have spared Mr. Gillespie, I would have spared Mr. Guthrie. (1)

Others who suffered imprisonment, banishment, or fines were Robert McWard, collegiate minister of the Outer Church, Glasgow, Alexander Moncrieff, minister of Scoonie, Robert Traill, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, James Kirko, laird of Sunday well, Dunscore, and Sir John Chiesley.

But worse was soon to follow.

(1) Wodrow, I, 180.

## CHAPTER XV.

### "The Killing Time."

The persecutions which began in 1662 were chiefly political. "No Bishop, no King", was again the guiding principle of the authorities. The King, they thought, had the right to choose the religion of the people, and, as was but natural, he chose that which he believed best fitted in with monarchical government, namely Episcopacy. James VI, in his efforts to establish absolute monarchy, found himself thwarted by Presbyterians like Andrew Melville, and so, by force and fraud, he suppressed Presbytery and established Episcopacy. Charles II, in the execution of his father, and in his own experience while amongst them, had seen what Puritanism could do, and he would run no risks for the future. He would not have his royal prerogative trifled with, nor his vices rebuked, and so Puritanism and the Covenant must go.

In the Church of England Puritanism was still strong, and must be got rid of. The attempt was soon made. The old Liturgy of the Church was restored, The Corporation Act was passed, and all magistrates and persons holding offices of trust were obliged to take the Oath of Supremacy, and to partake of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England - in the case of some, as one afterwards put it, to earn their promotion in this world by eating and drinking their damnation in the next. During the whole of the reign the Nonconformists were treated with great cruelty. They were spied upon, and severely punished by fines or imprisonment for every breach of the Acts.

In Scotland the Covenanters were treated with still greater cruelty. While the business of Parliament was going on the ministers were more dependent on rumours than on positive information of its doings. They had, however, a good idea that changes in the government of the Church were being made, and they took such action as they could to prevent this. Protests were made and supplications sent by individual ministers and by groups of ministers. South of the Tay several Synods met to proceed in the same way, but they were rudely ordered to disperse. In some cases ministers were removed from their charges by brethren who were inclined to Episcopacy.

By the "Act concerning Religion and Church Government", (1) the settlement of the government of the Church had been left in the hands of the King, and it had been decided that for the present it should be by Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods, and on 10th June Charles issued a proclamation which was at once an acknowledgement and confirmation of the Act, but in a few months his Majesty made plain what his intentions really were. He went through the form of consulting his Scottish advisers who were then in London. Their opinions differed. Middleton and Glencairn were strongly in favour of Episcopacy, which, they considered, would manage affairs according to the King's mind, but Lauderdale, and for a time Hamilton also, strongly opposed it, declaring that the King would thereby lose the affections of the people, and that the bishops would prove rather burdens than helpers to him. Crawford advised that the attempt to introduce Episcopacy should be abandoned for ever. Clarendon and Ormonde went in favour of this being done, on the ground that it would be difficult to maintain Episcopacy in Ireland if it were given up in Scotland.

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 87. (Act 127)

This fell in with the King's wishes, and the other Scots lords supported it, being desirous to stand well with him, especially as the Act of Indemnity had not yet been passed.

With reference to this meeting, Kirkton tells a story (1) which illustrates the irreligious spirit in which so many of the rulers of the time dealt with religious matters. A few days afterwards Glencairn called upon Lauderdale to explain that though he had declared for bishops it was only for bishops like those of primitive times, and not for lordly prelates such as Scotland had known before. Lauderdale was sore at not getting his own way, and answered with an oath, that since they had chosen bishops, bishops they should have, higher than any that ever were in Scotland, and that he should find. This was the beginning of the quarrel between them that led to the ruin of Middleton.

PC.R.I, 28<sup>n</sup> The King now took the matter into his own hands, and on 14th August 1661 instructed Lauderdale to write to the Privy Council that it was his Majesty's "firm resolution" to restore the Scottish Church to its right government by bishops. Charles begins this communication with a reference to his letter of 10th August 1660, and this he may well have spared. If he really intended the establishment of Presbytery in Scotland then, why does he now put a different meaning on the words he then used? Was the phrase "preserve the government of the Church of Scotland, as it is settled by law, without violation", used in earnest, or was it a low trick to deceive his readers? Some have supposed that it was not a trick, and that at the time the King meant what he said. In a letter from Lauderdale to Robert Douglas, dated Whitehall, 23 October 1660, he says: "As to the concerns of our

(1) Kirkton, History, p. 133.



Mother Kirk ... it is no small comfort to me, in serving my master, to finde That his Majestie is so fixt in his resolution not to alter any thing in the Government of that Church; of this you may be confident, tho' I dare not answer, but some would be willing enough to have it otherwise."(1) Lauderdale's future, though temporary, advocacy of Presbyterianism shows that he was not deceiving Douglas, but can we be sure that Charles was not deceiving Lauderdale? The facts of the case seem to be these: Charles hated Presbyterianism; it was no religion for gentlemen, (2) it was too earnest and much too austere: he loved Episcopacy, as the best supporter of monarchical government. Whenever it was possible Episcopacy would be the only acknowledged religion in all his dominions. In Scotland there might be difficulties in the way, and he must be cautious at the beginning, hence the tone of his first letter to the Church and his remarks to Lauderdale. But when he found the Parliament so very complaisant that it was possible to have Episcopacy, Episcopacy he resolved to have, and that at once. Neither his Covenant oath nor any of his promises would be suffered to stand in the way.

PC.R. I 30-32 The royal letter was at once put into an Act by the Council, and as such proclaimed on 6th September. Scotland was now to have a hierarchy, but as Sydserf, of Galloway, was the only survivor of the old bishops, steps had to be taken to consecrate a new set of dignitaries. Sharp was appointed Archbishop of St Andrews and Primate, Sydserf was translated to Orkney, and new men were nominated for the other sees. Edinburgh was kept vacant for some time in the hope that Douglas would accept it, but he steadfastly refused.

(1) cf. Memoir of Robert Baillie, prefixed to David Laing's edn. of his Letters & Journals, LXXXV.

(2) Burnet - History of his Own Times, vol. I, p. 74.

Besides him Baillie, Wood, Dickson, and others were approached, but all men of that type declined any kind of preferment under Episcopacy. Kirkton gives a poor account of all and a bad report of some. (1) He speaks more favourably of Leighton, whom Wodrow terms the best character of any of the bishops. His father, Dr. Alexander Leighton, of London, was a zealous Nonconformist, who was sorely punished by fine, mutilation and imprisonment for his writings against Prelacy, (2) but the son took a different course. He was at that time Principal of Edinburgh University, and it is said he was pressed to accept a bishopric. To show his sincerity, he chose Dumblane, probably the poorest of all, not that the income of any of the prelates in Scotland was large. It is estimated that the revenue of the Bishop of Winchester was greater than those of all the Scotch bishops put together. (3) In order that they might be able to hand down the virtue of Apostolic Succession, it was necessary that several of them should be consecrated by bishops, and Sharp, Hamilton, Fairfoul and Leighton went south that they might be duly ordained in Westminster Abbey. Sharp and Leighton had only a Presbyterial ordination, and they had to submit, in spite of Sharp's protest, to Episcopal ordination as deacons and priests before they could be consecrated as bishops. They returned to Scotland in the following spring, and soon thereafter proceeded to fill up the Episcopal bench.

Before the bishops returned from London, the Privy Council at the request of the King, dated 28 December 1661, issued an order forbidding Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk-sessions to meet till they should be authorized by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church. (4)

(1) Kirkton, Hist. 135-6.

(2) e.g. "Sion's Plea against Prelacy."

(3) Wodrow, I (4) Pubd. 9 Jany. 1662.

Wodrow, I, 249.

Charles was now going beyond his grandfather. James simply made the bishops permanent Moderators of the Presbyteries, but his grandson ordered that these Courts should not meet till they had been organized as regular Bishops' Courts.

Middleton's Parliament met for its second session on May 8th, and sat till September 9th. Its first measure was entitled: Act for the restitution and re-establishment of the ancient government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops. By this Act - a very lengthy one - all previous legislation in favour of the government of the Church by Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk-sessions, and especially the great Act of 1592, are rescinded and annulled; and the bishops are restored to Parliament, and all their accustomed dignities, privileges, and jurisdiction. (1)

Various other Acts, strengthening the power of the King and the bishops, and lessening the liberty of the subject, were quickly passed. The National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were declared unlawful oaths. (2) It was provided by another Act of far-reaching effects that all ministers who had been ordained from 1649 to 1660, had no right to their livings, as patronage had been abolished during those years. They must now obtain a presentation from the patron and a collation from the bishop before the 20th of Sept. 1662, otherwise the benefice would become vacant and the stipend for 1662 forfeited. (3) This was no doubt rather a contribution to the power of the bishops, than an admission of the rights of the patrons. But before there could be an Episcopal institution both the patron and the presentee had to take the oath of Supremacy, and in so doing own the bishop. Should this not be done before 20th March

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 372. Wodrow, I, 257.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 378. Wodrow, I, 264.

(3) *Ib.* 376.

1663, the presentation fell to the bishop jure devoluto. By another Act every minister is ordered to attend the visitations of his di<sup>o</sup>cesan under penalties. In this Act we have the first intimation of what was to lead to such terrible persecution - all private meetings or conventicles, "which, under the pretence of, or for religious exercises, may tend to the prejudice of the public worship of God in the churches, or to the alienating of the people from their lawful pastors." (1) By yet another Act all persons holding office under government, and all magistrates and councillors of burghs are obliged to sign a declaration expressly renouncing the Covenants. (2) Towards the end of the session the much longed-for Act of Indemnity was passed. (3) Such an Act was passed in England soon after the Restoration, but it was supposed that the measure was delayed in Scotland to facilitate the introduction of Episcopacy. Of course, in both countries there were exemptions. Under the edict known as the "Act of Fynes", by which a committee of Parliament fixed the fines to be paid by those whom they named as offenders, as the condition of their pardon. Some 7 or 800 are named on the list, and fines varying from 200 to 18,000 Scots were imposed. The list was arbitrarily drawn, and included many victims of private spite, minors, persons deceased, and some who lived out of the poors' box. (4) The money was supposed to go for "the relief of the King's good subjects, who had suffered in the late troubles". Much of it had afterwards to be levied by military force from those who were known to be Presbyterians and averse to the bishops' rule.

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 379. Wodrow, I, 267.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 405.

(3) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 415. (4) Kirkton, 146.

After the rising of Parliament the Communioner, accompanied by a full quorum of the Privy Council, made a tour through the southern and western counties, where the bishops were most opposed. The company were lavishly entertained by many of the gentry, and had nightly orgies. On his arrival at Glasgow, the Archbishop complained that none of the younger ministers had applied for institution, and were holding their cures in spite of the law, and he called a meeting of the Privy Council at that city on the 1st of October. It is said that every member, except Lockhart of Lee, was under the influence of wine when they passed an Act declaring that all who had not complied with the law had forfeited their livings, interdicted them from preaching, and charged them to remove with their families from their parishes before the first of November.

It was believed that not twenty of the ministers would refuse to submit under this threat,<sup>(1)</sup> but on the day appointed by the Council nearly 300 of them<sup>(2)</sup> left their manses, mostly in the southern and western parishes. The bishops and Council were astounded at this unexpected result, and the feeling throughout the country at being thus deprived of pastors they had learned to respect and love was intense. Sharp, whose policy of clearing out the stubborn ministers gradually was even now being put into practice, disowned the Act. Middleton could only marvel what "those mad fellows (the ministers) will do now". Several of the nobles urged a modification of the Act, and after some correspondence between them and the bishops, another Act was published on the 23rd

(1) Kirkton, History, p. 151.

(2) Wodrow says nearly 400. Burnet, 350.

W. L. Mathieson (II, 193), 271.

R. Logan, from Scott's Fasti, says of 952

Charges (72 vacant) 329 were deprived, 551 ad-  
hered.

RCR I 269-  
270

of December extending the time of evictment till 1st February, but this was more for the convenience of the bishops, who found great difficulty in filling up the vacant charges, than out of compassion for the ministers. Those so far affected, with the exception of some leading men, who, under Sharp's scheme, had been banished from the country, were mostly young men, having been ordained since 1648. Wodrow says of them: (1) "They were pious, painful, and a great many of them learned and able ministers of the Gospel, and all of them singularly dear to their people." The loss of stipend for 1662 pressed heavily on many, and having to leave their manses with their families to seek new homes in the wintry weather was a great hardship. Those who were appointed to fill their places were but poor substitutes. Burnet but speaks the truth, which is fully confirmed by contemporary writers, when he says: "They are the worst preachers I ever heard: they were ignorant to a reproach: and many of them were openly vicious. They were a disgrace to their orders, and the sacred functions: and were indeed the dregs and refuse of the northern parts." (2) Kirkton confirms this of the younger men, and declares them "so profane and void of conscience themselves, that they believed there was none in any other." (3) He adds: "Some old expectants there were, who, because of their scandal or insufficiency, could find no employment under the Presbyterians, were provided to churches in the first place." (4)

Accustomed to pastors of such a different type, the people could have no respect for the "curates", as the bishops' nominees were termed, and soon learned to hate them for their conduct, as well as because

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", I, 324.

(2) History of the Own Times. I, 103.

(3) History, p. 160. (4) Ibid.

of the warnings against them which were given by the ousted ministers. Most of the ministers involved obeyed the Glasgow order, forbidding them to preach after the first of November, and were blamed by some for leaving their parishes before compelled by force, but this would only have meant a few weeks' delay, and the impressiveness of the ejection would have been minimised or lost. The Scottish ministers here only followed the example of the English Presbyterian ministers a little earlier in the year.

As a rule the people submitted sullenly to the intrusion of the curates, but in a number of cases an open resistance was offered, which was severely punished. (1) Sometimes the dislike of the people was shown in less serious, but not less real ways. Doors were found barricaded; bell tongues were removed, so that the people might be excused for absence from the church; in one case a lad emptied a box of ants into the curate's boots, and caused him such pain that he had to interrupt the service.

Naturally the people sought for spiritual instruction and comfort elsewhere. In the south and west the churches were almost empty when such curates were in charge, and the parishioners flocked to neighbouring parishes where men of the old type still ministered. Sometimes the ousted ministers conducted family worship in their own houses, and such numbers attended that the gathering had to be held out of doors. This was the origin of the field meetings, which afterwards led to such grievous persecution. (2) From the first the absence of so many of the people from their parish church was a cause of great chagrin to the unpopular curates and of much annoyance to the authorities. Fines of 20/ Scots for each absence were imposed by the Act of 23rd December, but this was not

(1) Kirkton. History, p.162. (2) Ibid. p.161.

found effective, and worse soon followed.

Middleton's day of power was now over, and Lauderdale, who had won in the contest between them, was in favour. The ex-Commissioner was afterwards practically exiled by being sent as Governor to Tangier. Rothes, a son of the Rothes who had done so much for the Covenant, and himself a favourite of the present King, was appointed Commissioner, and Lauderdale came with him, "as tutor to his pupil" (1) to the opening of the Parliament in Edinburgh on 18th June 1663.

At this Parliament, by the wish of the King, the Lords of the Articles were restored, and the bishops present had eight representatives chosen, and in turn elected eight representatives of the peers, and the other sixteen were appointed in the old way. Several Acts of far-reaching import were passed. On 10th July an Act, entitled an "Act against separation and dis-<sup>1663</sup>obedience to ecclesiastical authority". It is popularly as the "Bishops' drag-net." (2) The time of the older ministers had now come. All who had been ordained before 1649 were ordered to obtain collation before 20th September, under penalty of suspension, or deposition. The people were to attend service regularly in their own parish church, and all other meetings were declared to be "seditious, and of dangerous example and consequences". Those who persisted in disobedience were to be fined according to their rank. Every nobleman or heritor was to forfeit a fourth part of his annual rental; each yeoman or farmer, such a proportion of his free moveables as the Privy Council should determine; and each burgess the same, together with the loss of the freedom of the town in which he lived. By the Act Papists were also liable, but Lauderdale afterwards exempted them, though the

(1) Kirkton. History, p. 166.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 455.



"poor Whigs" still continued to suffer. On 13th Aug. the Privy Council issued a proclamation, by which all outed ministers, upon pain of sedition, were to remove twenty miles from their own parishes, six miles from Edinburgh or any cathedral city, and three miles from every royal burgh, and not more than one minister so affected to reside in the same parish. On the 21st a National Synod, composed of the bishops, dignitaries, one minister chosen from each Presbytery, representatives from the Universities, and the royal Commissioner, was appointed to deal with such matters as might from time to time be delivered by royal authority to the Archbishop of St Andrews, the President of the Court. Decisions to be arrived at by a majority vote.

While the Parliament met Warriston lay a prisoner in the Tolbooth. He had escaped to the Continent, where he wandered about for some time, but having imprudently gone to Rouen, he was traced by spies, arrested, extradited, and sent to London. It is said that he was unduly bled in Holland by a Dr. Bates, (1) and left a wreck, both mentally and physically. He was sent to Edinburgh, and on 8th July was brought to the bar of Parliament to hear his doom as a traitor. He was hanged on the 22nd July, and his head fixed on the Netherbow Port, beside that of his friend, James Cuthrie. He is said to have made a lamentable exhibition of fear at his sentence, but at the end met his fate "composed and courageous". (2) He had taken office as Clerx-Registrar under Cromwell, though he had previously written and spoken against the sinfulness of serving under the Usurper. Kirkton says the real cause of his death was the personal hatred of the King, whom he rebuked for his debauchery. (3)

(1) Kirkton. History, 170. (2) Ibid. 172.

(3) Ibid. 173.

This historian (1) well sums up the history of Scotland for the next quarter of a century in one pregnant sentence. "After this, the history of Scotland is made up of the absurdities and wickedness of the clergy, the opposition of a grieved oppressed people, and the cruel severities of a persecuting power."

An active and general persecution now began. Further Acts were passed. All religious meetings, save those of the acknowledged clergy, were prohibited. On 7th October an Act was passed in Council, ordering Presbyterian ministers from Ireland, a number of whom, though unauthorized, had been officiating in Scotland, to leave the country within fifteen days. In the same Act all sheriffs and Justices, and "all officers of the standing forces", are required to assist the ministers (curates) in the discharge of their duties and "to execute the penalties expressed by Act of Parliament." That is to say, the exaction of fines is now placed in the hands of the army, and the curates are made witnesses and informers against offenders.

Two squadrons of the lifeguards, under Sir Robert Fleming were sent to the west, one of which was quartered in Kilmarnock, and the other in Paisley. Sir James Turner commanded the troops in the south. A man of some literary ability and a graduate of Glasgow University, he had had a varied experience. In turn he had served both the Covenanters and the King. He had also fought in Germany, where he adopted the principle on which so many mercenaries acted, that so long as men served their master faithfully, it did not matter what master they served.<sup>(2)</sup> His ruthless enforcement of their orders appears to have satisfied his present superiors, for on the 24th of November a letter was sent from the Privy Council, thanking him for the care and pains he had taken in enforcing the law. It is to be noted that on the same date

(1.) Kirkton, History, 179. (2) Memoirs, p. 14.

the Council expressly state that the soldiery have no power to exact any of the penalties imposed by the Act of 7th October, except the 20/ Scots for non-attendance at their own parish church. The troopers, however, had greatly abused the powers conferred upon them, and the people in most districts were cruelly oppressed.

The bishops were not satisfied with the progress made in establishing the power of the Church, and Sharp went to Court at the end of 1663 to complain of the slackness of many of the nobles in enforcing the laws. Not a few of them were by this time sick of the arrogance and cruelty of the bishops, and some of them, like Glencairn, had spoken out to this effect. This caused great offence to the Primate, who, by the help of English bishops, persuaded Charles to set up a Court of High Commission in Scotland on 16th January 1664. It consisted of the two archbishops, seven bishops, and a number of nobles and commons, of whom any four, together with an archbishop or bishop, formed a quorum. Great power was given to this Court. They might summon all who were disobedient to ecclesiastical authority, all conventiclers, all preachers in private houses, all who spoke or wrote anything to the detriment of the Church or kingdom, or molested the clergy, or failed to attend their parish church, by fining, or imprisonment, or inflicting corporal punishment. All officers of the army and all magistrates were commanded to arrest delinquents on the warrant of any five members of the Court. This was known as the "Crail Court", and it put its very extensive powers mercilessly into force. Not a whisper against existing rule in Church or State, no personal offence against any bishop might escape the arbitrary action of this tribunal. No formal libel was necessary: a few captious questions often decided the fate

of its victims. Fines of a ruinous amount were imposed, and many were sent to jail. Some found it preferable to undergo a voluntary banishment rather than face the harsh injustice of the Court. The taking of the oath of obedience was often imposed when nothing else would secure a conviction, and many who refused this on conscientious grounds suffered accordingly.

The Court usually met in Edinburgh, but a few zealots chosen by the bishops formed an itinerant Court, and travelled up and down the country in order to overawe the people. This went on for over a year, but so great was the dislike and disgust aroused by the proceedings of the commissioners, and so many were the complaints and petitions lodged against it, that it was felt that it must be stopped. In two contemporary works, "Naphtali" and "An Apologeticall Relation of the particular sufferings of the faithfull ministers and professors of the Church of Scotland since 1660, etc.," by John Brown of Wamphray, we have many cases of oppressions of the Court.

Though the High Commission was rather a slur upon the Privy Council, and usurped many of its functions, the Council was still willing to exceed its legal powers and do what it could to assist the Commission in its work. And when this latter Court ceased to function, little relief came to the Presbyterians, as the Council was equally willing to persecute.

The method of dealing with alleged offenders was summary. The curate of a parish complained to Turner, or an officer, or even a private soldier, who straightway judged the case, pronounced sentence, and frequently pocketed the fine, which on some excuse or other was often greatly in excess of the legal amount. If a family was unable or unwilling to pay, soldiers were quartered upon them, and lived at their cost,

till perhaps they were ruined. Ribald soldiers were intruded on godly households, whose religion and family worship they scoffed at. On occasion people were beaten, and dragged to prison or to church with equal violence. To facilitate the work of the soldiers the curates in most parishes drew up a roll of the congregation, which was called after sermon, and all absentees were reported to the military. No appeal was allowed, though mistakes were sometimes made. In the cases of old Presbyterian ministers, who, by connivance, or at their own risk, or by the interest of some influential person in the parish, were still officiating, soldiers were sent to find if parishioners from other parishes were present, as was often the case; and if so, they had to pay the fine on the spot. If, however, they had not sufficient money, they were robbed of their clothes, even of their Bibles. By such treatment hundreds of poor religious families were scattered or beggared. (1) Little or no attempt to restrain the soldiery was made by their superiors, and at a later date Sir George Mackenzie thought it sufficient to say "it is impossible to answer for the extravagances of soldiers". (2) They cared little whom they punished. A gentleman was made to suffer for the defection of his wife, his servants, or his tenants, and a tenant for his landlord, even though they themselves conformed.

The spirits of men were becoming embittered by the injustice and cruelty to which they were subjected. The whole west country was seething with discontent, and many were ripe for revolt. The outbreak of the war with Holland caused the Government to fear a revolt of the Whigs, and strengthened the hands of those who favoured a policy of stern repression. The

(1) Wodrow. "Sufferings". I, 374.

(2) "Vindication". p.10.

first act of open rebellion took place in November 1666. According to the teaching of Calvin (1) and his followers it is the right and duty of the representatives of the people to take action against tyrannical princes, and the influence of this Geneva doctrine is seen in the deposition of the Regent Mary, and of her daughter, and in the wars against Charles I. But such action, the Reformers taught, was not to be that of private men, but of their constitutional representatives. The battle of Rullion Green, however, was no episode in a reasoned and planned rebellion. We may almost say it was the result of an accident. Four countrymen, who had been in hiding in the hills, came to the village of Dalry, in ~~Lyshire~~ <sup>Kirkcubright</sup>, in search of food, and learning that some soldiers were abusing an old man in order to extort payment of his fines, their sense of humanity overcame their prudence, and they hastened to the relief of the victim. A scuffle took place in which one of the soldiers was wounded and the others surrendered. It was realized that they had done a desperate deed, and that Turner would exact a terrible vengeance. So it was decided to seize him before he could act. A body of insurgents gathered and marched on Dumfries where he lay. He appealed for mercy, and it was granted on his showing that his actions were more merciful than the bishops' orders, but he was carried off as a prisoner. Some attempted to dissuade them from their revolt, and they were in a difficulty whether to disband or not. The ministers were strongest in favour of their continuing in arms, and this course was followed. They marched to various places in hopes of getting

(1) Institutes, cap. 20, sect. 31.

fresh recruits, and though disappointed in many places, they were at one time 2000 strong. In Lanark through the timidity of the people they received but small additions. Here they renewed the Covenant, and here they might have made a stand, but on a report that Edinburgh would help them, they advanced by Rathgate and Colinton. The citizens of the capital not only failed to support, but stood to arms against them. The authorities were greatly alarmed by this rising, especially as it was rumoured that the Covenanters were in league with the Dutch, and the Privy Council issued a proclamation calling upon them to surrender, and sent Sir Thomas Dalrymple to suppress the rebellion. He was a fanatical royalist, who had fought in Muscovy, where mercy was unknown in war, and he followed on the track of the Covenanters. Negotiations had been found in vain, and the weary, half-starved, rain-soaked men, now reduced in numbers to 800 or 900, took up a position at Rullion Green, on the Pentlands. A few days drill was not sufficient to make the rustics equal to trained troops, and though they fought well at first, they were soon totally defeated. Some forty-five were slain and a hundred taken prisoners. The captives were taken to Edinburgh and treated with great cruelty. In the attempt to extort information as to the Dutch plot, torture was employed in the case of Neilson of Corsock and Hugh McKail - a thing unknown in Scotland for thirty years past. The "boots" were applied till their limbs were crushed almost to jelly. There was some such plot, but the Calloway Covenanters had nothing to do with it. The plea that they had been granted quarter by the army was dismissed by

P.C.R. II, 229

P.C.R. II, 231.

the Court, and the work of execution began. Between thirty and forty were hanged. It was afterwards discovered that the Archbishop of Glasgow had held back a letter from the King, which arrived before the execution of McKail and others, saying that enough blood had already been shed.

Dalyell was next sent into the west, and by his ruthless severities managed to a considerable extent to quell the spirit of the people. The fall of Clarendon had its effects on the Scottish authorities. Bothes and Sharp, the chief advocates of suppression, fell into disgrace, and the Earls of Tweeddale and Kincardine, and Sir Thomas Murray, more moderate men, came into power. The army was disbanded, and there was a partial respite from persecution.

On the 11th July 1668 Archbishop Sharp was fired at in Edinburgh, and narrowly escaped. He, however, remained in great fear of assassination, and having some reason to suspect a man named Mitchell of being his assailant, he, six years after the attack, pressed for his punishment, and in flagrant defiance of all forms of law, secured his conviction and execution. In this attempt we have evidence of the hatred entertained for the Primate by many of the people, and which afterwards found so tragic expression on Magus Moor.

In 1667, under the milder regime of Tweeddale, a proposal for some measure of indulgence for the Presbyterian ministers had been considered, but it was not till June 1669 that this was made public. The Council was to appoint to vacant parishes such men as they saw fit. Those who were willing to accept collation from the bishops were to have the stipend: those who refused were only to have the manse and glebe. All were bound to hold Kirk



Sessions, attend Presbyteries, and only to administer the Sacraments to their own parishioners in their own parishes. Forty-two of the ejected ministers accepted the terms submitted, and, while adhering to their own principles, expressed their gratitude for the royal clemency. (1)

This measure led to contentions among the Covenanters. The more scrupulous refused the indulgence, as so doing was regarded by them as owning the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, against which the Protesters had always stood out. It was also objected to by some of the more extreme Episcopalians, as the indulged Presbyterians would be exempt from Episcopal authority, and as they would, in some districts at least, draw the people away from the services conducted by the curates. But the services of the indulged were rejected by many of the Covenanters, who regarded them as false to the Covenant.

On the 10th of November of this year the notorious Asseratory Act (2) was passed. It gave the King supreme authority over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical, and in virtue thereof the disposal of the external government and policy of the Church as an inherent right of the Crown, which may enact such orders concerning the external government of the Church, and the persons employed in the same, as it may think fit. The Act was unpopular among all parties. It was said, and with much truth, that it made his Majesty both King and Pope.

In the year 1670 Robert Leighton, now Archbishop of Glasgow, set himself to advance a scheme of accommodation between Episcopalians and Presbyterians. The bishop was only to be the perpetual moderator of Presbyteries, and though he was to

(1) Kirkton, p. 279. (2) Act. Parl. Scot. VII, 554.

ordain ministers, it was to be in their own parish church, and not in a cathedral. The Presbyterians he consulted received the proposal coldly: they remembered that bishops had been introduced into the Church as perpetual moderators. Leighton was disappointed at the failure of his well-meant plan, and soon afterwards retired.

Conventicles, at which men sometimes attended in arms lest they should be surprised by the soldiery, became increasingly numerous. This greatly alarmed the authorities, and by the Parliament, which met on 28th July 1670, it was made obligatory on every one to reveal on oath, which might be administered by any one who had authority - even a private trooper - what they knew of conventicles and (1) those who attended them, even when their nearest kin were involved. To refuse was to be imprisoned or banished. The penalty for preaching at a field conventicle was to be death and the confiscation of goods, and that for mere attendance was a ruinous fine. To help on the enforcement of the Act, a reward of 500 merks was offered for every preacher seized, and the captor was free from penalties for any slaughter that might be committed in arresting the offender. In addition to this sanguinary law, one was passed imposing heavy penalties for having a child baptized by one of the outed ministers, and yet another making absence from the parish <sup>church</sup> for three successive Sundays without good cause a punishable offence.

But the conventicles were not made to cease, and the Government continued the enforcement of their orders in the hope of wearing down the people's power of resistance; and the Bass Rock was converted into a prison to which their victims were consigned.

(1) Act P. Scot. VIII, 11.

Following these, there came a second indulgence, offered to eighty more of the ejected ministers. But the conditions were burdensome and humiliating. They were not to leave their own parishes without the permission of the bishop; all were to celebrate the Communion on the same day; they were only to baptize or marry those belonging to their own congregation; and to observe the anniversary of the Restoration.

But fining still went on; and Wodrow in his History of the Sufferings of the Church gives figures to show how extortionate these were. From the County of Renfrew alone in the course of a few years these amounted to £368,000 Scots. Remembering the financial state of the country at the time, this would about equal at present the same number of pounds in Sterling money. They would have meant utter ruin to many, and the Government had to accept a composition, which, however, was insisted upon. (1)

Lauderdale, one of the chief instruments of the persecution of the Covenanters, was made a duke. Like many other perverts, he hated the party from which he had seceded, and sought to establish his credit with his new masters by his cruelty to the old. With his wife, a Court beauty, extravagant and unprincipled as himself, the pair now ruled Scotland.

There was now in the country a considerable number of ministers and laymen, who had declined to answer in Court the summonses which had been issued against them, well knowing what would be the result; and in 1675 an obsolete practice was revived to make sure their punishment. Letters of intercommuning were issued against them, the

(1) Wodrow, Sufferings, Vol. II. 227

effect, or purposed effect, of which was to cut them off from society. They were outlaws. Whosoever should harbour them, or have intercourse with them, or supply them with food or clothing, was deemed guilty of the same crimes as were charged against the victims of this enactment. Sheriffs and their officers were ordered to pursue and arrest them when they could. Thus many were driven to the hills and hunted like wild beasts. Under such circumstances their fanaticism deepened, and some of them were led to do desperate deeds.

The conventicles still continuing, and the gentry being greatly reluctant to sign bonds for their tenants and dependants, the Government determined to take a step to end what they chose to call the rebellion. In 1678, in January, an army of 8,000 men, (1) mostly composed of semi-savage highlanders, strengthened by militia and regulars, with "some cannon", was sent into the western counties. All weapons were ordered to be given up. The soldiers were let loose on free quarters, and proceeded to indulge in robbery and the most abominable outrages. Shocked and grieved at their doings, the Duke of Hamilton, a number of the nobility, and about fifty landed gentlemen went to London at the risk of their lives, to plead with the King that the devastation might cease. They were at length successful, and after two months the army was recalled (2), and the Celts returned to their homes loaded with plunder of every description. (3) But fines were still imposed, men were still imprisoned, field preaching still went on, men were still in hiding.

(1) Burnet, "Own Times", I, 278. (2) Ibid.

(3) Wodrow, Sufferings, II, 413.

On the 3rd of May 1679 Sharp met the fate he had so long dreaded. A band of outlawed men had determined to lie in wait near St Andrews, to slay one Carmichael, a creature of the Archbishop, who had been employed in hunting out Covenanters. He did not appear, and they were about to disperse when they learned of the approach of the Primate on his return home. Regarding this as an act of Providence delivering their enemy into their hands, they pursued his coach, and easily overtaking the lumbering vehicle, they dragged him forth, and stabbed him to death in the presence of his daughter, who accompanied him. (1)

A considerable number of the people were now ripe for rebellion, maddened by the oppression to which they had been and were subjected. On the 29th of the same month a body of the more extreme Covenanters rode into Rutherglen, scattered the bonfires which were blazing in honour of the day, affixed to the Market Cross a paper (2) denouncing the Acts under which they suffered, and then publicly burned the Acts. (3)

This bold action naturally caused great excitement. John Graham, of Claverhouse, had already won an evil reputation as a persecutor among the Covenanters of the south, but he now comes into a greater notoriety. He was at this time the captain of a troop of horse stationed at Glasgow, and on Saturday, 31st May, he rode out to Hamilton, to investigate as to the occurrence of the 29th, and here he learned that a conventicle was to be held at Loudon Hill on the following day. He resolved to disperse the gathering. While the service was proceeding, the

(1) Wodrow, Sufferings, Vol. III, 40, etc  
Russell. (2) ~~Ibid~~, III, 66-67. (3) Ibid 58.

sentinels gave warning of the approach of the military. Many of the attenders were armed, and they determined to fight rather than to flee. A position was taken up on a piece of swampy land near Drumclog, and here the battle was fought and won. Claverhouse lost about thirty of his men, and was compelled to retreat, (1) losing twelve more in the flight. The loss of the Covenanters was about half-a-dozen.

Next day the victors advanced through Glasgow towards Hamilton. The news of their success spread rapidly, and in the course of a few days several thousand men had joined their ranks, their numbers fluctuating between five and eight thousand men. This was a large company, but it was absurdly unfitted to meet the force which the Government speedily had in the field against them. English regiments were sent to join with the militia of the northern and eastern counties, and the Duke of Monmouth was appointed to the command. On the 18th of June he was in Edinburgh, and on the 21st he was face to face with the Covenanters, who had encamped on the south side of the Clyde, near Hamilton.

They lacked two things essential for a fighting force - they had neither a leader nor discipline. Their equipment, too, was poor: they were short of gunpowder and had but one little brass gun to oppose the Duke's artillery. Robert Hamilton at first held the chief command, but many of his followers entertained different opinions; and, instead of making military preparations, they entered on fierce theological disputes, and so there were warring parties within the camp. Some called for a Fast, in which to mourn their sins. Even

(1) Wodrow, Sufferings, III, 69.

in presence of the enemy there was a demand that the old officers should be replaced by new ones. This led to further wrangling, and Hamilton and some of his supporters left the camp in anger.

Understanding that the Duke was inclined to leniency, an attempt at negotiations was made. He expressed his willingness to do his best for them with the King, but insisted that they must first lay down their arms. Some were willing to yield; some thought the demand too much; and others refused to come to any terms with an uncovenanted King, and so the dispute went on. Their ministers promised them victory, and in this spirit the battle began.

The Clyde separated the two armies, but was spanned by a long bridge, which at that time was not more than ten feet wide. This was defended by 300 men under Hackston of Rathillet, one of the most determined fighters in their ranks. He barricaded the toll-house in the middle of the bridge, and made a gallant stand. When their powder was spent they fought with clubbed muskets, and when they sent for more they were ordered to retire. This gave the royal troops their opportunity, and they began to cross the bridge. The Covenanters might now have attacked their unformed ranks and driven them back, but lack of military skill and discipline prevented, and soon, before the charge of the soldiers, the Covenanters fell into confusion and began to flee. Their cavalry had already, through fear or the stampede of their untrained horses at the discharge of the enemy's artillery, fled from the field. Hundreds were slain in the battle or in the flight, and about 1,500 were taken prisoners. Monmouth did his best for them, but the treatment they received was cruel. For lack of room in the prison, they were cooped up

in an enclosed part of the Greyfriars Churchyard in Edinburgh. (1)

By the efforts of Monmouth an Act of Indemnity was passed about the end of July, and those were released or exempted who promised never again to take up arms against the King, or to attend field preachings. Many took the oath. A number, however, refused. Two preachers - Kid and King - were hanged in August, and five men were executed on Magus Moor in November, in revenge for the murder of Sharp. A company of 257 were shipped in November as slaves to Barbadoes, but 200 of them were drowned in the wreck of the vessel on the Orkneys. The survivors apparently were released on bond.

About the time of the passing of the Indemnity Act, another - known as the Third Indulgence - was carried, allowing Presbyterian ministers, if still unindulged, to preach and administer the sacraments in private houses, if they ceased to take part in field meetings. This did not appeal to the extreme men: few took advantage of it, and it was soon withdrawn.

After the battle those who had been present, and had not accepted the Indemnity, were eagerly sought after. The search was accompanied by many horrors. If threats failed to obtain the information wanted, torture was employed: the thumbkins were employed.

During these times of oppression and cruelty there had been forming bodies of men who adhered to the Covenant with absolute devotion and strictly logical obedience. They would have nothing to do with compromise; they scorned the Indulgence; they would pay no cess; they would not own a King who had broken his Covenant oath. Nor would they hold

(1) Wodrow, Sufferings, III, 124-125.



fellowship with any Presbyterian brethren who took up a more moderate position. Their sufferings naturally drew them more closely together, and they formed themselves into a number of societies, and called themselves Society People. At the time they were often termed the Wanderers, the Hillmen, and sometimes the Wild Whigs. And from their most distinguished minister, Richard Cameron, they were even then sometimes known as the Cameronians.

On 3rd June 1680, one of the Society men, Hall of Haughhead, while in the company of Donald Cargill, one of their leading ministers, was killed at Queensferry, in an attempt made to arrest him by the governor of Blackness Castle. On his body was found a paper, which is known as the Queensferry paper. (1) It is intended to bind those accepting it to eight articles. One of these was to uphold the Presbyterian Church in Scotland; another was to discard the royal family and set up a republic; while the last article is one which is not quite in conformity with the teaching of the New Testament. They were to destroy those assailing their worship and liberties; not to injure any one, "but only those that have injured us." The Covenant obligation to obey the King only bound them to a covenanted King, and they had no hope for a King who had usurped Christ's Kingship and violated the Covenants. They "declare they shall, God giving them power, set up a Government or Governours according to the Word of God", whose qualifications are indicated in Exodus XVIII, 20. Such "Government was not to be committed to a single Person or a Lineal Succession." Here we have a clear rejection of the royal family and the setting up of a republic.

(1) Printed in Appendix to Cloud of Witnesses, 1714.

The paper, however, was unsigned, and was not recognized by the Society People.

A step in the same direction was taken on 22nd June - the anniversary of Bothwell Bridge - when Richard Cameron, at the head of twenty armed men, rode into Sanquhar, and read, and affixed to the market cross a short but-most emphatic declaration of war against the King. (1) They disowned Charles Stewart, and under the Standard of Christ, they declared war against him as a Tyrant and Usurper, and all the men of his practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ. The conclusion reveals how desperate and determined they were - "rewarding those that are against us as they have done to us."

This insult naturally <sup>or</sup> angered the authorities, and a reward of 5000 merks was offered for the capture of Richard Cameron, 3000 for that of Cargill, Douglas, and Cameron's brother Michael, and 1000 for that of their comrades, dead or alive.

The zealots were now about to attempt to put the doctrine of the Two Kingdoms, as they understood it, into action. What they threatened to do on behalf of the Spiritual Kingdom, the Civil Kingdom did for itself in less than nine years afterwards by "The Glorious Revolution." But Cameron's days were now numbered.

Accompanied by a few followers, he wandered in Calloway and Ayr, preaching his doctrines in passionate strains as opportunity offered. Within a month from his visit to Sanquhar, on 20th July, sixty-three of the extremists were surprised by a party of soldiers twice as numerous as themselves at Ayrsmoss, in the parish of Auchinleck.. They determined to fight, and Hackston took command.

(1) Wodrow, III, 2<sup>k</sup>2.

Under such a leader a good fight was put up, but they were defeated. Cameron, his brother, and seven others were killed, five were captured, and the others escaped through the bog. Hackston, sorely wounded, was one of the prisoners, and after a form of trial, was executed with revolting barbarity in Edinburgh.

Donald Cargill, now over sixty years of age, was the leading spirit among the hillmen after the death of Cameron, but he displayed a wonderful energy in carrying on the work, traversing the country, and preaching on every opportunity. In October he summoned a great conventicle at Torwood, and here he solemnly excommunicated and delivered up to Satan King Charles, the Duke of York, Monmouth, Rothes, Lauderdale, Sir George Mackenzie, and General Dalryell. The Government, enraged at such a daring action, increased the reward offered for the arrest of Cargill, and made every effort to apprehend him, but neither reward nor torture would induce any one to betray him. In the July following, however, he was captured, tried on the 26th, and with four others, hanged at the market cross on the 27th.

In the year 1681 James, Duke of York, came to Edinburgh as the King's representative. The English House of Commons had more than once passed a Bill to prevent his succession to the throne, which Charles had refused to allow to become law, and it was hoped that the servile Scottish Parliament would give them a better example. By the Parliament meeting on 28th July much business was done, but three Acts specially claim our attention. The first,<sup>(1)</sup> according to custom was for the confirmation of the Protestant religion. The second,<sup>(2)</sup> in contradiction to it, declared that the kings of the country

(1) Act. P. Scot. VIII, 238. (2) *Ibid.*

derived their royal authority from God alone, that they succeeded to it by lineal descent, that no difference of religion, no Acts of Parliament could affect that succession, and that any one who denied this was guilty of high treason. Thus the way was paved for the Duke to follow his brother. After these came the notorious Test Act. (1) By it any person who held any office, however high or humble, under the Government, was to swear that he held to the Confession of 1567, that he acknowledged the supremacy of the King in all causes and over all persons, both civil and ecclesiastical, that he would never consult about any matter of state without his Majesty's licence or command, that he would not endeavour any alteration in the government of the country.

Though this Act, strictly considered, is directed against both Papists and Presbyterians, it soon became clear that it was only intended against the latter. The royal family was excluded from its operation. Charles was a Papist at heart and the conversion of James was no secret. The Catholics were busy with propaganda work in Scotland at the time, and their agents were boasting to Rome of the number of their "communicants". Romanists held both civil and military appointments in the country, and were little interfered with.

Some had grave difficulty in taking this oath. Argyle delayed, but at length did so, with the qualification that he took it only in so far as it was consistent with itself and the Protestant religion, and that he did not regard it as preventing him from attempting in any lawful way, such alterations in Church or State which would be in

(1) Act. P. Scot. VIII, 245 - 355.

accordance with loyalty and religion. The explanation was accepted at the time, but in a few days he was committed to prison for his interpretation of the oath. (1) By a majority of one the judges found him guilty, but he managed to escape in disguise, and fled to Holland.

During the two following years the country was overrun by a lawless soldiery, fining, robbing, and arresting much as they pleased. About this time Graham of Claverhouse comes prominently forward as the arch-persecutor. His apologists declare that his severity was inspired by his intense loyalty to the King, but his opponents attribute it to his cruelty and his greed for fines and confiscated estates. So terrible was his reputation among the persecuted hillmen, that they believed he had sold himself to the devil, and consequently for a season bore a charmed life. His defeat at Drumclog apparently rankled in his mind, and spurred him on to revenge. Of his heartless cruelty in carrying on his proceedings against the Covenanters there can be no doubt. Another man hated of them was Sir George Mackenzie, who in the Law Courts was as eager and unscrupulous in securing convictions as Claverhouse was savage in the field.

The list of martyrs and confessors, whose story of suffering has been handed down to us in *The Cloud of Witnesses*, *Naphtali*, and other books, is very long, and may not be narrated here, however briefly. Some of them were men of good position, keen intelligence, and high moral character, but the majority were men and women of humble rank, simple godly folks whose only desire was to worship God in Sincerity and to do their daily duty in peace.

(1) Wodrow III, 312-339. Furnet, I, 342-343.

The discovery of the Rye-house plot alarmed the Government, and led to increased persecution in Scotland. In hopes of gaining information which they sought, they had recourse to the torture of the thumkins and the boots. One of the victims was William Carstares, who was so soon to take such an effectual part in the restoration of Presbytery. Believed to have some knowledge of the Plot, and in order to make him reveal it, he was subjected to the thumkins till the sweat of agony poured over his face and the Duke of Hamilton and the Earl of Queensferry could not bear the sight. What little he did disclose under promises was dishonestly used.

Persecution still increased. A list of nearly 2000 persons, who are described as fugitives to law and subject to punishment, was issued, and serves to indicate the state of the country at this time. (1) It was against the Hillmen that this was chiefly aimed. By their Declarations they had made it known that they had thrown off their allegiance, and were determined to defend themselves: but at the beginning of November 1684 they issued a stronger Declaration still. It is known as the "Apologetical Declaration," and was written by Renwick. (2) It narrates the present state of affairs, renews their former Declarations, and abhorring that "hellish principle" of killing all who differ from them, all who stretch forth their hands against them shall be reputed enemies to God and the Covenanted Work of Reformation, and punished as such, according to their power and the degree of the offence. It concludes: "Let King Jesus reign, and all his enemies be scattered."

(1) Wodrow, Vol. IV .

(2) Wodrow, Vol. IV, 148.

The Government had declared the Covenanters rebels, and now they had goaded them into becoming rebels indeed. The Apologetical Declaration was a challenge to the Government, but not one of a kind that placed the existing regime in any actual danger. Yet the Government considered it necessary to give military officers authority to shoot at sight any person who refused to disown the Declaration. Whether this were really due to fear on their part, or it was merely a cunning move to use the threats of the Declaration as an excuse for using still more stringent methods against the Wild Whigs of the west, there is no doubt that many were really afraid, and a number of curates, and informers, and other enemies of the hillmen fled from their homes in terror of their lives. A form of oath was drawn up, solemnly abjuring the Declaration, and officers, with a military guard, were sent to various parts of the country to exact it. The people were brought before them, and any one refusing the oath was shot on the spot. This was the beginning of what is strictly known as the killing times. Hitherto the accused had some measure of security in the civil courts, but now all power was given to the military. Their methods were simple. A few questions, such as: "Will you take the Test Oath?" "Will you take the Abjuration Oath?" "Will you pray for the King?" were put. If the answers were unsatisfactory, sentence was pronounced, a file of soldiers was drawn up, the prisoner was placed in front of them, and the order to fire was given, and all was over. Many were slain in this summary way by the roadside, in the fields, at their own doors. Generally the soldiers were unwilling to shoot women, but the women did not always escape. Many were imprisoned and some were killed. The pathetic story of the drowning of Margaret Wilson and Widow

McLauchlan in the rising tide of Solway shows to what a depth of degradation some at least of the King's minions had fallen.

The year 1685 witnessed several important political events. In February Charles II died, and was succeeded by his brother, James VII. The rebellions of Argyle in the north and Monmouth in the south soon followed, but both were unsuccessful, and resulted in the death of the leaders. Argyle was supported by his own clan and a number of volunteers, but the Presbyterians of the country, upon whose support he relied in his avowed purpose to abolish Popery and Prelacy, failed him. The defeats of Rullion Green and Bothwell Bridge, and the dragonades which followed, had curbed the spirit of all save the determined Society men. But Argyle had voted for the execution of Cargill, and therefore could look for no help from them. He was badly advised to make at once for the Lowlands with such force as had been able to raise, but he was defeated, captured, and executed.

During the year the military displayed great activity in the persecution of the Hillmen of the south-west, and not only the traditions of the time, but the records of the Privy Council<sup>(1)</sup> itself afford many instances of the enormities which were perpetrated. Daniel Defoe visited the country some years afterwards, and interviewed people who had seen as well as heard of things that were done, and he expresses his belief that the persecution in Scotland was more fierce than those of the early Christians by the Roman emperors or those of the popish Inquisition. This of course can only be a matter of opinion,

but when we consider that men like Dalrymple, Claverhouse, and Grierson were at work, there may

*cf. volumes of published records - Privy Council Registers*



be good grounds for his opinion. Sometimes, according to their declared intention, the Whigs offered armed resistance, and the soldiers were not always the victors.

As has been noted, it was only in the southwest that the resistance to the Government continued strong. In some districts indeed it never had been strong, and in some it was practically non-existent. The opposition was not to a creed, for the Church was still professedly Calvinistic; nor was it to a ritual, for it had not been again attempted to force a Liturgy upon the people. Under such conditions many laid aside, often sullenly no doubt, their covenanting scruples, and attended their parish church. What then were the essential elements in the resistance of the Whigs? First of all, they resented the government condemnation of the Covenants as drawing the nation into apostasy, and next, their institution of Episcopacy, which to them was a step towards Popery, and Popery was a thing abhorred as idolatry. With a clear conscience they could not own an Erastian Government, which to their minds usurped the place of Christ as the Head of the Church, and which was not only uncovenanted, but the enemy of the Covenants, which it had declared to be unlawful oaths; and which, through its bishops, was leading the nation back to Popery. No doubt these sentiments had been greatly strengthened by the sudden ejection soon after the Restoration of so many ministers who had preached such doctrines to them for years, and who still continued to witness for them. And so with clear consciences they suffered.

Any estimate of the number of such sufferers must be largely a matter of guess-work, but the editor of *The Scots Worthies*, after as careful an examination as was possible, reckoned it as having been during the twenty-eight years of persecution 18,000. Probably

the number is too great, perhaps not much too great. Of these 1700 were transported to the Plantations, besides 750 banished to the Northern Isles, 2800 suffered imprisonment; 7000 went into exile; 680 were killed or died of wounds received in battle; 498 were killed without any legal process; while 362 were executed under form of law, and many others no doubt perished of exposure in their wanderings, and others from confinement in insanitary jails.

James was a professed Romanist, and as a Romanist he reigned in opposition to law. He greatly favoured those of his own faith. For many of them the Test Act was a dead letter, and they held both military and civil posts. In February 1687, in accordance with which Quakers were entitled to assemble in Licensed meeting houses, while Presbyterians and Roman Catholics might, under certain conditions hold worship in private houses. On 5th July the King went further, and by proclamation freedom of worship was given to all sects if loyal, in buildings notified to and approved of by the magistrates. The Papists, for whose sake mainly the King had dared to do this illegal act, were now entitled, as all other dissenters, to erect churches and worship in them. Conventiclers were still excluded from the grace, but penal enactments against other dissenters were annulled.. Many Presbyterians welcomed the liberty. Exiles returned home to take up pastoral duties once more. Grateful thanks were returned to his Majesty for the favour received. Many Episcopalians, however, resented the Proclamation, and suffered for their opposition .

The Hillmen would not acknowledge the indulgence, and continued their testimony. James Renwick, a young man of six and twenty, was their most prominent preacher. He was twice proclaimed by the Government

and a reward was offered for his apprehension. He was at length seized in the Capital itself on 1st February after a scuffle. Efforts were made to induce him to own the King's authority, that his life might be spared. His execution was put off for a week in the hope that he would submit, but he steadfastly adhered to his principles, and on 17th February 1688 he was hanged, the last of the long line of martyrs.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### The Revolution of 1688.

It was through England that deliverance came. The tyranny of James and his illegal efforts to introduce Romanism into the land alienated all classes of Protestants. The arrest of the seven bishops for refusing to read the arbitrary and unlawful Declaration of Indulgence and the real or supposititious birth of a Prince of Wales, with the prospect of a line of Papist kings, brought matters to a head. The Whigs were ripe for revolt, and many of the Tories had given up the principle of no resistance to the sovereign, which they had professed and preached. Those of them who could not wholly surrender it, though they would not fight against James, would no longer fight for him.

William of Orange was approached, and met the approach favourably. The political blunder of Louis of France in attacking Germany left the Dutch free. Troops and munitions were collected, and a large fleet sailed from the Scheldt. The first attempt was hindered by a storm, but on the 5th of November 1688 William landed at Torbay at the head of an army of 13,000 men. The Prince had not been expected to land in the west, which was still lying crushed under the terrible severities which followed upon the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion, and at first the response was slow. Risings had already begun in the north and west, and soon the gentry and the peasants were volunteering for the service of William. The King called in the troops from Scotland and Ireland and all parts of the country, and soon had an army at Salisbury considerably more numerous than that of the invader. Various

important towns now declared for William, and with Plymouth to secure his rear, he advanced upon the King. The spirit of his men was uncertain, and fearing the result of a battle, James retreated upon London. William then marched for the Capital, and James fled to France on the 23rd of December. For a day or two there was something like anarchy in the city, chiefly directed against the Papists, but order was soon restored.

The difficulty arising from the absence of any person legally entitled to call a Parliament was surmounted by convoking the Lords then in London on the 21st of December, and on the 26th another body, consisting of all members who had sat in the House of Commons in the time of Charles the Second, together with the Aldermen of London and a deputation from the Common Council. Both of those bodies agreed in requesting William to issue letters summoning a Convention of the Estates of the Realm, and till it should meet, to take upon himself the executive administration.

When once the Protestant parties were freed from the pressing tyranny of James, divisions again began to reveal themselves. When the Convention met on 22nd January difference of opinion was displayed, but at length an understanding was reached, and it was decided that the Prince and Princess of Orange should be declared King and Queen of England.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of England had a firm hold on the affections of the people, and even the persecuted Dissenters had joined with it in opposition to the King when he sent the seven bishops to prison. In Scotland it was far otherwise. Dr. Story well expresses the actual state of affairs: - "Had he (James) laid up all the Scotch prelates in Edinburgh Castle, and fed them there with the 'bread

of adversity and the water of affliction', the one half of the Scottish nation would have looked on with a kind of humorous surprise, the other would have believed that he had been divinely led to do justice on those who had worn out the Saints of the Most High." (1)

The Protestant bishops of Scotland had ever been slavishly devoted to the Crown, and they gave ample expression to the sentiment now. On the 3rd of November, two days before William landed at Torbay, all the Scotch prelates but two, in addressing his Majesty, that "deceitful, dull-witted, hard-hearted, loose-living convert to Popery and votary of absolutism", (2) styled him 'the darling of heaven', promised to foster in their flocks a steadfast allegiance to the king "as an essential part of religion", doubting not that heaven would bestow upon him "the hearts of his subjects, and the necks of his enemies." (3)

When it became known that the Prince of Orange had landed in England, Scotland also rose against her oppressor. The Privy Council issued an order forbidding any one to receive or publish the Declaration which William, before leaving Holland, (4) had made to the people of Scotland, affirming that the object of his expedition was to free the country from Popery and arbitrary power. But this did not prevent the Declaration from becoming widely known. It was joyfully received, and in Glasgow, and Ayr, and several other western towns it was publicly proclaimed. This was but one expression of the relief felt in the country from the expectation that the burden of religious tyranny under which they

(1) R. H. Story, *Carstares*, p. 161. (2) *Ibid.*

(3) This was written when news came that the Prince had been blown back by a storm. Burnet styles it "a very indecent letter." *"Own Times"*, II, 510.

(4) Wodrow, *"Sufferings"*, IV, 470.

suffered would soon be removed, but there were others. In Glasgow the students of the University burnt the effigies of the Pope and the Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow. The royal troops, with the exception of the garrison of Edinburgh Castle under the Duke of Gordon, a Papist, had been withdrawn to support the King in the south, consequently there was little to restrain any outbreak on the part of the people, and while the result of the contest between William and James was still in doubt, riots began in Edinburgh. As in London, these were chiefly directed against the Papists. The rioters grew bolder when the news of the retreat of the King from Salisbury became known. The Chancellor, the Earl of Perth, was forced to flee from the city. Holyrood Chapel, which had been fitted up for Popish worship, was wrecked, and several of the soldiers on guard and a number of the rioters were killed. The houses of Papists were plundered, and great piles of Popish books and pictures, crucifixes and furniture, were burned in the High Street.

The disorders spread. Before the end of the year all the western and south-western districts, which had been the strongholds of the Covenant and the chief scenes of persecution, were taking action against the "curates", as the Episcopal clergy were styled. The fanatics, who had been driven to the hills, might now venture down, and in the fiery strains to which they had been accustomed in their conventicles, they thundered against the intruders, and roused the peasantry against them. No lives were lost in the "rabbling of the curates" which followed - commencing on Christmas Day - nor were there any gross outrages against person or property. The people seemed rather to be under the impression that they were simply righting a wrong rather than avenging one. Many of the curates were

aware of the hatred of the people, upon whom they had spied, and many of whom they had brought to suffering and ruin, and now that the tables were turned, they fled from their manses. The furniture of others was thrown into the fields, and others again were warned off with curses and threats. This of course meant the loss of the stipends which chiefly had attracted them. For months these summary and illegal ejections went on throughout the country. About 200 curates were so treated. (1)

The Presbyterians, knowing that William had been brought up a Presbyterian and was a member of the Dutch National Church, which was then, as now, Presbyterian, and aware of the great influence Carstares and others, who had been with the Prince in Holland, had with him, were very confident of his support.

The prelates had sent Bishop Rose, of Edinburgh, to London in December, to convey to James the assurance of their devoted loyalty, but by the time he reached the Metropolis the King was in flight. He then waited on the Primate and several of the English bishops, asking for their advice as to how he should act, but could get no satisfaction. So he could now but remain in London to see what he could effect with the Prince. The English Convention had by this time come to their decision as to the future rulers of the country, and the Scottish Convention was soon to meet, so Rose thought it time to return to Edinburgh. He requested an introduction to Court, through Bishop Compton of London, in order to obtain a passport to Scotland. The bishop thought it a good time to ask William for protection for the rabbled curates, and agreed to introduce Rose and Sir George Mackenzie for this purpose. It seemed to them that it might be advisable that the Scottish Episcopalian nobles and gentry in London should unite with them in

(1) Macaulay, Hist. III 227.



approaching the King in a body, but they learned that William would not see more than two at a time of either Episcopalians or Presbyterians, lest it should provoke jealousy. In his conversation with Rose and Mackenzie, Compton said, "The King bids me tell you that he now knows the state of Scotland much better than he did when he was in Holland; for while there he was made believe that Scotland generally all over was Presbyterian, but now he sees that the great body of the nobility and gentry are for Episcopacy, and it is the trading and inferior sort that are for Presbyterianism. Wherefore he bids me tell you, that if you will undertake to serve him to the purpose that he is here served in England, he will take you by the hand, support the Church, and your order, and throw off the Presbyterians." (1)

William was devoted to no particular form of church polity: he regarded no one of them as of divine origin. He was an Erastian, and was resolved to support that form of church government which would best support him. Both the Episcopalians and the Dissenters in England were willing to stand by him, but as the Episcopalians were stronger, he would support them. The English bishops very strongly urged him to favour the same policy in Scotland, and he would gladly have done so if he safely could. With one strong favouring Church in both countries, he would have felt stronger.

Hence the plain hint given to Dr. Rose through Compton, a hint which the Scottish bishop would not take. Not even the very clear hint given by the King himself in the farewell interview he granted him had any effect.

"Are you going for Scotland?" asked William. "Yes, sir," answered Rose, "if you have any commands for me." "I hope," replied the Prince, "you will be kind to me, and follow the example of England". The bishop's

(1) Quoted by Cunningham, II, 155.

reply was, 'Sir, I will serve you as far as law, reason, or conscience, shall allow me.' William turned on his heel without a word, and the fate of the Scottish Episcopal establishment was virtually sealed." (1)

The Presbyterians had several powerful friends at Court. Chief amongst these was William Carstares, an able Presbyterian minister, who had suffered torture for his principles under James. In exile in Holland he had made the acquaintance of William, who had learned his worth, and placed great confidence in his judgement. He had accompanied the Prince in the same ship to England, and had conducted divine service at the head of his army at Torbay. He still maintained the confidence of the King, and used all his influence in favour of the establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland. He assured William that his friends were not to be found amongst the Episcopalians in Scotland, and that the safety of his crown in that country lay in the support of the Presbyterians. The King must have been in a difficulty. As he indicated to Compton, he would have preferred to see Episcopacy established in Scotland as well as in England, believing it to be held by the upper classes, and stronger than it really was, yet he came to see ever more clearly that he could not depend on the support of the Prelatists in Scotland, who were devoted to the exiled King. They might have some influence among the aristocracy and gentry, but by the great majority of the people they were loathed. They were more likely to prove a source of weakness to any ruler who allied himself with them than any help. In the Presbyterians was his real hope; but how to avoid offence to the Anglican bishops, who had so heartily taken up his cause? In the end he acted with great wisdom, and left it to the Scottish people to decide for themselves.

(1) R.H. Story, Carstares, 164. Grub, III, 297.

A number of prominent Scotsmen were in London when William arrived, and others hastened to join him there. William took advantage of this to consult them as to the affairs of the northern kingdom. On the 7th of January 1689, the Duke of Hamilton, the premier peer of Scotland, attended by 30 lords and 80 gentlemen of note, waited upon the Prince at Whitehall, in response to his request. He asked them to consult together, and let him know how he could best advance the interests of the country. He then left them free to their deliberations, which they continued for three days. In their approach to William there had been a profession of unanimity, but there was really dissimulation, greed, and treachery, so characteristic of the aristocracy of Scotland at the time. Underlying their discussions we may trace a favourite device of the time-serving nobles in times of difficulty to secure the lands and titles to the family, whichever side should win. Hamilton, Queensberry, and Athole and their eldest sons were all on different sides - the fathers for the Prince, and the sons for the King. Finally they asked William to call a Convention of the Scottish Estates at Edinburgh for 14th March, and in the meantime to act as civil and military administrator.

From a strictly legal point of view, it was an illegal assembly. The Test Act was still in force, and no lord, baron, or burgess could sit without taking it, and consequently no good Presbyterian or patriot could be a member. Further, the burgesses were elected by the Town Councils, and no one could be a councillor till he had renounced the Covenant, acknowledged the King's supremacy, and taken other oaths of a like kind. Therefore, from such an electorate none but Episcopalians and Jacobites could be

expected to be returned. The new King acted boldly. He dispensed with the objectionable oaths, and ordered the representatives of the burghs to be chosen by the votes of the whole of the inhabitants. There were 50 members for the burghs, 49 for the counties, 42 peers, and 9 bishops returned, a goodly number of whom were in favour of the Revolution. As we might expect, the other party complained that the King had done these things solely on his own authority, the same offence as that which James had committed. But in what other way could the real feelings of the people have been expressed?

Nine bishops had taken their places as representing the Spiritual Estate, and the Bishop of Edinburgh opened the proceedings with prayer. The Duke of Hamilton was elected President against the Duke of Athole by a majority of 40. The consequence was that about 20 of the defeated party instantly passed over to the victors, in hopes to share in the fruits of office, which, however, were all too small.

On the 16th two letters were presented - one from William and the other from James.<sup>(1)</sup> These were characteristic of the senders. William showed a clear apprehension of the realities of life and of kingship, but James displayed no recognition of either. The Prince expressed his anxiety that they would settle the religion and liberties of the nation upon lasting foundations, with a reference to the public good and the inclinations of the people. But he made no allusion to the existing differences between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians. To this letter the Convention agreed to send a respectful and grateful reply. The letter from the fugitive King offered a pardon to those who should return to their duty before the end of the month, and threatened the doom

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. IX, 8.

of traitors against all others. He had learned neither wisdom nor mercy. No one even suggested that a reply should be sent. The contents of this letter were a grievous disappointment to the Jacobites, who realized that any hopes of being able to continue the contest in the Convention were now utterly ruined. The meeting broke up in great excitement.

On the day immediately preceding his flight James told Balcarres that he intended putting the civil affairs of Scotland under his control, and Claverhouse - now Viscount Dundee - that he should have a commission to command the troops. In view of the Edinburgh Convention, they earnestly set themselves to organize the royalist party in the hope that they might be able to secure a majority. Some who were inclined to stand aloof were induced to attend, and waverers were kept steady. Gordon, a Papist, who held the Castle for James, was led to delay its surrender, which he purposed, and so his artillery remained a menace to the city which lay beneath. Unable to control the Convention, as they had hoped, the Jacobite leaders in consultation decided that they must use the powers which James had sent them, and, leaving Edinburgh, form a royal Convention at Stirling. All arrangements for this were being carried through when Athole claimed a day's delay, but Dundee who was, probably with good reason, in great dread of assassination and had been refused protection by the Convention, would not stay, though he had promised to remain till the business of the Convention was concluded.

The Convention was in session on Monday, 18th March, when news was brought that Dundee had been seen to clamber up the Castle rock, hold conference with Gordon, and was now riding off to the west at the head of fifty troopers. Great excitement prevailed.

Hamilton acted promptly and strongly. The doors were shut and the Jacobites were prisoners. The citizens were called to arms and the Covenanters, who thronged the town rallied to the signal. The royalists were cowed by this determined action. All hopes of secession were at an end. The doors were opened, and they were free to leave. Some withdrew to their country seats, and others who remained in Edinburgh ceased to attend the Convention.

The plot had failed, but there could be no doubt as to the purpose of Dundee. James was willing that the country should be plunged into civil war, in the selfish hope that he might regain his crown. The Convention took steps to place the country in a state of defence. A proclamation was made at every market cross that all Protestants from sixteen to sixty should be ready to assemble in arms at the first summons. A squadron of the English fleet, with Mackay's three Scottish regiments, was sent to the Firth of Forth for the defence of the Convention.

Meanwhile the Convention went on with their business. A most important resolution was submitted, declaring in plain terms that King James VII, without taking the Coronation Oath, had acted and ruled as king, and by the advice of wicked counsellors, did arbitrarily invade the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and did exercise his power to the subversion of the Protestant religion: "Whereby he hath forfeited the right to the Crown, and the throne is become vacant."<sup>(1)</sup> Only five members voted against this. Following this another resolution that William and Mary should be declared King and Queen of Scotland, was proposed and carried.

The Edinburgh Convention followed the example of that of Westminster in a Claim of Right.<sup>(2)</sup> This document

(1) Act. P. Scot. IX, 34. (2) Ibid, page 38.

was passed on 11th April 1689, and became famous in our national history. It begins by narrating the arbitrary action of James against the liberties of the people, and his illegal efforts to establish Popery and subvert Protestantism in the country. A long list of the offences of the King and the grievances of the people follows: "whereby", the deed declares, in the words of the resolution of the Convention, "King James VII hath forfeited the right to the Crown, and the throne is become vacant." It then hails the deliverance that has come through William of Orange, "now King of England," and the Estates, for the vindication of the rights of the people and Parliament, declare that no Papist can be King or Queen of the realm. Various other matters concerning the liberties of the people are set forth. Amongst these it is declared "that Prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the church above Presbyter, is, and hath been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since the Reformation (they having been reformed from Popery by Presbyters), and therefore ought to be abolished".<sup>(1)</sup> And finally they resolved "that William and Mary, King and Queen of England, France, and Ireland, be, and be declared King and Queen of Scotland", and provision for the succession is made at length.

The next thing to be done was to revise the Coronation Oath, and send three members of the Convention to London to administer it. The three appointed were Argyle, who, though not in strict law himself a peer, represented the peers, Sir James Montgomery, representing the Commissioners of Shires, and Sir James Dalrymple, the burghs. On May 11 the Commissioners

(1) Wodrow, "Sufferings", IV, 484.

attended a solemn and imposing function at Whitehall. William and Mary were seated under a canopy, and a splendid circle of nobles, statesmen, and high officials surrounded them. The oath was administered in the Scottish fashion. The King and Queen held up their right hands, and Argyle recited the words clause by clause, while the royal pair repeated them distinctly after him, till they came to the last clause. Here their Majesties were asked to declare that they "would root out all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God, that shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the foresaid crimes". But William, to his credit be it said, paused, and declared, "I will not lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor". The words seem plain and positive enough, but one of the Commissioners replied, "Neither the words of this oath, nor the laws of Scotland, lay any such obligation on your Majesty". "In that sense, then, I swear", said the King; "and I desire you all, my lords and gentlemen, to witness that I do so". He had cleared his conscience. William and Mary were now King and Queen of Scotland.

While affairs were moving towards a settlement on these lines to the contentment of the majority of the people, two widely differing parties stood out in open opposition.

One was the remnant of the Covenanters, still a fairly large and determined body. They had benefited from the Revolution as no others had done, but it had not effected all they considered it ought to have done. They were greatly disappointed with the Convention. It had indeed condemned Prelacy, but, in their estimation, in far too feeble terms. It had not been denounced as an abomination in the sight of God. Presbytery had not been proclaimed as divine, and nothing positive had as yet been done to



establish it as the religion of the country. Worst of all, nothing had been done to secure the renewal of the Covenant, and make it binding on the nation: it had not even been named. At the utmost they regarded William very coldly. He suffered a Prelatic government in England, and he had neither taken the Covenant himself, nor would compel any one to do so. Many of them would neither pray for him, nor do anything to acknowledge his authority. An uncovenanted King and an uncovenanted nation could neither look for the divine blessing, nor expect their loyalty.

While great satisfaction was felt by the Covenanters at the deliverance from persecution which the coming of William had effected for them, there was considerable difference of opinion amongst them as to what support they ought to give to the new government. In view of the approaching Convention in Edinburgh on 14th March, it was thought proper that a General Meeting of the Societies should be held at Lesmahagow on 2nd March. It was largely attended, and, after fasting and prayer, confession and preaching, the Covenants were solemnly renewed on Sunday, 3rd March.<sup>(1)</sup> Later it was decided that a petition be presented to the Estates, "that they might make choice of the Prince of Orange to be King, and devolve the regal authority upon him, with, and upon such conditions and provisions as religion and liberty might be secured."<sup>(2)</sup> This paper was submitted privately to the Estates, but the reference to "the Covenants and its strictness" was not favourably received, and it was not given in.<sup>(3)</sup> Events would soon compel them to take a side.

The other party consisted of those who came to be known as Jacobites. This comprised a number of the

(1) "Faithful Contendings Displayed", 380-2.

(2) Ibid 389. (3) Ibid 390.

nobles and gentry, several of the Highland clans, the bishops, many of the Episcopal clergy, and many laymen, especially in the northern shires. After his escape from Edinburgh Dundee had been busily at work, chiefly among the Highland clans, in raising an army in support of King James, and once more the country was to be cursed with civil war.

It was now necessary for the Covenanters to decide what position they would take up. On 29th April at a General Meeting, held at the Kirk of Douglas, the question was enquired of them: "whether in this juncture, when there were great fears of an invasion from Ireland, and of intestine wars in the land, it were a necessary duty to raise a regiment of our friends, for defence of religion, the country, and ourselves." (1) Some held that for them to have a regiment in pay in an army in which were many malignants, men of blood, and murderers of their brethren, and regarding whose chief (Mackay), "whom they knew not, nor what he was for, or against," was sinful. Others held that in such times of danger such associations were necessary. There was a "jangling" debate, but the vote went against the latter view. (2) Those holding the former opinion, however, were not convinced that they would be in the path of duty if they refused to fight. Other meetings were held, and finally conditions were reached, according to which they might take arms without sin. These were extraordinary, (3) and though they would no doubt have been useful in the maintenance of staunch Covenanters and moral men, Cleland, their prospective commander, was certainly right in holding that such contracts between men and their officers, were absolutely inconsistent with military discipline. Fresh disputes were the natural

(1) "Faithful Contendings Displayed", 393.

(2) Ibid 394. (3) Ibid 398 etc.

oppose

result, and at length Cleland had to confess his failure to raise a regiment of Covenanters. But at the middle of May, when the men had actually gathered in companies, a more successful attempt was made. A short declaration that they engaged in the service to oppose Popery, Prelacy, and arbitrary power, and to recover and establish the work of reformation, was prepared, and Cleland rode from company to company, and read this paper, and one company after another agreed to enlist on these conditions. (1)

The Government had not been idle, and an army under General Mackay was sent north to attack the Jacobites. Those forces met in the Pass of Killiecrankie on the 27th of July, and the lowland troops were utterly defeated by the Highlanders, though they were less numerous. The news of this victory quickly spread, and the utmost consternation was caused in the lowlands and in England. Wild rumours of the highland advance were current, but they quickly ceased. The victory was rather a calamity than a triumph for the Jacobites. Dundee, their brave and trusted leader, had fallen in the battle, and it was generally recognized that this loss was irreparable, for no other could maintain harmony amongst the jealous clans. This was soon seen. Cameron of Lochiel and several other chiefs and clansmen retired in dudgeon to their homes.

Notwithstanding those defections, others, stirred to hopes of plunder by the news of Killiecrankie, flocked to the royal standard, and soon Cannon, who succeeded to the supreme command, had under his precarious control a larger army than Dundee had led to the field. Mackay, at Perth, soon reorganized his beaten army, and was able to meet and cut in pieces a band of Robertsons, who had been sent to occupy the city. (1) "Faithful Contendings Displayed",

At this point the Government, against the remonstrances of Mackay, sent the recently raised Cameronian regiment to garrison Dunkeld, a foolish step, considering it was an open town, far from any other government post, in a hostile territory, and dangerously near to the Highland army. As was to be expected, the Cameronians were speedily attacked by the enemy. At first, believing themselves to have been treacherously exposed by a perfidious Government, they were inclined to revolt, but reassured by Cleland, their Colonel, taking refuge in the Cathedral church and behind the garden wall of a house belonging to the Marquis of Athole, they made a heroic defence. The clansmen were about four to one, and attacked fiercely, but after several hours of hard fighting, during which they suffered severely, they began to give way, and in spite of all the efforts of their leaders, were soon in open retreat to the hills. The Cameronians also had their losses, including the accomplished and gallant Cleland and Henderson, his successor. But they had not only made a triumphant defence, they had finished the war. (1) The Jacobite army melted away, and in four weeks from Killiecrankie it had ceased to exist. But the Cameronians and their successors - known as the 26th regiment - remained to fight with great honour for King and country in many parts of the world. Another effort made in the Highlands on behalf of James was easily suppressed, and it was only in Ireland that William had to wage his last, and successful, struggle for the crown.

The Convention adjourned till the 5th of June. By its first<sup>(2)</sup> Act it proclaimed itself a lawful Parliament, and by its second<sup>(3)</sup> ratified the appointment of William

(1) Macaulay, History, III, 341.

(2) Act. Parl. Scot. IX, 9. (3) Ibid, p. 99.

and Mary as King and Queen. An opposition to the Government had been organized, and under the name of The Club, gave great annoyance to those in authority. The Convention, in its Claim of Right, had declared Prelacy to be an insupportable grievance, and that it ought to be abolished, but nothing further had yet been done. The Government now wished to effect a settlement of the ecclesiastical affairs of the country, as they had been petitioned to do. The Club, however, was determined that till their grievances were redressed, this should not be done, and on a vote being taken, this was carried. A fortnight later the Government again proposed to settle the affairs of the Church, but the matter was again delayed. Many different opinions were held among the members of the Estates, and many difficulties were raised. At length in the middle of July an Act was passed abolishing Episcopacy, and this was touched by the sceptre and became law. (1) Another Act was carried, declaring that their Majesties, with the assent of Parliament, should establish the government of the Church agreeable to the inclinations of the people, but this was not touched by the sceptre, and remained a dead letter.

Various other measures were proposed, but the differences of opinion which prevailed, and the political troubles of the time, still made for delay, and not till the meeting of Parliament in April 1690 was anything definite accomplished, but by that Parliament Acts were passed which established the Church of Scotland.

The first Act was to annul the Act of 1669 asserting the King's supremacy over all persons and in all causes. (2) The second was to restore to their

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. IX, 104.  
(2) do. IX, 111.

(1) Act. Parl. Scot. IX, 104.  
(2) do. IX, 111.

livings all Presbyterian ministers who had been ejected for non-conformity. Other important legislation was also effected. The Lords of the Articles were abolished. The Westminster Confession of Faith was ratified as the Creed of the Church. (3) The Confession was read in full amidst the yawns of wearied members, but when it was proposed that the Directory of Public Worship and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms should also be read, there were cries of "No reading!" with the result that despite the wishes of many Presbyterians, they did not become the law of the Church, and now only hold their place by the sanction of long usage. The rabbling of the curates was legalized, and the government of the Church was vested in those ministers who had been ejected under Episcopal rule, from and after 1st January 1661, some 60 in number, and those whom they should admit. A General Assembly was appointed to meet, with powers to nominate visitors to purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous, and erroneous ministers, by due course of ecclesiastical process. Against the wish of the King, patronage was abolished, and the right to nominate to vacancies given to the heritors and elders. If the congregation objected, appeal might be made to the Presbytery, who were the final judges. Compensation to patrons was allowed.

On 16th November the General Assembly met, the first for nearly forty years. There appears to have been some anxiety in Government circles as to what they would do. Lord Melville exerted himself to induce them to be brief and moderate in their proceedings. In his letter of 10th October, he wrote to Fraser of Brae: "'a short session, a handling only of matters that are generall and absolutelie necessarie, will be your safetie; if you should but enter upon possession, and adjourn, it were much to your advantage.'" (2)

(2) Leven and Melville Papers, p. 543.

(1) Act. P. Scot. IX, 111. (3) *Ibid* IX, 133.

In the same strain he wrote on the same date he also wrote to several other ministers. (1) The King also in his letter to the Assembly, urges them to moderation, and this was shown to a considerable extent by the Assembly. One of their early Acts was to receive into the ministry of the Church the only ministers of the Cameronians - three in number, Thomas Lining, Alexander Shields, and William Boyd. It was their wish to join the Revolution Church, but they must needs clear their consciences, and this was done by handing in a long paper, bewailing the defections of the land and the breaches of the Covenant. This was judiciously suppressed, and they were received on a shorter paper, in which they made their submission to the Assembly, and craved to be received as ministers of the Church. Episcopal ministers who would accept the Confession of Faith, conform to the Presbyterian discipline, and take the oath of allegiance to William, were to be admitted to the ministry of the Established Church. Undoubtedly many of the ministers of this order suffered considerable hardships during the changes of the Revolution, but little compared with the sufferings of those who remained faithful to the Covenant during the long years of cruel persecution.

It will be observed that during all the negotiations and in the final Settlement there is no mention of the Covenants: they are tacitly ignored. Never again were they to be regarded as a national institution. The original enthusiasm in favour of them had greatly died away. Their absence from the Statute Book of the country was a matter of relief to some, and one of indifference to many. But there were not a few to whom this was a source of bitter disappointment and angry sorrow.

(1) Leven and Melville Papers, pp. 542, 543, etc.

The Society People had welcomed William, but they were grievously disappointed with the ecclesiastical arrangements which were made after the Revolution. They did not join the Established Church, but remained apart. They resented the ignoring of the Covenants and the toleration which was allowed. They regarded the Covenants as binding upon all succeeding generations, and held Church and nation to be in a state of apostasy. They declined to acknowledge the political institutions of the country by taking any office or by voting for those who sought it. Theoretically at least, many went further, such as declining to take an oath of allegiance, to pay taxes, to recognize the Law Courts, or to hold any post under Government. Their three ministers having been admitted to the National Church, they were left without a minister till 1706, when the Rev. John Macmillan, of Balmaghie, joined them. In 1743 another minister came to them, and they constituted a Reformed Presbytery. Later a Presbytery was formed in America, and another in Ireland.

Those who made the Covenants bound themselves very firmly, but they could not bind those who came after them. Men could only come under the obligations of the Covenants when they were willing to do so, and there was a growing reluctance to do this. About 1863 most of the Scotch Synod came to be of opinion that there was nothing in their principles preventing them from exercising the franchise. But a small minority held out, and a disruption took place. In 1876 a union took place between the larger body and the Free Church of Scotland. A small minority still adhere to their original principles.



The Covenants have thus passed, never to be renewed, and we are led to ask: Was the long fight for Presbytery and the Covenants worth while? The Scottish people at the Revolution secured their wish, and had restored to them that Presbytery they had loved since the Evangel was first brought home to them: Did they pay too dearly for it? It is tolerably certain that if they had submitted to James and his successors, not only the dignities but more of the wealth of the old church would have remained to the new, the country would have been spared the strife and suffering and loss of nearly a hundred years, and a uniformity in religious matters with England, such as many desire, would have been secured. Would the result of all this, had it come about, have been for the spiritual welfare of the people, or would it have led to a deeper stagnation? It is perhaps not wise to speculate on what might have been, but realising that spiritual struggle is often spiritual gain, may we not say that because of the cruel battle they had to fight, and in the memory of it, the Scottish people have gained a religious power, a quickened intelligence, and a strength and dignity of character they would not otherwise have acquired?

An ACCOUNT of the DIVISIONS  
of the  
CHURCH in SCOTLAND  
BETWEEN the REPEAL of the ACT of CLASSES  
and the RESTORATION:  
Being a SUPPLEMENT to  
The HISTORICAL SETTING of the  
SCOTTISH COVENANTS  
of the Reign of  
CHARLES the FIRST.

Rev. J. W. McEwan, M.A., B.Sc.  
Ashbank,  
Strachur.

AN ACCOUNT of the DIVISIONS of the CHURCH  
in SCOTLAND between the REPEAL of the ACT  
of CLASSES and the RESTORATION.

On the advance of Cromwell after his victory at Dunbar on the third of September 1650, the perilous condition of the country was generally recognized. Many began to question the wisdom of continuing to enforce the Act of Classes (1) in view of the threatening state of affairs, but a considerable number, both of ministers and laymen, were utterly opposed to any modification of its terms. After the disaster of Dunbar an army had been gathered in the south-western counties, but which refused to act with the national army, (2) now at Stirling. This force attacked the English at Hamilton on the first of December, but was then defeated and scattered (3) This second defeat made the question of receiving into the Scottish army those who were meanwhile debarred from taking part in the defence of the country still more urgent. A victorious enemy was now master of their seas and possessed of the best parts of their country; their standing forces to resist the invasion were "few, weak, inconsiderable"; their State and Army were "full of divisions and jealousies," food was scarce; the loyalty of a number was failing, and, caring neither for King nor Covenant, they were inclined to come to terms with the enemy. (4) But this desperate condition of affairs in the country failed to secure unity in the Church.

(1) Act. Parl. Scot 1646( 8 Jany.) and 1649 (23 Jany.)

(2) Nicoll's Diary, p.36.

(3) Baillie's Letters and Journals 111, 106-7, 124-5.

Lamont's Diary p.24.

(4) Baillie, 111, 127.

The Government now took action. Deeming it necessary to have the support of the Church, a query addressed by them to the Commission of the General Assembly (1) on the 14th of December received a unanimous answer (2) to the effect that under present circumstances they could not be against the raising of all fencible persons for the defence of the country, except the opposers of the Covenant and the cause of God (3). On the 24th of May 1651 a further query as to the restoration to Parliament and to offices of trust of those hitherto debarred (4) received a favourable, though strictly conditioned reply (5). Finally, on 2nd June 1651 the Parliament rescinded the Acts of Classes. (6)

The Church was now divided into two hostile parties - those who came to be known as the Resolutioners, who approved of the passing of the Public Resolutions of 1650, and those known as the Remonstrants or Protesters, who protested against the Resolutions and remained strongly opposed to the repeal of the Act of Classes. The principal men amongst the resolutioners were David Dickson, Robert Baillie, and Robert Douglas, and amongst the Protesters, James Guthrie, Samuel Rutherford, Patrick Gillespie, John Livingstone, Robert Traill, and Lord Wariston. Besides the extreme men of both parties there was a number of moderate men, who lamented the divisions

(1) Nicoll's Diary p.38. Records of the Commn. 111 158

(2) Baillie 111, 107.

(3) Records of the Commission 111,159.

(4) Ibid 345.

(5) Ibid pp. 441-2.

(6) Act. Parl. Scot. VI 676.

Records of the Commission 111, 458 etc.

Balfour, Historical Works, IV, 301.

in the Church, and were ever ready to make efforts for the restoration of harmony. The most prominent and active of these was Robert Blair, of St Andrews.

Though the passing of the Public Resolutions was the occasion of this serious division in the Church, it was not the actual beginning of the strife. The General Assembly of 1638 was a packed one and was practically unanimous, and this unanimity continued for about a decade. Divisions thereafter began to show themselves. The Church was strongly opposed to the "Engagement" of 1648, but the welcome extended to Cromwell on his arrival in Scotland after his defeat of Hamilton at Preston, revealed a division. To this friendly association with the Sectaries some were inclined to attribute their present differences. (1) Whether this opinion be warranted or not, it is quite certain that a number of ministers were suspicious of Charles II from the very first, and seeds of division were thus sown. His reluctance to sign the Covenants and his association with Malignants hindered their allegiance and provoked them to acts which brought them into opposition to those of their brethren who were devoted to the King. (2) A further revelation of an existing, as well as the cause of a greater division, was the issue of the "Humble Remonstrance of the Gentlemen, Commanders, and Ministers attending the Forces in the West", on 17th October 1650 (3). This document was addressed to the Committee of Estates, and the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church was invited to concur

(1) Row's Blair, p. 303.

(2) e.g. Ibid p.245. (3) Balfour IV, p.141. et seq. Records of the Commission III, 95.

'A True Representation,' in Consultations I, 294 etc.

in it. The King and the Committee of Estates found that "the said paper, as it relates to the Parliament and civile judicatories, to be scandalous and injurious to his Majesties persone, and prejudiciall to his authoritie", and as it relates to religion and Church judicatories, referred it to the Commission of the Assembly. (1) The Commission was also dissatisfied, and thought it "apt to breid divisions in this Kirk and Kingdome, as we doe already finde in part by experience." (2) This was unfortunately true. The upholders of the Remonstrance proved themselves the strongest Protesters of a couple of months later. (3) Thus even before the Act of Classes was actually repealed, even before the passing of the Public Resolutions, the two parties <sup>were</sup> in conflict, each endeavouring to advance its own interests and hinder those of the other, and this state of matters continued right down to the Restoration.

This antagonism was manifested in various ways. An incident of this period illustrates the state of feeling which prevailed. On the 25th of May 1651, in view of the prospective march of the Scottish army, the Commission of the Assembly appointed a solemn Fast and Humiliation to be kept throughout the Kingdom on the third Thursday of June and the Sabbath following. (4) The army were to observe this Fast on convenient days before they marched. Eight reasons were given at length for the keeping of this fast. The sins of the nation are confessed

(1) Records of the Commission 111, 124. Balfour IV, 174

(2) Ibid p. 131.

(3) Animadversions of Robert Blair. Balfour IV, 311.

(4) Records of the Commission, 111, 447.

and lamented. Prayer was to be made for those who, on their repentance, had been received into the army; that the King might be restored to his just rights, and made an instrument for promoting the work of reformation in England and Ireland; that God would stir up the spirits of the godly in the three kingdoms to wrestle with God for a deliverance from their "common and treacherous enemy"; that God would unite the hearts of all who were at present in hazard, and remove all jealousies and heart-burnings from among them; that those who had submitted to discipline would manifest the reality of their repentance by their carriage against the enemy; that the Lord would preserve the lives of his people from sword and famine; that He would grant that the enemy would fall and fly before their army, and that He would preserve the remnant of this oppressed Kirk and Kingdom "from unjust violence of the cursed and cruel adversary." (1)

Such sentiments, however, did not appeal to some of the Protesters, who had suspicions of the use to which the army might be put, and they not only refused to join in the Fast, but in their sermons and in other ways expressed their dissatisfaction with the Public Resolutions, seeking to dissuade their hearers from taking part in the public service, which in the present circumstances they considered a sinful act. (2) So serious did the Committee of Estates regard this conduct, and so hurtful to the public weal, and so discouraging to the army, that they recommended the Commission of the Assembly to take some present and effectual course for the suppression thereof. (3)

(1) Records of the Commission 111,447-449.

(2) Ibid page 489. (3) Ibid.

The General Assembly was appointed to meet at St Andrews on the 16th of July 1651, and for this both parties made careful preparation. Wariston was the great legal authority of the Protesters, and he drew up sufficient papers to occupy much of the time of the Assembly if they were read. But the Estates made a move which rendered his attendance impossible. By proclamation the "keepers of the public registers and seills" were summoned to come to Stirling, and to reside there during the meeting of the Estates, an order which effectually prevented Wariston from being present at the Assembly, though he sent on the papers.

The Resolutioners on their part were not idle. At the meeting of the Commission held on the 24th of May, letters were ordered to be sent to the Presbyteries, requesting them: 1) to try who of their number were disobeyers or opposers of the Public Resolutions; 2) to confer with them, and if, after a conference, they still continued so to act, to summon them to the General Assembly to answer for the same. (2) Together with this letter was sent a copy of an Act passed by the Commission, citing dissatisfied persons to appear before the Assembly. (3)

This might be regarded as a declaration of war against the Protesters, and they accepted it as such, considering that the letter and the enclosed Act had for its object the prevention of their election as members of the Assembly by Presbyteries. And it is certain that this action of the Commission had such an effect upon a number of Presbyteries that various Protesters who were ordinarily elected as commissioners, were not appointed on this occasion. (4)

(1) Wariston's Diary 11, 320. (2) Rec. Commn. 111, 445

(3) Record of Commn. 111, 445. Row's Blair p. 273.

(4) "Nullity of the Pretended Assembly, page 289 etc.



Nevertheless Protesters were elected in those cases in which the whole Presbytery was composed of those holding their views. But when a Presbytery was divided, there was either two elections, or else dissent from and protestations against the election of such as were dissatisfied with the Public Resolutions, or else against both.

The Assembly duly met. Its Acts were never printed, and were never recognized except by a section of the Church. No official record of its proceedings is known to exist, but from contemporary notes it is possible to obtain a certain understanding of its doings, and to see how <sup>divided</sup> was the Church at this time. Lord Balcarres attended as the Royal Commissioner. The differences between the parties was displayed even in their opening devotions. Andrew Cant, who preached in the morning began with a declaration that he would not speak of the Public Resolutions since they were to be examined by the Assembly, but he condemned them nevertheless, and also the writing of the letter to the Presbyteries, and the sending of the Act. In the afternoon, Robert Douglas, at the close of his sermon, contradicted what had been said in the morning. (1)

After the commissions had been handed in, Professor John Menzies, of Aberdeen, a Protester, before the constitution of the Assembly and the election of a Moderator, asked that the members of the Commission of the Former Assembly, being under a scandal for carrying on a course of defection contrary to the Covenant, might not be permitted to sit as members of the Assembly.. Douglas replied that their conduct would be shown to be in nowise scandalous. The meeting was now in an uproar, but Menzies

(1) Row's Blair page 274.

insisted on his motion, and was supported by James Cuthrie, Patrick Gillespie, John Hamilton, and other Protesters. Robert Blair made an effort at peace, but with little effect. James Wood, David Dickson, Robert Baillie, the Royal Commissioner, and others urged that nothing could be done until the Assembly was constituted. Samuel Rutherford then desired to give in a paper against the constitution of the Assembly, but after a long debate it was laid aside. Wariston also sent a Protestation, but it was never read. The meeting being now angry and excited, it was suggested that a conference be held to "take away the former heat and division", (1) but it was decided that till the Assembly was formally constituted this could not be done. They then proceeded to the election of a Moderator, and Robert Douglas was chosen by a majority of votes.

On the following day a letter from the King was read, excusing his absence, entreating them to study unity, and to censure those who were opposed to the Public Resolutions. In support of this, the Royal Commissioner made a speech on the same lines. At the same session a committee was appointed to examine the proceedings of the Commission, which, on the 24th of July were highly commended by the Assembly. The only exception was that as some had "already made ill use of the same", they found it necessary to declare that the Act and Declaration of the West Kirk of 13th August 1650 was not to be interpreted as having any other meaning than that the King's interest is not to be owned but in subordination to God"; the Kirk being ever willing to own his Majesty's interest in that subordination, according to the Covenants. (2)

(1) Gordon's Account. (2) Rec. of Commn. 495-6.

Proposals for a conference between the opposing parties were renewed, and after debate it "was granted, though not judicially, only it was permitted to be." (1) That afternoon the meeting was held, but though it lasted for a long time, it issued in nothing, the Protesters still adhering to the Remonstrance, and justifying their opposition to the Public Resolutions. (2)

The Protesters, perceiving how matters were going, met on Friday 18th July, to consider a Protest against the Assembly. Some were unwilling to go so far as to protest against the supreme court of the Church, and would have been satisfied to enter a Protestation against the ratification of the Public Resolutions. It was ultimately decided that not till all hope of coming to terms were gone, would the Protestation be lodged.

On the night of Sunday, 20th July, news came to St Andrews of the defeat of the Scottish forces in Fife, and the Assembly convened at midnight, and decided to adjourn their meeting to Dundee on Tuesday, the 22nd. (3) ~~At the beginning of the proceedings of this midnight meeting Rutherford handed in, on behalf of all who would adhere to it, a Protestation against the Assembly and a Declinature from it, but it was not then read.~~ (4)

~~The adjourned meeting at Dundee on the afternoon of the 22nd was poorly attended. The Protestation was read at the opening of the session, but none of the subscribers was present to answer to his name.~~

(1) Row's Blair, p. 276.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) Gordon's Account in Peterkin's Records.

(4) Row's Blair, 277.

Lamont's Diary, p. 33.

This paper was directed against the proceedings of the Commission . and declares the Assembly to be an unlawful Assembly on certain specific grounds:

- 1) That because of the writing of their letter and the sending of their Act by the Commission to the various Presbyteries, it was a prelimited Assembly;
- 2) Because of the King's letter against the opposers of the Public Resolutions;
- 3) Because of the speech delivered to the Assembly by the King's Commissioner to the same effect; and
- 4) Because the members of the Commission of the 1650 Assembly were members of the present Assembly, which they ought not to be, in respect of their having led to a course of defection.

After the reading of this Protestation the Royal Commissioner made a speech to the effect that the document was very derogatory to the freedom, liberty and honour of the Assembly, and if necessary the King's authority would be interposed against the signatories, for the vindication of the Assembly's honour. But this suggestion was very displeasing to the Assembly, and the Moderator, "by way of nipp to the Commissioner," besought him to stop, (1) for they should deal with them ecclesiastically, according to the freedom of the Assembly.

On 23rd July the Protestation was publicly read, and the grounds of an answer drawn up by the Committee were likewise publicly read; and when this had been done Douglas declared that the Protestation was the highest breach of all the articles of the Covenant since the work of reformation began. In the course of the debate which followed it was pointed out that by an Act of the 1638 Assembly declinators of the Assembly should be summarily excommunicated. (2) The

(1) Gordon's Account. (2) G.A., Glasgow, 20 Dec. 1638  
Session 26. Also Sess.24.

Moderator and others, admitting the existence of the Act, held that they might modify and mollify, and if needs be, repeal it. (1) The Commissioner, again revealing his antagonism to the Protesters, agreed that they might repeal the Act, but seeing that it was now in force, it could not be passed by. This provoked the Moderator to give him another "nipp", by answering that they knew what to do with their own Acts. (2) The Committee recommended that three should be cited - James Guthrie, of Stirling, Patrick Gillespie, of Glasgow, and James Simson, of Airth - but on a vote being taken, it was carried that James Naismith and John Menzies be also summoned. Some of the more moderate members of the Court, considering that the cited ministers had acted from conscientious motives, thought they should be more amicably dealt with; and seven of the Assembly declared that they were not clear on the citation of any of them.

None of the ministers whom the Assembly had ordered to be cited, appeared when his name was called, and Guthrie, Gillespie, and Simson were deposed. (3) Naismith, who had written that owing to the action of the enemy he was unable to appear, was suspended; and Menzies, who had also sent an excuse for his non-attendance, was referred to the Committee, probably because "there were some hopes of gaining of him". (4)

On the rumoured approach of the enemy the members of the Assembly dispersed, to secure their own safety as best they could, but several, including Douglas, the Moderator, fell into the hands of the English at Alyth on 31st August, and were taken as prisoners to London.

(1) Gordon's Account. (2) Ibid. (3) Lamont's Diary 33. Blair, Nicoll's Diary 54-55. (4) Row's Blair 278.

Before rising the Assembly passed Acts against those who do not acknowledge the present Assembly, and do not acquiesce in the Acts thereof, and against expectants who oppose the Public Resolutions. It also issued "A Warning and Declaration", on 30th July, which is referred to by James Guthrie as "a little book by itself, fraughted all alongst with hard representations." (1) Wariston, in his diary for 14th August 1651 says it begins "very fairly against Malignancy and Malignants, and for piety and pious men; and then comes on most deeply for malice and bitterness to alledge and proove that al this busines was a designe for strenthening the enemy and ruyning the land, and impeding al defence; and intelairds cunningly treuths with falsehoods, so as it may appeare to a sober conscientious spirit not to a spiritu Dei, sed hominis, at best, to say no worse." (2)

The meeting of the Assembly had done nothing to help to a reconciliation of the opposing parties, but rather the reverse. Old antagonisms were revived with fresh bitterness, and new ones were created. Neither party was in anywise disposed to give way, and both took steps to vindicate their respective positions.

The Scottish army having now marched south, the Commission of the Assembly, meeting at Forfar on the 9th of August, thought fit to issue "A Short Warning and Exhortation to the right honourable the officers of the Armie and all under their command, and to all the noblemen, gentlemen, and others in the Kingdome of Scotland," (3) and to order it to be read publicly in every congregation on the first Lord's Day after it came into the minister's hands. (3)

(1) Waters of Sihor, Records of the Kirk, 638.

(2) Wariston's Diary 11, 111. (3) Rec. Comm. 111 505.

It is brief as such papers then went, but it is well written, in strong clear terms. It contains a fitting reference to the state of the country and its prospects, and exhorts the hearers to fervent and frequent prayer for the King and the Army - "the forces that fight for the Cause of God at home and abroad.." All are warned to obey the Committee of Estates cheerfully and unanimously. Then follow some passages which evidently refer to the Protesters.

"Let not our souls be vexed with hearing of your unnaturall withdrawing of your selves, your counsell and helping hand, unto the just and necessar Resolutions for the public good!"(1)

" We must say that whosoever shall not lay aside their privat interest, or shall refuse to help the Lord against the mightie, or shall withdraw their counsells from public judicatories, or studie to make parties in a tyme requyring so much vntie, shall not avoyd the heavie curse of God, and God will avenge upon him the marvell of a broken Covenant"(2)

Apprehensive that the Protesters might win the support of the English favourers of the Covenant, the Commission three days later prepared and issued from the same place "A Short Information and Brotherly Exhortation to our brethren in England." The reference in this paper is rather to the Sectaries than to the Protesters, though the latter are not spared. They enter on a vehement defence of their action in joining with those who had formerly been debarred from the service of the country by the Act of Classes. They contend that the Public Resolutions are so clearly warranted by the law of God, the law of

(1) Records of the Commission 111,506.

(2) Ibid, (111,506)

nature and of nations, the Solemn League and Covenant, and by the universal practice of the people of God in all ages, "that it were a needlesse labour to endeavour the vindication thereof." Yet there were among themselves "a few unsatisfied", who now, to the great advantage of the common enemy, and the weakening of the hands of those who were at the work, oppose those "just and necessary Resolutions, and actively obstruct the vse of the lawful and only likely meanes left of of opposition to the prevailing enemy". (1) . From the activities of those men at home the writers of the letter are induced to believe that they have not been idle towards their English brethren, and have by the sending of emissaries and papers abused them with misreports and prejudiced them against the supporters of the Resolutions. But they are sufficiently assured of the faithfulness of the judicatories of the Kirk in guarding against Malignants and Sectaries, as not to believe evil of their brethren, and entreat them not to be deceived by their efforts. (2)

Now follows a long gap in the Register of the Commission. This is explained, in part at least, by notes written in the Register itself. It is mentioned that some other meetings were held, but the papers and minutes were taken upon Mr. James Hamilton, when he was captured by the English at Alyth, and sent as a prisoner to London. There were also at later dates some meetings "in the farr north parts of the countrey", of ministers and others, who had sought safety from the troops of the Commonwealth, when they overran the country.. But it was most for encouragang and strengthening one another:

(1) Records of the Commission, 111, 510

(2) Ibid 508 - 513.



and the little thing that was done could hardly be preserved, being only minuted in loose papers." (1)

The Resolutioners were in a very decided majority over the whole Church, but in some Presbyteries and Synods the Protesters were the more numerous, and often the more active. Baillie indeed was at one time afraid that they were endeavouring to hinder the defence of the country, and that they would by force of arms frame both Church and Kingdom to their minds. (2) Happily they did not attempt anything of this sort; but they certainly did much to keep the Church disunited.

Though the Protesters so emphatically denied the lawfulness of the General Assembly of St Andrews and Dundee, they did not go the length of calling one of their own. They, however, began to summon at intervals what they termed "extra-judicial meetings" of those who protested against the lawfulness of the late Assembly, and of those who were still unsatisfied with the Public Resolutions. (3) Such a meeting was held in Glasgow at the end of September 1651. Their proceedings "were kept quiet" (4) and their meeting-place was transferred to Edinburgh, where they assembled at the beginning of October. (5) Hither they summoned from all parts of the country brethren of their own opinion (6) to find out the sins of the time, and 66 in all assembled. (7) Some days at the outset were passed in fasting,

(1) Records of the Commission p. 513.

(2) Baillie III, 133.

(3) "A True Representation" Consultations I, 323.

(4) Row's Blair, 285.

(5) Letter, J. Livingstone to Blair, Sel. Biog. 1, 26

(6) Lamont's Diary p. 35, *Scott's Commonwealth* 327.

(7) Mercurius Scotticus, quoted by Balfour, IV, 317.

prayer, and the confession of their sins one to another - not their public sins only, but some of them, "more zealous than prudent", went the length of confessing also some very private sins. (1) Thereafter they proceeded to discuss a number of public questions. The decisions arrived at on such matters are illuminating as to the views held by many Protesters of the time. The first question considered was:- "Whether it was lawful to close a treaty with the King at Breda, to put him in the exercise of his authority, it being known that he had given commissions to Montrose and others." As we might expect, the answer was in the negative. As Row pertinently remarks "Some in their confessions granted that they had meddled with matters too high for them, and yet the first thing they fell on was one of the highest that ever they meddled with." (2) The second point was: "Whether the course carried on by the Committee of Estates and Commission of the Kirk, did not involve the bringing in of the malignant party contrary to the Word of God, our Covenants, etc." The answer to this was in the affirmative. The fourth was: "Whether or not there was sufficient cause to protest against the Assembly at St Andrews." The answer here also was in the affirmative. The last point considered was one of great importance: "Whether or not, matters thus standing, it were not expedient that those of the old Commission i. e. of the General Assembly of 1650 that were free of the courses carried on, should sit down in the Commission, and take on them the authority thereof, ruling the affairs of the Kirk of Scotland." (3)

The affirmative answer led the meeting beyond a mere expression of opinion into the taking of a

(1) (2) (3) Row's Blair p. 286.

course of action, which gave great offence to many moderate men, and did very much to widen the schism in the Church. The Protesters' Commission was constituted, and continued to act as such wherever its authority could be enforced. (1)

To the action of this meeting the Presbytery of St Andrews was the first to give what may be regarded as the Resolutioners' reply. They emitted a short paper, declaring that the Assembly at St Andrews and Dundee was a lawfully constituted Assembly; that no ecclesiastical meeting, of whatsoever name or nature in this land, could assume authority over the Assembly or the Commission but another free and lawfully convened General Assembly; that any taking any authority upon them over the Assembly or Commission, or to censure any man, their actions shall be reckoned as the deeds of private men, having no lawful authority from God or man; that though they heartily approve of the conference of gracious brethren, who follow peace, and desire that way of repairing the woeful breach, they will never concur with any usurped authority. (2)

Copies of this Declaration were sent to various Presbyteries throughout the kingdom, and were homologated by a number of them. Some of the Synods, holding their autumnal meetings about this time, took up the matter very favourably. The Synod of Lothian went further than mere approval. They appointed several of their number to attend the meeting of the Protesters' Commission, which was to be held on the second Tuesday of November, and in the Synod's name to declare their dislike of this

(1) True Representation - Consultations, page 324.

(2) Row's Blair, page 287.

Commission and of their taking authority upon them; and to entreat them as they loved the established government and peace of the Church, not to act any further in that capacity. But all Synods were not of this mind. In several the Protesters were powerful. In that of Glasgow, by a majority of votes, approval of the Protestation was carried. But it was noted that this was done by the votes of the ruling elders, the majority of the ministers present voting in the minority. (1)

In the month of November an extraordinary paper was issued by a meeting of Protesters at Kilmarnock. It is entitled "A Discovery after some search of the Sinnes of Ministers". James Guthrie and Patrick Gillespie are said to have been the chief movers at the meeting, but it is very questionable if Guthrie had any hand in the writing of the paper. It consists of twelve heads, (2) and is practically a repudiation of the Stuarts, and of the perpetual obligation of the Covenant, and its enforcement upon all. There is an implied apology for the Sectaries running through much of the Document. It condemns the national prejudices and the bitter invectives in press and pulpit against the people of God in England who differ from them. The corruption in the membership of the Church, the meddling of ministers in civil affairs and their tyranny over the people, the refusal of treaties with the English whereby much blood was shed, are also among the things condemned. The tenth article is most remarkable, coming as it does from a Presbyterian assembly. The offence here indicated is "The pitching vpon our forme of

(1) Row's Blair pages 287-8.

(2) A brief outline is given in Nicoll's Diary p.67, and more fully in Balfour IV, 330 ) 333.

presbyteriall government as the vtermost attainable perfectione of reformatione".(1) This shows whither some at least of the Protesters were tending.

The crushing defeat of the army of Charles at Worcester and the operations of Monk in Scotland had placed the country under the complete domination of England, and its government had resolved upon the the incorporation of both countries in one Commonwealth. At the beginning of 1652 commissioners were sent to Dalkeith to arrange this union.. The national feeling as a whole was sullenly hostile, and many of the clergy were actively hostile. There were, however, exceptions. They of Kilmarnock were not the only favourers of an English alliance. There were some who displayed a tendency to quit both monarchical government in the State and presbyterial government in the Church, showing their willingness to comply with the English. Many of both parties in the Church regarded this as a fearful breach of the Covenant.

At the end of December "they that took upon them the power of the Commission of the Kirk" held a largely attended meeting in Edinburgh with a view to retard and if possible to crush the efforts of such.(2) At the meeting, after considerable debate as to its terms, a letter was drawn up for presentation to Cromwell, explaining the position of the Protesters and pleading that he would seriously endeavour that their religion and liberty might be preserved to them entire.(3) James Guthrie was the author of the letter, and he, Wariston, Chiesley and Brodie took it to General Lambert at Dalkeith. They were but coldly

(1) Balfour IV, 333.

(2) Row's Blair 289-90.

(3) Register of Consultations 3, 1-12.

received. (1) and an application for a pass for Andrew Kerr to take it to Cromwell was refused. (2) The meeting had done little to secure its end, for towards the close of January "those of the Sectrian temper" handed in to the English a Declaration and Overtures. What they specially requested were the abolishing of presbyterial and monarchical government, the settling of toleration, the levelling of noblemen, and the embodying of Scotland into one Commonwealth with England. (3) The English promised an answer at their convenience, and straightway had the paper printed.

The Resolutioners were also aroused by the present condition of affairs, and they arranged for a meeting to be held on 12th February, that they might testify against the action of those who urged the incorporation of the two countries in one Commonwealth, and at the same time endeavour to effect a cessation of the divisions and controversies which existed in the Church itself. The meeting was duly held, and it agreed to issue a Warning and Testimony against the defections and dangers of the time. But before publishing it, and, to use Faillie's words, "to make it more effectual", we thought fitt to invite our dissenting brethren to joyne with us in it, the duty being uncontroverted, and confessed to be necessar. If we joyned in this, it was a step to further union, and if this was refused, we had little hope to joyne in haste in any thing else." (4)

A number of the Protesters had also assembled in

(1) Cromwellian Union p.16. (2) Ibid p.8.

(3) Row's Blair, p.291.

(4) Faillie's Letters and Journals 111,173.

Edinburgh, and with some difficulty the Resolutioners obtained a meeting with Wariston, Patrick Gillespie, and James Guthrie. The result was not satisfactory. After a long debate, they were informed that the Protesters' meeting was dissolved, the brethren gone home, and that those present could say nothing. As a matter of fact, none of their leading men had gone home except John Livingstone. Union for the present was hopeless. "This dealing did grieve us all, and made us see more of the progress and incurableness of the schisme." (1)

In April James Durham, eager for peace, made overtures to this end to the Synod of Glasgow. With them Blair of St Andrews fully sympathized. Baillie, however, disapproved of them, being unwilling to make any concessions to the Protesters. The Overtures were most reasonable, but unfortunately they were not carried into effect. (2)

On the twelfth of May another meeting of ministers was held in Edinburgh in hope of composing the differences in the Church. After a considerable exchange of views, the Resolutioners proposed that, as appointed by the General Assembly of 1651, an Assembly should be held in July, as, by the Divine blessing, such a gathering might be of great use in removing causes of strife and in healing divisions. The Protesters present, however, refused to agree to the holding of an Assembly on the authority <sup>of that</sup> of the previous year, against the lawfulness of which they had protested. (3)

(1) Baillie's Letters and Journals 111, 173.

(2) Ibid. <sup>III, 177</sup> cf. also page 183.

(3) Row's Blair p. 295.

No agreement being obtainable, the Commission of the former Assembly met, and decided to ask the Presbyteries to appoint commissioners to a General Assembly to be held in Edinburgh on the third Wednesday of July. (1) On the other hand the Protesters summoned an extra-judicial meeting.

The Assembly met on 21st July 1652, and David Dickson preached the opening sermon in place of Robert Douglas, who was still detained a prisoner in London.

Before the Assembly was formally constituted, Wariston and some others entered, and desired that a paper should be read. Dickson held that no paper could be read before the constitution of the Assembly. It was answered that as the paper concerned the constitution of the Assembly, it would be in vain to read it after the Assembly had actually been constituted, and on that ground permission to read it was granted. (2) The paper dealt with such matters as the best way of securing the Cause and Work of God from errors, heresies, schisms and from Malignants, the characteristics by which such people may be known; the purity of church membership; the evidence to be required in the reception of penitents into the Church; and lastly it requires that "an effectual course may be taken for the securing of the Work and People of God from the harm and evil consequences which hath already, and may further ensue from the late pretended Assembly at St Andrews and Dundee, and the Acts thereof". (3) "Their main desire was", as Row indicates, "that the Assembly might be adjourned and a conference appointed." (4)

The Assembly found that it was necessary to be

(1) Records of the Commn. <sup>p. 515.</sup> (2) Row's Blair p. 296.

(3) Records of the Kirk p. 647. Nicoll's Diary 97-8.

(4) Row's Blair p. 296.



constituted before they could adjourn, but promised that they would afterwards appoint a conference, and endeavour to secure unity and peace. When this decision was intimated, Wariston exclaimed that they expected no other answer, and proceeded to read a strongly worded protest signed by 67 ministers, 85 elders and others, (1) against the constitution of the Assembly and the validity of every part of its proceedings, "wherein were many sharp teeth, and reflections upon those of another persuasion". (2)

Despite this provocation, the Assembly appointed a committee to consider the question of peace and union with their brethren. The Protesters also appointed a committee, and the members of both committees received strict instructions how they were to proceed. The Resolutioners again offered to take off the censures that had been inflicted at the last Assembly, and agreed not to inflict any that might be incurred by their protesting against the present, provided they withdrew their Protestation and Declinature by a fixed date, and that they promised neither in preaching nor in any other way to promote division. They also promised not to inflict censures on any who might have incurred them by protesting against the late Assembly. These terms were afterwards embodied in an Act. (3) The Protesters instructed their delegates to inform the others that they did not regard them as commissioners appointed by a General Assembly of the Church, but only as sent by a meeting of ministers and elders having no judicial authority;

(1) Lamont says "About 65" and "About 80" respectively. Diary p.45. (2) Row's Blair p.296.

(3) "An Act and Overture of the General Assembly for the Peace and Union of the Kirk." 2 August 1652. Records of the Kirk, p. 649.

that they were not to consider the question of censures, which was neither the chief nor only ground of their grievance, but such great matters as the causes of God's wrath, and the proper remedies of past and the prevention of future defections. All the matters referred to in the paper handed in at the beginning of the meeting must be discussed; the sense of the Public Resolutions; and the proceedings at the meetings at Dundee in the former and in Edinburgh in the present year. If satisfaction could not be obtained on those points, they were to protest: "That as we have sought Peace, and pursued it by all lawful and possible means, though much in vain on our part. So we are henceforth free from the guilt and blame of the sad prejudices and evil consequences whatsoever which may follow upon their present way, and their former and future actings of that nature, so contrary and destructive to Edification and Peace." (1) On such conditions it was hopeless to expect a settlement, and none was obtained.

Both parties, evidently conscious of the scandal which was now so marked, endeavoured to escape the odium by casting all the blame upon the other. Very soon after the Assembly of 1652 both the Resolutions and the Protesters published papers seeking to justify their action. The Resolutions printed "an Act and Overture of the General Assembly, for the Peace and Union of the Kirk, with a Letter to the Nobility, Gentry, and all other wise and pious Persons in every Presbyterie, to promote the same." In this they complained of the aspersions cast upon them by the Protesters, giving an account of the unsuccessful conference, and called upon all who loved the peace of this afflicted Kirk "to endeavour

(1) Records of the Kirk p.648.

to reclaim all who are upon this divided way", and get them to accept the peaceful offer of the Assembly. A little later this had some effect. In October many of the gentlemen of Ayrshire and Renfrewshire, "who were the greatest pillars of the Protesting party", left it and came over to the Resolutioners.(1) On the other hand, the Protesters published as soon as they could "The Representation, Propositions, and Protestation of divers Ministers, Elders and Professors . . . . To the Ministers and Elders met at Edinburgh July 21 1652." This was shortly followed by "Reasons why the Ministers, Elders and Professors, who protested against the pretended Assemblies at St Andrews, Dundee and Edinburgh, cannot agree to the Overtures made unto them at the Conference upon the 28 and 29 of July 1652." With this was given the instructions to their delegates at the Conference, and a copy of their letter to David Dickson. These papers of the Protesters were answered by "The Protestation Given in by the Dissenting Brethren, To the General Assembly July 21 1652. Reviewed and Refuted. . . . Done by a Member of the General Assembly." The publication of such papers only widened and embittered the breach.

The increasing divisions in the Church were a great grief to many of the more moderate men amongst the Resolutioners. Row expresses this strongly: "The differences among ministers still increasing was the very worm-wood and gall wrung into our cup, and the heart-break of all honest and moderate men"(2) Though maintaining the authority of the two Assemblies, they were displeased with the censuring of Protesters, and the hindering of young men who adhered to the Protestation and Remonstrance from entering the ministry,

(1) Diurnal of Occurrences pp. 86 - 87.

(2) Row's Blair p. 301.

while they also resented the high-handed and insolent action of the Protesters in refusing to acknowledge the Assemblies, the printing of their papers, and the holding of their extra-judicial meetings. Robert Blair and several other like-minded ministers held a number of meetings to endeavour to find some remedy for this evil state of affairs. Finally, they arranged for a meeting at Edinburgh in November, when the Commission would meet and the Protesters hold an extra-judicial meeting. They had several conferences with Wariston and other leading Protesters, but nothing was effected. All that the Protesters would concede was the delay of the printing and publishing of their papers till the mediating ministers had an opportunity of meeting the Commission, which was to assemble shortly: (1)

On the 11th November the Protesters drew up a paper, which was signed by Samuel Rutherford in the name of ministers, elders and professors, and which was presented to the Commission on the 24th of the same month. In it they express their desire for a treaty of peace, and state their conditions. One of these was that the Commission should not act as an authorized Commission of the Assembly. The tone of the document is hardly conciliatory, and it concludes with a warning that if their proposals are not attended to they will be constrained to vindicate themselves and others from such usurpation and persecution by the use of all lawful and possible means for their own defence and the preservation of the truth and the liberties of the Kirk. (2) The reply of the Resolutioners, dated 27th November is couched in rather milder terms. They maintain that they are the true Commission, but promise to send letters to the Synods and Presbyteries

(1) Row's Blair pp. 301-3.

(2) Records of the Commission 111, 531-4.

asking that they should not enforce any censures already incurred in virtue of any Acts of the last two Assemblies; if possible not to enforce the Acts anent the admission of elders and the trials of expectants; and exhort them by conference with their brethren to advance the cause of Peace. And it agrees in the advisability of holding a conference before they leave Edinburgh. (1) The meeting of the Protesters being already dissolved, the Commission nominated a committee to meet at St Andrews on the first Wednesday of January to discuss the contents of the reply with such of their brethren as should come to them for the purpose; and so the matter ended for the time. (2) It was revived, though not satisfactorily, at the next quarterly meeting of the Commission, held on 24th February 1653. A letter from Wariston and Patrick Gillespie, received after the close of the last meeting of the Commission, was then read. It complained of the delay of the Commission in sending a reply to the Protesters' letter of November 11, thus preventing them from sending a reply; and the writers add that they were not instructed to call any meeting for conference in case of an unsatisfactory answer to their paper, and claim that their party were free of any concessions conditionally offered. (3)

James Wood, of St Andrews, had written a paper entitled "A Vindication of the Freedom and Lawfulness of the late General Assembly begun at St Andrews and continued at Dundee, etc." The Protesters' reply was already in print, and now that the parties were at open war, it appeared in February 1653. It is styled "The Nullity of the Pretended-Assembly at Saint Andrews & Dundee, etc." It is written in an exceedingly

(1) Records of the Commission 111, 531 - 5.

(2) Ibid p. 535.

(3) Ibid p. 539.

bitter spirit, but contains numerous descriptions of the happenings of the time. The larger part of the book is occupied with a reprint of the "Vindication", which is criticised paragraph by paragraph. The publication of this work added greatly to the ill-feeling which already prevailed. It was a great disappointment to the mediating ministers like Blair who had been working for reconciliation. It was a source of great annoyance to the Commission, and on 25th February 1653, they addressed a letter to the Presbyteries, in which they lament the sins of the nation, mourn the studied overturning of the authority of the late General Assemblies and the subordination of Church judicatories to the civil power, and exhort their brethren to bear faithful testimony against the encroachments on the authority of the Church. They next refer to the book itself. In this they find much bitterness and acrimony against the judicatories of the Kirk and several of the leading members thereof, an arrogant presumption by the Protesters that they are the generality of the godly party, a laying of all the blame of all the existing differences on the Resolutioners, an accusation of betraying the liberty of election, and not only of suppressing of facts but of statements contrary to fact. Therefore they request those who may have been so misrepresented to send a true narration of their conduct to the Moderator or Commission at their first convenience. They also appoint the last Sunday of March and the first Sunday of April to be kept as a Fast, for causes assigned. (1) The Causes were circulated as a broadside at the end of February.

On the 17th of March was issued another famous tract, "Causes of the Lords Wrath against Scotland, Manifested in his sad late dispensations." The

(1) Records of the Commission 111, 540-3.

authorship of this piece was at the time attributed to James Guthrie, and this was one of the items in the indictment at his trial, but later information goes to show that he was only partly responsible.

References in Wariston's Diary make it tolerably certain that he was the begetter of it. (1) It is in some respects a revised edition of the Remonstrance, being suited for address to the people at large. It may be noted that here the Protesters for the first time in print claim to be the true Commission of the 1650 Assembly. The matter came before the Commission on 30th May, and the claim was condemned as an usurpation, and the book referred to the ensuing General Assembly. (2)

The Resolutioners held their Fast, and the Protesters responded by appointing "a day of humiliation for that sinfull humiliation". (3)

Some further literary passages took place between them before the date fixed for the General Assembly. The Protesters wrote denying the Resolutioners' account of the negotiations for the November conference; the Resolutioners replied, and published both the letter and the answer. In May both parties were in Edinburgh, and the mediating ministers among the Resolutioners made another attempt at peace, but again they failed. (4) In view of the meeting of the Assembly, the Protesters prepared their inevitable protest. Some of them had promised the more moderate men among the Resolutioners that this "should be drawn in more mild and gentle expressions than the

(1) Wariston's Diary II, 148 and 149.

(2) Records of the Commission III, 552.

(3) Wariston's Diary III, 108.

(4) Brodie's Diary

former was". (1) The promise was not kept. At their meeting on 19 July, they passed a lengthy and bitter "Reply to the late Printed Answer Given to the Letter Directed by the Protesters to Their Brethren, etc."

The General Assembly was appointed for 20th July, but there was some doubt if it would be permitted to meet. (2) However, no objections were made till it had actually met, and the opening devotions were concluded, when officers of the Commonwealth entered, and challenging the right of the Assembly to meet, led the members some distance out of the town, and ordered them to leave Edinburgh the following morning. (3)

This enforced ending of the Assembly prevented the Protesters from lodging the Protestation they had prepared, but they drew up a protest against the English for dissolving the Assembly, "which also had in the bosom of it a protestation against the Assembly's meeting as a free lawful Assembly". (4) Row declares that they did this because some were jealous that they had a hand in the dismissal of the Assembly. (5) Baillie makes no mention of this protestation, but rather represents the Protesters as gratified at what had occurred. (6) On the following day the Protesters held a meeting of their own, but this was likewise prohibited by the English, and a declaration was issued, ordering all ministers to leave the town forthwith.

(1) Row's Blair pp. 307 - 308.

(2) Diurnal of Occurrences p. 115. Brodie Dy. 35.

(3) Baillie's Letters 111, 244. Lamont pp. 69-71.

Nicoll's Diary p. 110. Row's Blair p. 308.

Diurnal of Occurrences pp. 116 - 117.

(4) Row's Blair p. 308.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Baillie 111, p. 244.



The closing of the Assembly caused a fear amongst many Presbyterians that meetings of Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions would also be forbidden. The fear was groundless: only Assemblies were prohibited; even Synods were permitted to meet.

Lilburne, who was in charge of affairs in Scotland, regarded meetings of ministers as dangerous. The reason given for the present action of the authorities was that such a meeting might do something to foment the rising in the Highlands. They had some reason for this. From the very beginning of the movement in favour of Charles, the King had depended on getting the support of the ministers.(1)

In the month following the dissolution of the Assembly a Declaration was issued by the Commissioners for the visitation of the Scottish Universities and placing and displacing of ministers, expressly forbidding the clergy to preach or pray for the King.(2) The order was not always obeyed, and several ministers were imprisoned.(3) The order appears to have stirred up the loyalty of some of the Protesters, "who, till now, have been either silent or cold in their petitions for him."(4)

Further papers were published in the course of this year. One was "An Answer to the Declaration of the Pretended Assembly at Dundee, together with Observations on the Acts of the P. Assembly, etc." These were chiefly the work of Wariston, and were probably the last of his printed papers. The

(1) Scotland and the Commonwealth pp. 47 and 293.

(2) Scotland and the Protectorate pp. 28,29,43 80.

(3) Paillie's Letters III, 253.

(4) Diurnal of Occurrences p.119.

(2) Nicoll's Diary p.111. Diurnal p.119.

Resolutioners also issued a paper, probably written by James Wood, "Some Few Observations on the late Differences in the Kirk of Scotland." It sums up the existing differences between the two parties, and answers the Nullity and the Causes of the Lords Wrath. None of them can be regarded as bringing peace any nearer, but they mark the beginning of a period of rest from the printing of pamphlets. The Resolutioners were now engaged in the more profitable work of preparing the Short Commentaries, in which David Dickson was so deeply interested.

Both parties were professed supporters of monarchical government, for loyalty to the Covenants involved as much. The Resolutioners, however, were more devoted to Charles II than the others. (1) Their support of the Public Resolutions and their compliance with the wish of the King for the rescinding of the Act of Classes, won the royal favour and offers of assistance, as we see from the King's letter to the Assembly of 1651, and his Commissioner's speeches there. The Protesters were not at heart favourers of republican government; and, though some of the more extreme among them displayed an increasing tendency to approximate to the ideas and practices of the Invaders, they were neither numerous nor influential. It is certain, however, that at the beginning of the English domination of the country the Protesters were in higher favour with them than the Resolutioners, as they were known to be suspicious of Charles, while the others made no secret of their devotion to him. So the favour of the conquerors was often displayed when matters of dispute arose between the two parties in the Church. Writing to William Spang on 19 July 1654, Paillie says: "Our

(1) Records of the Commission III, p. 511 - 512.

Churches are in great confusion: no intrant gets any stipend till he have petitioned and subscribed some acknowledgment to the English. When a very few of the Remonstrators or Independent partie will call a man, he gets a kirk and the stipend; but when the Presbyterie and well near the whole congregation, calls and admits, he must preach in the fields, or in a barne, without stipend. So a sectarie is planted in Kilbryde, ane other in Leinzie, and this guyse will grow ryse to the Wrack of many a soull. (1)

The Protesters gave great offence to the other party by their extra-judicial meetings; that at those ~~professedly religious gatherings~~ they should take upon themselves to determine upon matters of the greatest importance already decided both by Church and State (2). The Resolutioners complained bi their arrogating to themselves the reputation of being the "godly partie" (3) They strongly resented that their opponents "have published to the world in print that this Nationall Church is guilty of a defection from the Covenant of God, many eminent servants of Jesus Christ are branded as authorized ringleaders in that defection, godly men are said to be blasted, deserted, and backsliders, the generality of the ministry are cried out upon as corrupt, we are traduced as opposite to the purging out of scandalous and insufficient ministers: yea, the judicatories are accounted unworthy of that trust, in that they must have extrajudiciall committees appointed for that effect. (4)

In violation of the orders of the Assembly and the general custom of the Church, the Protesters are

(1) Baillie's Letters 111, 244.

(2) "True Representation - Consultations 1, 324.

(3) Baillie 111, 248. "Vindication".

(4) True Representation - Consultations 1, 331.

declared to have made innovations in the government and worship of the Church. The Presbyterian ideal does not appear to have been always adhered to by them. According to Baillie(1), they held the right of a part of a congregation to separate from the rest when the discipline was not to their mind, and to erect themselves into a church independent of any judicatories with which they were at odds. In some cases the Protesters erected themselves into a separate Presbytery, which they owned and declared to be the true Presbytery of that district, and refused to unite with the other ministers in carrying on the usual work of the Presbytery. By continued Protestations they also in some cases hindered the work of the Synods of particular provinces. (2)

In a number of instances the Protesters obtruded ministers on congregations, sometimes contrary to the mind of all the members, or at any rate of the great majority of them, on the call of a small minority, whom they were pleased to name the godly part of the congregation. (3) Sometimes they put in a minister, not only thus against the will of the congregation, but against that of the Presbytery in whose bounds it was. (4) They even did this in some cases where the congregation was already provided with an able and godly inrant. (5) Baillie gives particulars of some such highhanded acts by Protesters.

(1) Baillie's Letters 111, p.133.

(2) "A True Representation" - Consultations 1, 328-9.

(3) Records of the Commission 111, p.550.

A True Representation, Consultations 1, p.329.

(4) Baillie's Letters 111, p. 247.

(5) Consultations 1, p. 87.

A noted and illustrative case occurred in the Parish of Douglas, where the heritors, Session, and people had called Archibald English, "a verie good and able youth", to succeed his father as their minister, but the Protesters stirred up a few of the elders, who had signed the call, to request that the young minister should pass his trials before the United Presbytery, and not only before the Resolutioner part of it; from whom the Protesters had separated themselves. They then stirred up a few of the elders and people to give a call to "a silly young man, a meer stranger from Fife, a Mr. Francis Kidd, who had never been heard or seen in the bounds." When this youth was brought to preach in the Church on a Sunday, the people refused him admission, and he had to preach on a braeside to some strangers and a few of the people of the parish, most of whom ran away "from hearing of him, except a verie few." As soon as this service was over, some one was sent to read an edict at the Church door, but who refused to give a copy of what he had read. On Monday morning the Protesters ran through the trials of Mr. Kidd, within an hour, a brief period in those days, and came in the afternoon to ordain him. Again the people refused him admission, and now the Protester Presbyters "sent once and again" for the assistance of the English guard. At length their importunity so prevailed, that a lieutenant and a dozen soldiers were sent to protect them, and on a braeside, without any sermon, the ordination was carried through. The Glasgow Synod appointed some of its members to act with "the true Presbyterie of Lanark" a week afterwards, when, along with some other business, they admitted to the Church of Douglas Mr. Archibald English "after all trials duely performed with the blessing and tears of the congregation." At this time (1654) the Protesters were in such favour with the English that "the stipend

and church shall goe to Mr. Kidd, and his twelve or sixteen followers, and Mr. Archibald English shall be tollerated, with much adoe, to preach to the whole congregation, Marquess of Dowglas, Earle of Angus, whole heritors and people, in the fields, or a barne, without a sixpence of stipend." (1)

They varied greatly from the received, and indeed the legal order of observing the Sacrament of the Supper. (2) Where it was possible they instituted monthly Fasts and Communion, admission to which was more rigidly guarded than had ever been the custom of the Church, more than half of those who were ordinarily admitted being excluded by them. (3) They appointed Fasts for causes pleasing to themselves, and without seeking the concurrence of the regular judicatories of the Church. When the regular Church Courts appointed such days they sometimes refused to join in them, because fixed by the authority of an Assembly which they disowned. (4) Another innovation was the holding of Fasts on week-days. At such Fasts four or five of the best preachers of their way of thinking in the neighbourhood were invited to preach, and "exercised from morn to even." (5) On a Communion Sunday a number of ministers, "sixe or seven, and sometimes double or more" (6) took part, leaving their own congregations "desolate" for the day, and great crowds of strangers flocked in to the scene of their efforts. (7) Such gatherings usually extended over

(1) Baillie III, 247-8.

(2) Appointed by G.A. 1645.

(3) Baillie III, P.245.

(4) A True Representation - Consultations %, 327-8.

(5) Baillie III, p.245.

(6) "A True Representation" p. 326.

(7) Baillie, III, p.245.

the Saturday, Sunday and Monday, and many sermons were preached on each day.

But the Resolutioners were also sometimes guilty of oppressive actions when it was within their power, notwithstanding their bitter complaints against the other side. Though the English authorities were at first hostile, they had as a rule numbers and local influence to support them.

After General Assemblies had been forbidden by the Government in 1653, some of the Protesters took advantage of the absence of any Supreme Court in the Church by appealing in any dispute to the next free General Assembly, no man knowing when there would ever be such again, and in the meantime going on in their own course. The judgements of an inferior judicatory might be appealed against in the same way, and rendered of none effect. They thus struck at the very root of Presbyterian government. (1)

Cromwell, now Lord Protector, was clearly interested in if not concerned about the state of the Church and religion in Scotland, and soon after the conclusion of peace with the Dutch in March 1654, he sent for three of the leading Protesters - John Livingstone, Patrick Gillespie, and Professor John Menzies, of Aberdeen, - to come to him in London, to consult about Church affairs. (2) Here they were well received, and secured some remission of fines for their friends, and several favours for the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen. (3) At the end of May the Protector summoned Robert Blair, Robert Douglas, who had been released in the spring of the preceding year, and James Guthrie, to come up for a similar purpose. (4)

(1) A True Representation - Consultations 1, 331.

(2) Life of Livingstone (Sel. Biog.) 1, p.187.  
Pow's Flair 313. Lamont's Diary 68. Baillie 243.

*meoll's diary 127*  
(3) Baillie 111, 282. (4) Consultations 1 p.70.  
*Courts. Hist. Scot.* *meoll 127. Scot. + Proteste 32*

None of them was willing to go, and none went. Blair sent a letter of excuse and a protest against the invasion of the country by the English. Guthrie also wrote, and testified against the toleration which had been granted. (1) Livingstone neither pleased the English (2), nor was pleased by them. (3) and returned home in August. Menzies and Gillespie both remained in London a little longer.

While the two latter were in London they took part in a matter which gave great offence to many on both sides. Soon after their return to Scotland, an order was issued by the Council of Estate in relation to Church affairs. (4) The judges were instructed that no entrant to the ministry should have any stipend till he had received a testation from a certain number of ministers in the district. As this measure had been obtained by Protesters, it was but natural that the majority of ministers appointed were Protesters. Some Resolutioners were also named, but they, as well as several leading Protesters, declined to act. There was another clause in the Ordinance which authorized the judges to assist in the ejection of such ministers as might be purged by the committee of triers. This added greatly to the power of the Protesters in the disposal of livings. The Resolutioners greatly resented this. Owing to the part he took in obtaining this order, it became known as "Mr. Gillespie's Charter" Nor had he been scrupulous in inserting in the order the names of men which were likely to carry weight in the Church, such as Blair, Rutherford, and Moncrieff (5).

(1) Row's Blair p. 316.

(2) Ibid. p. 317.

(3) Life p. 187. Row's Blair 317.

(4) "An Ordinance for the better support of the Universities in Scotland and encouragement of Public Preachers there." *Acts of the Interregnum*

(5) *minister of colesse: furrnellone; etc. cxii - cxv.*



These and others repudiated the "Charter", as containing "many things encroaching upon the liberties of the Kingdom of Christ, and contrary to the established order of kirk government in Scotland, and sworn to in the Covenants."(1)

In the summer of 1655 the Protector appointed for the government of Scotland a Council of Estate, on the same lines as the Committee of Estates, which had controlled the affairs of the country prior to the occupation by the English, and Lord Broghill was nominated as President. He is highly spoken of by both parties as a wise and judicious man.(2)

In the same year the Council renewed the order that ministers should not pray for the King in public, and backed their command with the intimation that offenders would lose their stipends. As we have seen, a number of them had already given up the practice, but many, especially of the Resolutioners, still continued it. The matter was now brought to a point. To abandon a practice in which they had so long persisted in spite of warnings and threats, merely to escape a money penalty, would have been a scandal, and the ministers knew it. After many meetings for prayer and conference, they sought to escape the difficulty by making application to the Protector, when, through the good offices of Lord Broghill, the offensive order was withdrawn, on the understanding that they would of their own accord cease to mention the King in their public devotions. Many, however, continued to pray in such general terms as the intelligent could understand.<sup>(3)</sup> The ministers passed a resolution that they did this

(1) Row's Blair p. 318. cf. Scst. & Protectorate  
Lamont's Diary p. 81. 211 and 219.

( ) Nicoll's Diary pp. 135 and 158.

(2) Row's Blair p. 320.

Baillie's Letters pp. 111, 315, 316, 321.

(3) Row's Blair 324.

not through fear of personal suffering or loss, but from a conscientious conviction that it was for the advantage of the glorious Gospel of Christ. (1)

With the passing of the years the differences in the Church had increased rather than diminished. This was largely due to the action of the extreme men on both sides. The Protesters were very active in the matter of publishing their opinions, collecting money from every possible source to meet the cost of printing, and this did much to foster and augment bitterness of spirit in the Church. The moderate men were distressed by the continued divisions, but did not wholly despair of effecting a reconciliation. Nor were they sparing in their efforts to secure it. Even so early as April 1652 James Durham had overtured Synod of Glasgow with a view to securing peace. Blair worked in Fife to the same end. But the opposition they encountered was too strong. Robert Baillie was one of the opposers, considering that too great concessions were being offered to the Protesters. (2)

In spite of all discouragements, the moderate party continued to cherish hopes of a settlement. Blair and Durham contrived to arrange for a meeting of Protesters and Resolutioners in Edinburgh on 8th November 1655. The Conference extended from 8th to 28th November, and in a series of overtures and offers, queries and answers the position of the opposing parties is set forth. (3) At the same time the papers exchanged reveal the bitterness which prevailed.

(1) Consultations 1,89-90  
Baillie's Letters 111,295.

(2) Ibid 111,177. &c.

(3) Consultations 1, 91-160.  
Baillie's Letters 111,296-297.

The Resolutioners had submitted seven overtures on 1st June 1655, which they considered would tend to unity and the healing of their divisions. To these the Protesters replied on the ninth of November by eight overtures with a similar intention. Then followed queries and answers, and papers, and meetings for the settlement of various questions; and, finally, on 28th November, when the Protesters had declared that they would stay no longer in town, the Resolutioners delivered their last paper, and closed the conference. On the 17th of December the Protesters handed in their reply to Douglas. (1)

The Resolutioners offered a number of concessions. They agreed that the Public Resolutions and the Acts and Declarations that were the result thereof should be regarded as of none effect, that all censures be taken off, that the controverted Assemblies be no precedent in the constitution of future Assemblies, and that they would join with the Protesters in the impartial exercise of discipline, and consented to submit all remaining differences to the next General Assembly. The Protesters demanded that the Public Resolutions be explicitly condemned, and that meanwhile a Commission of equal numbers of both parties, notwithstanding their minority in the Church - should be appointed for the management of all matters of difficulty. (2) Row informs us that Patrick Gillespie had now veered round somewhat, and had given a certain amount of support to the Resolutioners, and that the chief difficulty lay with Wariston, James Graham and Sir John Chiesley. (3)

(1) Consultations 1 p. 161.

(2) Baillie's Letters III, p. 332.

(3) Row's Blair p. 326.

Wariston and James Guthrie about this time "had fallen on a new conceit. (1) Guthrie had drawn up a new Covenant, from which he had eliminated all the articles of the former Covenant, which related to the King, Parliament, or liberties of the land, or mutual defence, in the hope that they would thereby draw all the godly to their side. This was very displeasing to the Council, and led to further trouble among the Protesters themselves. Some of them in the east country favoured it, but in the west the opposition was strong, and the matter was soon laid aside. (2)

The divisions still continued, and the dispute went on to other quarters. It is clear that the endeavour of the Protesters was to get the Council in Scotland to set up commissioners within the Church, based upon powers derived, as they maintained, from the Commission of the General Assembly of 1650. To counteract this the Resolutioners, on 30th January 1656, addressed a letter to the President of the Council, justifying their position, and at the same time enclosed a paper of eight articles, showing that the power of the 1650 Commission could not stand in force. (3) This was followed in February by a Petition to the Council, which, after narrating the present woeful condition of the Kirk, desires it "to take off what restraints are put upon the exercise of our Kirk discipline and government, and permit the ordinary judicatures to meet and act freely without interruption in matters ecclesiastical." (4) There was also laid before the President a summary of the Acts of

(1) Baillie's Letters III, p. 297.

(2) Ibid III, 297 - 8. cf. p. 331.

(3) Consultations I, pp. 184 and 187.

(4) Ibid p. 192.

Parliament, establishing the government and liberties of the Church and its constitution.(1) A still further letter was sent to Lord Broghill, beseeching him to use his influence to give effect to the Petition, which had been sent to the Council.(2)

In August 1656 the Resolutioners adopted another plan. Learning that the Protesters proposed sending a deputation to Cromwell, they also arranged to send a minister to London, to represent their case to the Protector. A meeting was held, and James Sharp, the minister of Crail, was the chosen representative. To Sharp, at his request, detailed instructions were given,(3) and these were later, on several occasions, supplemented by such information, suggestion, and counsel, as seemed advisable in the circumstances. In these the constitutional working of the Church is insisted upon as the proper cure for existing evils. On 23rd August a letter was sent to Lord Broghill, who had now gone south, commending Sharp to him in his mission.(4) About the same time letters were sent to Mr. Simeon Ash, a leading Presbyterian minister in London, and a number of other influential people, for a like purpose.

Sharp had a capacity for such work as that on which he was now engaged, and he did not spare himself. He very soon obtained interviews with the Protector and various leading men in the Metropolis, and made a favourable impression. The Marquis of Argyle, who was reputed to be the Protesters' agent in London, however, persuaded Cromwell not to hear him any further till one of the Protesters should arrive, when his Highness could hear them both.(5) Accordingly, in October James

(1) Consultations 1.p.197. (2) Ibid p.198.

(3) Baillie 111, 324. Consultations 1. 204-210.

(4) Consultations 211-212.

(5) Row's Blair p.329.

Simson, minister of Airth, went to London to represent the Protesters.

This sending of ministers to discuss the existing state of ecclesiastical affairs before Cromwell, and making him the umpire between the rival parties, was very offensive to moderates of the type of Blair. They strongly objected, both on patriotic and religious grounds, to this exposure of their "sinful and shameful divisions." (1)

In the beginning of 1657 the Protesters strengthened their position by sending up two ministers - James Guthrie and Patrick Gillespie - and three elders - Wariston, Ingliston, and Greenhead. Prior to their setting out, they forwarded a lengthy document, reflecting severely on the other party. (2)

Baillie gives a summary of the claims they pressed upon the Protector: "An order that within the bounds of every Synod there should be named a committee, of equall number Assemblie-men and Remonstrants, who should have power to determine all differences in planting and purging in all the Presbyteries of the bounds. 2. That there should be a committee of delegates from all the Synods, of equall number of Assemblie-men and Remonstrants, to determine finallie all differences ecclesiastick in the whole land. 3. That the Protector should nominate a committee to plant kirks, and that the power of giving of stipends in all vacand churches should be in this committee. 4. That the Parliament should renew the Act of Classes, to the end that places of civill power should be in the hands of their party." (3)

(1) Row's Blair p. 329.

(2) Ibid p. 330.

Consultations 1 p. 350.

(3) Baillie's Letters III, 353-4, also page 573.

In January 1657 the Resolutioners, at the request of Sharp, had printed in London a lengthy tract, entitled "A True Representation, etc.". It was written by James Wood, and "smoothed" by George Hutcheson.<sup>(4)</sup> It gives an account of the Rise, Progress, and State of the Present Divisions of the Church of Scotland. It is well written from a strong Resolutioner point of view, and is believed to have had a considerable effect on those for whom it was mainly intended.

In London the representatives of both parties exerted themselves diligently to obtain the aid of those whom they reckoned influential people. In February both sides had an opportunity of stating their case before Cromwell at Whitehall. In his letters of 12th (1) and 14th February (2) Sharp gives a graphic account of the meeting and debates. In the course of the discussion there were several smart personal passages, many assertions and denials, and much recrimination. Sharp was called upon at short notice, and had to argue single-handed against the five Protesters, but he appears to have gone through the ordeal with success. The Protector was attended by a sort of jury of Presbyterian and Independent ministers and some laymen, and, though the Independents were at the outset in favour of the Protesters, Sharp's arguments quite won them over. At length Cromwell told them that at present he was pressed with weighty business, but he would call for them again. Some time later he bade them "go home and agree among themselves."<sup>(3)</sup>

(1) Consultations pp. 348 - 357.

(2) Ibid 357 - 369.

(3) Row's Blair pp. 333 - 334.

(4) Baillie's Letters p. 354.

The only success the Protesters secured by the visit of their deputation to London was the renewal of the Act of Classes, which they obtained largely by the help of Lambert and some leading officers in the army. But this was a barren victory, for Sharp received private and satisfactory assurance that it would do no harm. ( Sharp had won the real victory for the Resolutioners.

Successful in warding off what they regarded as a danger to the Church through the granting by Government of a "vast toleration", to which deliverance various political causes contributed, the Resolutioners in 1658 published a small pamphlet. "A Declaration of The Brethren, who are for the established Government and Judicatories of This Church, Expressing their earnest desires of Unity and Peace with their Dissenting Brethren". If this were intended as an eirenicon, it had a very different effect. A suggestion in the Declaration that the Protesters were tending to subvert the government of the Church, brought forth in the same year an angry reply of 120 pages, written by James Guthrie. The title is a whole paragraph, but the production is well known by the short title of "Protesters no Subverters and Presbyterie no Papacie." This, in turn, was answered in the following year by the last book in the controversy, which had gone on so long and futilely. It is a Review and Examination of "Protesters no Subverters", and leaves the issuers of it under the accusation of schism.

During the disturbed period which followed upon the death of Oliver Cromwell, on 3rd September 1658, till the Restoration of Charles II in May 1660, there was no particular change in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs, though the strife between the rival parties in the Church still continued. It was observed, however, that there appeared to be a greater tendency to peace than



had as yet prevailed. Probably the uncertainty of events in the realm of politics helped to this, but unity was not restored.

The two parties were still suspicious of each other. In the Parliament, which Richard Cromwell summoned to meet at the end of January 1659, Wariston sat as one of the peers and Argyle had been elected to the Commons; and, fearing that they might do something to their prejudice in favour of the Protesters, the Resolutioners again sent Sharp to London to look after their interests. (1) He had not been very long in London when he fell under suspicion of communicating with some of the agents of Charles, and, at the instance of Wariston, was accused before the Council, but acquitted himself so well, that in a short time he was sent home in peace. Here he remained till February 1660, when, on the summons of General Monk, and as the representative of the ministers who had already sent him twice, he returned to London. (2)

Early in 1660, when it became increasingly clear that the desire of the Country was for the restoration of the King, there arose also a natural desire that he might at his return find harmony among the ministers. This encouraged Blair, despite all former failures, to make another effort. He therefore called a meeting at St Andrews, which was attended both by Protesters and Resolutioners and a number of moderates from various parts of the country. Though there was here some appearance of concord and an absence of recrimination, no final settlement of disputes was found possible. (3) The Restoration found the Church still divided; and thus divided it still was when the woeful days of persecution began.

(1) Row's Blair p. 336.  
 (2) Ibid p. 344 - 345.  
 (3) Ibid p. 343.

The causes of the main Divisions in the Church in Scotland during the years between the repeal of the Act of Classes and the Restoration of Charles the Second, were not such as are usually found at the root of ecclesiastical differences. They were not doctrinal; for both parties professed an acceptance of the same articles of faith, as expressed in the Confession adopted in 1643. Nor was there any difference of opinion on questions of church government; both agreed that a State established Presbyterianism was founded on the Word of God. If it is suggested that the difference was political, it has to be borne in mind that politics and religion were then closely united, and that a man's politics was but one expression of his religion. These grounds therefore do not account for the divisions which followed. Probably, on ultimate analysis, we shall be forced to conclude that they were due to a temperamental attitude to religion. Any attempt to trace the evolution of such differing temperaments is outwith the scope of the present paper. We have simply had to note their effects.

The Protesters claimed to have 200 godly ministers in their ranks,(1) and The Resolutioners were always inclined to boast of their numerical superiority. This statement of the Protesters was not an underestimate, and indicates very clearly that the great majority of the ministers of the Church adhered to the Public Resolutions; but, as we have seen, there were many moderate men among them, who were willing to make concessions for peace' sake. On both sides were men of high character and great ability, but the advantage in point of ability and in the gifts of leadership lay with the Resolutioners. So also in

(1) Consultations 1 p.357. Sharp's Report.

their publications the superiority is with them also. They present a better statement of their case, and usually in less bitter terms.

Both parties had signed the Covenants, but the very attempts to impose such Covenants on all and sundry, in spite of their personal beliefs and likings, marks the intolerance of the age in Scotland. To the Covenanters one belief alone was right, and that was their own: no other could be tolerated. Hence their anger at the measure of toleration allowed by their English conquerors to all who would live peaceably. I presume that it must be admitted that the Protesters were more strictly loyal to the letter, and probably also to the spirit of the Covenants. Hence their bitter opposition to those whom they deemed less loyal. By consenting to the rescinding of the Act of Classes, the others had shown a tendency to compromise, which their after history plainly confirmed. All unconsciously to themselves, the spirit of a new age was already at work amongst them.

The early differences at length developed into a party spirit unknown in the first days of the Covenant, and this widened the breach between them. No doubt the efforts made for peace by wise and good men on both sides were often sincere and earnest, but it would be a stretch of charity to say that this was always so in the case of all too many. Says Baillie, referring to the conference of 1655, "The Remonstrators had as little a mind to unite with us as we with thes."<sup>(1)</sup> The desire for reconciliation and harmony in course of time degenerated into a zeal for a party.

It is impossible in fairness to lay all the blame for the deplorable disputes between them on one party

(1) Baillie's letters and Journals III, p.279.

alone. At the beginning of the divisions at least, the desperate condition of the country and the great need for unity, compel us to believe that only very strong conscientious convictions kept them apart. But later, and all too soon, we find on both sides narrowness, prejudice, and frequent displays of bad temper. As we have noted, opportunities for reconciliation presented themselves, and had either party been as truly desirous of peace as they professed, harmony might easily have been restored.

Modern writers are apt to take sides, and attempt to vindicate the proceedings of the one party and condemn the doings of the other. Some declare the Protesters to have been indeed the godly party, spiritual, sincere, earnest, and the true friends of pure religion, and the others worldly-minded, time-serving men. Perhaps the majority, with some reason, applaud the Resolutioners as the truly moderate, peace-loving party, while they condemn the Protesters as fanatics and divisive schismatics. One goes so far as to say: "On one point nearly all historians are agreed, that it was their spirit (the Protesters') and the course which they pursued that rent the Church in pieces, and caused the restoration of Episcopacy in 1662, and drove many into conformity with it who had perilled life and fortune for its overthrow a quarter of a century before." (1) How far is this true? Charles II had no love for Presbytery. His first associations with them, and his experiences of their austerities, had left memories which rankled in his mind. The confessions they forced from him of the sins of his father and the idolatry of his mother, were never forgotten nor

forgiven. He was indeed ready at all times to make use of Presbyterians when they served his purpose. Had they been strong enough or determined enough, they might have compelled him to carry out the professions he tentatively made prior to his restoration. But his royalist supporters and counsellors were for the most part resolute Episcopalians, and when he and they realized the divisions and weakness of Presbyterianism in Scotland, he had little hesitation in breaking his promise, and forcing Episcopacy upon an unwilling country. Had the infatuated Resolutions been less complaisant and as staunch to their principles as the Protesters, would this have happened?

The state of religion in Scotland during the Cromwellian period has been considered in the thesis, but a few supplementary notes may be given here.

1) The external aspect. The English authorities, in pursuance of their policy of toleration, made provision from the stipends of vacant churches for the support of ministers of "gathered" churches. These were not numerous: sectarianism did not appeal to the Scottish people as a whole, and such congregations were usually in towns garrisoned by the Roundheads. Several sectarians were appointed ministers of parish churches. Such cases caused both alarm and anger to the Presbyterians as deviations from the Covenant. There were no secessions of groups from the Church. When a Presbytery divided, each part regarded itself as the True Presbytery of the Church, and would not leave it. As the breach between the Resolutions and the Protesters widened, there developed also a difference in their styles of preaching and conducting services. The former were more sober in manner, and more in accordance with the traditions of the Church. The latter developed a more vehement style both in

their prayers and preaching, and this had a more popular appeal.

2) The Spiritual Aspect. Here, of course, it is less possible to speak positively. The Protesters claimed that the "generality of the godly ~~party~~" adhered to them, but this claim the Resolutioners strongly resented. It is certainly easier made than substantiated. As we have seen, the rosy pictures of the national religious life drawn by Kirkton and others, except possibly in particular districts, is not borne out by Kirk Session records and other documents of the time. The quarrel between the parties was not confined to the ministers, many of the people also participated, and the bitterness was widespread. We cannot doubt that this tended seriously to lower the spiritual tone of the people, and led to much un-Christian thought and many unChristian acts. Yet we have evidence in literary survivals of the period, and in the willingness, after persecution began, of so many many to suffer and even die for their faith, that there was much real religion in many of the people beneath all the wrangling and the strife.

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORITIES.

Act. Parl. Scot. - Volume VI.

Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum ) Firth and  
Rait - London 1911.

Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie A.M.  
Edinburgh - Ogle - 1842.

Historical Works of Sir James Balfour - London 1825.

Life of Mr. Robert Blair, Minister of St Andrews,  
Containing his Autobiography and Supplement by Mr.  
William Row. Ed. McCrie. Wodrow Society 1848.

Brodie's Diary - Spalding Club - Aberdeen, 1863.

Burnet - History of his own Times - Lond. Smith 1838.

Cromwell's Letters and Speeches - ed. Thos. Carlyle.

Cromwellian Union - Ed. C. Sanford Terry.  
Scott. Hist. Socy. 1902.

Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of  
Edinburgh and some other Brethren of the Ministry.  
ed. by Rev. Wm. Stephen B.D. Scotti Hist. Soc. 1921.

The Records of the Commissions of the General  
Assemblies of the Church of Scotland holden in  
Edinburgh in 1650; St Andrews and Dundee in 1651; and  
in Edinburgh in 1652. Ed. from the original MSS by  
James Christie D.D.

Scottish History Society 1909.

Diurnal of Occurrences chiefly in Scotland, commencing  
21st August 1652. Spottiswoode Miscellany, Vol. 11.

Diary of Alexander Jaffray. Spalding Club, 1856.

Diary of Archibald Johnston, of Wariston. Volume 11.  
Ed. by D. Hay Fleming LL.D.. Scott. Hist. Socy. 1919.

Lamont's Diary, Ed. Kinloch. Maitland Club. Edr. 1830.

Letters from Roundhead Officers. Bannatyne Club 1856.

Life of Mr. John Livingstone, Written by Himself.  
Select Biographies. Volume I. Wodrow Society. 1845.

Nicoll's Diary 1650-1657. Bannatyne Club.

Peterkin'- Records of the Kirk of Scotland, Edin. 1838  
Contemporary Records.

Scobell's Acts and Ordinances.

Scotland and the Commonwealth. Ed. C. H. Firth M.A.  
Scott. Hist. Socy. 1895.

Scotland and the Protectorate. Ed. C. H. Firth M.A..  
Scott. Hist. Socy. 6dinburgh 1899.

Thurloe's State Papers, Volumes IV and V.



MODERN AUTHORITIES.

History of the Church of Scotland during the Commonwealth by the Rev. James Beattie. Edinr. 1842.

A History of the University of Glasgow by James Coultts M.A. - Glasgow, Maclehose 1909.

The Church History of Scotland by John Cunningham D.D. (second edition) Edinburgh, Thin, 1882.

History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, by S. R. Gardiner M.A..

History of the Church of Scotland by the Rev. W. M. Hetherington A.M. 1843.

The Covenanters by the Rev. J. King Hewison, Glasgow, Smith 1908.

Politics and Religion in Scotland 1550 - 1695. 2 Volumes - 1905. by W. L. Mathieson.

The Resolutioner-Protester Controversy 1650-1659: A Bibliography, by James D. Ogilvie. For Private Circulation. Edinburgh, MCMXXVIII.

The Church of Scotland, Past and Present, Edited by Rev. R. Herbert Story D.D., Vol. II. n.d.

An Outline of the Relations between England and Scotland (500-1707). London, Blackie, 1901.  
By Robert S. Rait.

History of Scotland - J. Hill Burton, P. Hume Brown, Andrew Lang, etc.

PAMPHLETS.

A Warring and Declaration from the General Assembly at Dundie the 30 of July 1651.

The Protestation of divers Ministers against the Proceedings of the late Commission of the Church of Scotland; as also against the lawfulness of the present pretended Assembly. (1651)

A Short Information and brotherly Exhortation to our Brethren of England: From the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland convened at Forfar. August 12. 1651.

A Discovery After some search of the Sinnes of The Ministers, Because of which (as we conceive) the Lord is angry, and hath almost made his Ministers and Ordinances vile and contemptible. By The Erethren Of The Presbytery Of Kilmarnock. (1651)

A Vindication Of The Freedom & Lawfulness of the late Generall Assembly Begun at St Andrews And Continued at Dundee; In Answer to the Reasons alledged against the same in the Protestation and Declinatore given in at St Andrews, and in another Paper contrived since, and spread abroad amongst such as were conceived more inclinable to follow that Way, but kept up from others. (London 1652)

An Act and Overture of The Generall Assemblie, For The Peace and Union of The Kirk, With A Letter To The Nobility, Gentry, And all othe wise and pious Persons in every Presbyterie, to promote the same. (1652)

The Representation, Propositions And Protestation  
Of divers Ministers, Elders and Professors, For  
themselves, and in name of many others well-affected  
Ministers, Elders, and People in Scotland. Presented  
by the Lord Wareston, Mr. Andrew Cant, Mr. John  
Livingston, Mr. Samuel Rutherford, and diverse others:  
To the Ministers and Elders met at Edinburgh July 21,  
1652. (1652)

Reasons why the Ministers, Elders, and Professors,  
Who Protested against the pretended Assemblies at St  
Andrews, Dundee and Edinburgh, cannot agree to the  
Overtures made unto them at the Conference upon the 28  
and 29 July 1652. etc. Etc. Printed 1652.

The Protestation Given in by the Dissenting Brethren  
To The General Assembly July 21, 1652. Reviewed and  
Refuted. .... Done by a Member of the General  
Assembly. Printed 1652.

The Nullity Of The Pretended Assembly at Saint  
Andrews & Dundee; etc., etc. Printed 1652.

A Vindication Of The Freedom and Lawfulness and so  
of the Authority of the late Generall Assembly, Begun  
at St Andrews, and continued in Dundee, in Answer to  
the Reasons alleadged against the same in the Pre-  
testation and Declinator given in by some Brethren at  
St Andrews. ... Together with a Review of the said Vin-  
dication, etc etc. By a Friend of the Protester  
cause. Printed 1652.

Causes of an Humiliation Appointed by the Commission  
of the General Assembly, to be observed through this  
whole Kirk, on the last Sabbath of March, and the first  
Sabbath of Aprile, 1653.

Causes Of the Lords Wrath against Scotland, Manifested in his sad late dispensations, etc. (1653)

A Letter From the Protesters, With Answer Thereunto, from an Asserter Of the Authority of the two late General Assemblies, At Dundee and Edinburgh. (1653)

A Reply To the late Printed Answer Given to the Letter, Directed by the Protesters To Their Brethren, who are for carrying on of the Publick Resolutions, and for the Authority of the late Pretended Assemblies. (1653)

An Answer To The Declaration Of the Pretended Assembly at Dundee; etc. (1653)

Some Few Observations about the late Differences in the Kirk Of Scotland. (1653)

A True Representation Of The Rise, Progress, and State Of the Present Divisions Of The Church Of Scotland. Printed in London, 1657.

A Declaration Of The Brethren, who are for the established Government and Judicatories Of This Church, Expressing their earnest desires of Union and Peace with their Dissenting Brethren. (1658)

Protesters no Subverters And Presbyterit no Papicie, etc. etc. (1658)

A Review And Examination Of a Pamphlet lately published, Bearing the Title of Protesters no Subverters, and Presbyterie no Papacie, etc. (1659)