



ST GILES' LECTURES.

FIRST SERIES—THE SCOTTISH CHURCH.

LECTURE VI.

EPISCOPACY, PRESBYTERY, AND PURITANISM IN SCOTLAND, 1572 TO 1660 A.D.

By the Rev. JOHN CUNNINGHAM, D.D., Minister of Crieff.

THE sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were times of fierce religious conflict. In the period immediately preceding 1572, the struggle was between old Romanism and nascent Protestantism. In the period following 1572, and stretching on to the very close of the next century, the struggle was between Presbyterianism and Prelacy. The first of these conflicts was short, sharp, and decisive. The second was protracted and indecisive, and, like a slow fever, simply kept the country in a state of continual unrest.

In 1572, when my lecture begins, Scotland was in as chaotic a state, socially, politically, and ecclesiastically, as it well could be. The king was a boy of six years old. The deposed Queen-Mother was a captive in England. The government was in the hands of a Regency; but the first Regent, the Earl of Moray, had been shot on the streets of Linlithgow in 1570; the second, the Earl of Lennox, was killed, in what we would

now call a *coup d'état*, at Stirling in 1571; the third, the Earl of Mar, died in 1572; and before the close of the same year, the fourth and last, the Earl of Morton, occupied the dangerous pre-eminence, and ruled for a time with a rod of iron; but in the end he was more unfortunate than all his predecessors, for he died a traitor's death. In 1572 there had been four regents in little more than two years, recalling the time when Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian successively wore the Roman purple in a similarly short period.

The Reformation may be said to have been now legally completed, for the Regent Moray had given as much legal validity as he could to the new Church: the Confession of Knox was the Confession of the Nation; and to say a mass was death. But a relapse was possible—even probable. Men are not able all at once to tear out of their hearts religious ideas deeply rooted there—above all, women are not able to do so; and we may be quite sure the women of the Reformation Period had still a strong hankering after their priests, their masses, their confessionals, their indulgences, and their religious processions. The great wave which had surged over the country had swept them out of the ancient Church; but there were thousands who had been carried out in the crowd almost against their will; and another wave, if the tide began to recede, might wash them back again. Everybody recognised the possibility of this. The Guisian relatives of Queen Mary plotted for it; and the diplomatists of Queen Elizabeth plotted against it.

Though the practice of the old religion had been declared to be illegal, the framework of the old Church remained almost entire. Most of the abbeys had been wrecked, most of the cathedrals sadly defaced, and all the parish churches purged of their images; but otherwise the face of things remained much as before. The bishops were still drawing two-thirds of their revenues; the parsons were still living in their manses, and in large districts of the country, more especially in the northern and south-western counties, keeping possession of the

churches and barring them against the Protestant preachers. The Church of which the foundations had been laid by Queen Margaret, and which had been defended to the last extremity by Cardinal Beaton, was now like a useless shell lying on the beach, almost entire, and outwardly as beautiful as ever, but with all its inner life gone.

But what was to be done with the Church's rentals and teinds as the bishops, abbots, and parsons died out? The Reformed clergy had claimed these as their inheritance, but the lords and lairds had destined at least a considerable portion of them for themselves. It must be told that there were many among the Lords of the Congregation who hungered and thirsted more after the corn-fields of the monks than after righteousness. But however this may be, as the law stood, it was only bishops who could draw the episcopal revenues—only abbots who could lift the rents of the abbey lands. To the lay mind, it seemed that to destroy these orders, was to disturb the balance of the Constitution, by removing the Third Estate, and to annihilate the tenure by which a great deal of the property of the kingdom was held. This feeling lay at the bottom of the arrangement so well known in Scotch ecclesiastical history as the Concordat of Leith. According to this Concordat, concluded between the Church and the State on the 1st of February 1572, Archbishops and Bishops, Abbots and Priors, were to be continued as parts of the Spiritual Estate, but with restricted powers, and subject to the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. This compromise being made, the vacant bishoprics were soon filled; but it was everywhere whispered that the patrons had bargained with the presentees that a portion of the episcopal revenues was to be handed over to them. This led to their being stigmatised as Tulchan Bishops—they were no better than stuffed calves set up to make the cow give her milk.

Such was the state of the country and the Church when Andrew Melville returned home after a residence of many years at the universities of Paris, Poitiers, and Geneva. He

had already a great reputation as a learned man ; he had been the intimate friend of Theodore Beza, the successor of Calvin, not only at Geneva, but in the Reformed Churches everywhere ; and Glasgow was fortunate in securing him as the Principal of her University. Here he taught not only Divinity and Oriental languages, but Greek, Logic, Rhetoric, Arithmetic, Geometry, Aristotle's Ethics, Politics and Physics, and Plato's Dialogues—a whole *Senatus Academicus* in himself. Students came in such numbers that his class-room was crowded.

Melville came to Scotland with strong Genevese proclivities, and it was not long till he threw down the gage to the Episcopal party in the Church. The battle began in the Assembly of 1575, and here he obtained his first victory from his accurate knowledge of his Greek Testament. The Assembly declared that the name 'bishop' properly belonged to all who had charge of a flock ; and all scholars are now agreed that, according to Apostolic usage, the Assembly was right. But Melville was not content with this. In 1578 he pushed his advantage further, and in 1580 he obtained his crowning victory. The Assembly then unanimously declared the office of a diocesan bishop to be 'unlawful, and without warrant in the Word of God,' and called upon those who held the office forthwith to demit it. It was a wonderful triumph to be obtained so quickly by one man against the influence of the Regent, the simoniacal nobility, and the bishops whom they had set up.

Looking back upon it now, after three centuries, is it a triumph of which we should be glad, or which we must regret ? It is tolerably certain that if the dignities and offices of the old Church had remained, the greater part of the wealth of the old Church must have remained with them. By their abolition it was lost. It is also certain that the country would have been saved the convulsions and throes through which it had to pass in the next hundred years. Moreover, thus early, before Presbyterianism was distinctly stamped upon the Scottish

Church, that religious uniformity between England and Scotland would have been secured which many thoughtful men in all the centuries have earnestly wished to see, and which many thoughtful men even still would sacrifice much to realise. To those who regard all forms of Church polity as indifferent—and these in Scotland are now a large class—it may seem that Scotland has paid too high a price for the discovery that diocesan bishops were unknown in the Apostolic Church. We have lost our episcopal revenues and our abbey lands ; the clergy have lost their places in Parliament and on the bench ; the country has come through agonies of which the traces still remain ; and England and Scotland, long united politically, are still divided ecclesiastically. All this has come of Melville's victory.

Such is one aspect of the question. But there is another aspect which we must also look at. The Presbyterian Church was the home of freedom and independent thought all through the seventeenth century—on two different occasions it was their last asylum when they had been driven out everywhere else. From it there issued the forces which established the Commonwealth and afterwards led to the Revolution ; and it is questionable if there had been Commonwealth or Revolution without it. Without it the Stuarts might have been still upon the throne, doing as the Stuarts always liked to do. One Church might have been established over all the island, undisturbed by the muttering of dissent, but dead, stagnant, with no breath of God blowing over it ; and Great Britain been as king-ridden and priest-ridden as Spain. Unless, perchance, the revolutionary fiends, held back for more than a century, and breaking out with all the more fury because of it, swept away both Monarchy and Church—as happened in France—reading to all Churches and nations a salutary lesson for all time. I am inclined, then, to think that after all we did not pay too high a price for our Presbytery, though it cost the clergy their dignities and lands, and the country some bloody agonies.

Having swept away the Episcopal polity so far as an Act of Assembly could do it, Melville and his party set themselves to build up the Presbyterian. The *Second Book of Discipline* was compiled and approved of by the Church. It is curious that in this famous constitutional document only four ecclesiastical assemblies are mentioned—the Œcumenical, the National, the Provincial, and the Congregational. The Œcumenical was never realised till the Pan-Presbyterian Council met in Edinburgh three years ago. The National is the General Assembly which from that time till this, save in times of suppression, has held its sittings annually. The Provincial is the Synod. The Congregational Court or Eldership appears to agree in its main features with the Kirk-session. But what of the Presbytery—the most rudimental court of the Presbyterian Church? It is not once mentioned. The truth is, it was not yet clearly conceived of as a court separate from the kirk-session. More than one-half of the parishes were yet without regular ministers. One minister, in many cases, dispensed the sacraments in four or five different parishes, where there were only readers to read the *Book of Common Order* on the Sundays. There was one Eldership for such a group of congregations. But as the parishes were gradually supplied with ministers, an ecclesiastical development took place which resulted in every congregation having its own kirk-session and every district its own Presbytery. The original Eldership parted into two separate organisations.

Up to this time there had been no such thing as a Presbytery in Scotland; but even while the *Second Book of Discipline* was being debated in the Assembly, Presbyteries were being constituted in different parts of the country. They at once attracted the attention of the Court. Some of their moderators were summoned before the Privy Council, jealous of this new ecclesiastical judicature, and ordered to produce their minutes. But the work of constituting Presbyteries went on, and they soon existed everywhere. As they increased, the occupation of the Superintendent was gone.

The king was now a lad of fifteen, and a very precocious lad. He had nominally at least assumed the reins of government. Morton had laid down the regency, and soon afterwards was compelled to lay down his neck under the knife of the Maiden; and his head now grinned from the highest gable of the Tolbooth. Two gay young men had become the constant companions of the king—Esmé Stuart, generally known as Mons. D'Aubigny; and Captain James Stuart, a son of Lord Ochiltree's. The first was a Frenchified cousin of the king; the second, a worse than Frenchified brother-in-law of John Knox—a curious conjunction. The one soon became Duke of Lennox and the other Earl of Arran, for James was prodigal of titles to his favourites. These two ruled everything. The English Court was alarmed, and so were the Scotch Presbyterian ministers. And there was good cause. The bishops who had not demitted their office, were maintained in their cathedrals and dioceses in defiance of the mandates of the Church. It was rumoured that Popery as well as Prelacy was about to be re-introduced; and the public recantation by D'Aubigny of his popish errors, did not allay the panic. It was regarded as a sham. The horrors of St Bartholomew's Day, still fresh in the memory, intensified the feeling. It was at this crisis the Raid of Ruthven took place. The royal lad was wheedled to Huntingtower, near Perth, and kept a virtual prisoner by the Earl of Gowrie and other Presbyterian lords; Lennox and Arran were obliged to flee for their lives, and almost every pulpit in the kingdom proclaimed the deliverance of the Kirk and the king from the hands of their enemies. But it was a short-lived jubilee. Within a year James managed to escape from his keepers, and was soon surrounded by his old friends. The Raid was declared to be treason. Most of the barons hastened to make their submission, and were forgiven; but not so the ministers. Many of them still justified the deed in their sermons, and foremost among these was Melville, who, with his fierce elocution, told the king to be warned by the fearful

examples of Belshazzar and Nebuchadnezzar. He was summoned before the Privy Council, but declined its jurisdiction, and ventured to be contemptuous. Ordered to enter himself as a prisoner at Blackness Castle, he thought it safer to cross the Border and seek a refuge in Berwick.

It is certain that James had already contracted a dislike of Presbytery ; and the Raid of Ruthven and the plain speaking of the preachers had deepened the feeling. In 1584 the Acts were passed by the Estates which are known in history as the Black Acts. They ratified the jurisdiction of the Three Estates ; they declared the king to be supreme in all causes and over all persons ; they placed the chief ecclesiastical authority in the hands of the bishops. These enactments struck at the root of the most cherished principles of Presbytery. Some of the ministers left the country ; the most of them sullenly submitted, for what else could they do ? For eight years from this time there was ecclesiastical chaos in Scotland—Episcopacy and Presbytery jumbled confusedly together.

But strange to say, at the very time when the fortunes of Presbytery were at the lowest ebb, an Act of Parliament was passed, which made a well-endowed Episcopate for ever after impossible in Scotland. In 1587 the Act of Annexation was passed, which attached the temporalities of all benefices to the crown. The teinds still remained sacred, but the lands were secularised. It was the first direct act of disendowment connected with the Reformation. If the rich estates which had maintained the splendour of the Pre-Reformation bishops and abbots, had remained with the crown, for national uses, we might not so much have lamented it ; but many of them were soon squandered by the prodigal James among his favourites, and now they only increase the acreage of some of our great proprietors. When the next act of disendowment comes, how much of the teinds will go in the same way ?

During all this time Presbyterianism and Episcopacy were struggling for supremacy, and now Presbyterianism managed

to throw its antagonist. But how, it is difficult to say. James had got married to a Danish princess, and had been engaged in drinking-bouts with the Danish nobles, forgetful of Episcopacy and Presbytery alike. When the young husband returned, he was immensely pleased with everything and with everybody, for the Presbyterian ministers and people had given him a right royal welcome. In the Assembly of 1590, he delivered his celebrated speech. As Calderwood has it, 'he fell forth praising God that he was born in such a time as the time of the light of the Gospel, to such a place as to be king in such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in the world. The Kirk of Geneva,' he continued, 'keepeth Pasche and Yule; what have they for them? they have no institution. As for our neighbour Kirk in England, it is an ill-said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings. I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity; and I forsooth, so long as I brook my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all deadly.' This speech is very like our Scotch King Solomon, and yet it is altogether unlike everything else he ever said or did. It gives the lie to all his past and all his future. But for the time being he was sincere. Two years afterwards, in June 1592, the Act was passed which is known as the Magna Charta of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. It annulled the Black Acts so far as they infringed upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction in spiritual affairs; it gave legal sanction to the Presbyterian Courts, and provided that presentations to benefices should henceforth be laid before the Presbyteries, who were instructed to take the presentees on trial, and give them collation should they be found qualified. This last clause made the presbyters of those days to rejoice with exceeding great joy, for it stripped the bishops of the most essential attribute of their office, and gave it to the Presbyteries; and yet, strange to say, it was this very clause which, in 1843, split the Church asunder, from the Church's refusal to take on trial the presentee to Auchterarder. It does not seem to have

occurred to Andrew Melville, stickler for spiritual jurisdiction though he was, that it was wrong for the Parliament to impose this upon the Church; it was rather a thing for which the Church should be devoutly thankful; but the successors of Andrew Melville, two hundred and fifty years afterwards, thought differently, and read the clause as putting a yoke on their necks, which they could not and would not bear. The bishops who were dispossessed in 1592, were avenged in 1843.

In 1592 Presbytery was supreme, but it did not long maintain its supremacy. It abused its power. The king wished to be lenient to some of his great nobles in the North who were still attached to Popery. The ministers would have no mercy upon them. They would confiscate their estates and drive them into exile. The pulpit then performed the work which the press has usurped now, and fierce philippics were pronounced against the king and his courtiers. David Black, one of the ministers of St Andrews, preached a sermon denouncing king, queen, court, council, in language which would hardly be used now by the most violent republican demagogue. He was summoned before the Privy Council, but he declined its jurisdiction. As the altar consecrated the gift, so, in those high days, it was thought the pulpit sanctified every word that was spoken in it, however libellous or treasonable it might be. Notwithstanding his declinature, he was found guilty, and banished north of the Tay; for our Highland glens were regarded then as Siberia is now among the Russians, or as Botany Bay was lately among ourselves. But the matter did not end here. The whole Church had been excited by the trial, and the excitement culminated in a riot in Edinburgh, in which James thought his royal life was endangered. He came to the conclusion that Presbytery could not be bridled, and that it must be destroyed.

He carried out his plans with considerable kingcraft. He shifted the meeting-place of the Assembly from Edinburgh to the North, where a love for Prelacy and even Popery still

lingered. Moreover, it was hoped the turbulent spirits of the South and West would not travel so far—for a long journey it then was. The first Assembly was held at Perth, but the king's design was there veiled under general propositions. Soon afterwards, another Assembly met at Dundee, and there a standing Commission was appointed of some of the most eminent and ambitious ministers of the Church—one of them bearing the name and, I suppose, the blood of our present Premier. In the month of December of that same year, 1597, these Commissioners, who seem to have understood well the part they were to play, appeared before the Estates, and craved that some of their number should be admitted to Parliament as the Third Estate. The crave was granted; but it was provided that if they entered Parliament it must be as bishops, abbots, or priors, as in the olden time. This was exactly what was wanted, and indeed just what had been arranged. Again an Assembly was summoned to meet at Dundee. The king was present, and protested that he did not wish to see 'papistical or Anglican bishops,' but only some of the wisest of the ministers to sit in Parliament and Council, and 'not to be standing as poor supplicants at the door.' The proposal sounded well, and was carried, notwithstanding the resolute opposition of some of the more sturdy Presbyterians. It was remarked that it was the Northern ministers who had decided the vote. Caithness and Orkney led the ring. The Southern ministers bitterly complained of this, just as some people are complaining at this present moment of the preponderating vote of the North in a somewhat different matter. Thus had James very dexterously managed to insert the thin edge of Episcopacy into the Church. Of course, it was something for a parish minister to sit in Parliament, and become a member of the Privy Council, and a lord of Session. It was scarcely in flesh and blood to resist these honours when they were thrust upon them. How many of us would resist them now? And why then should we severely blame these ancient pres-

byters when their ambition had been stimulated and the consciousness of a Parliamentary power, to be still further developed in their descendants, was already stirring their blood?

Five years after this, James succeeded to the throne of Elizabeth; and from being a petty king, brow-beat by his clergy and intimidated by his nobles, he suddenly found himself the almost absolute monarch of a great kingdom. In Church affairs he had all along been influenced by Anglican examples; but now when he was surrounded by bishops and deans, and felt the strength which his new position gave him, he set himself with more earnestness than ever to the work of religious uniformity. It was a natural and excusable ambition, had he gone about the matter in a kindly and constitutional way. But that was not James's way—especially now. He dissolved Assemblies which he thought would be unruly; and cast the ministers, who met in spite of him, into jail. He called other Assemblies, when and where he pleased, by his own kingly prerogative, and packed them with his own creatures. In this way the work was easily and effectually done. In an Assembly which met at Glasgow in 1610, the Presbyterian polity was pulled down, stone by stone, by the hands of Presbyterian ministers, and the Episcopal polity set up in its room. The Parliament had been still more prompt than the Assembly. In 1606 it had repealed the Act of Annexation so far as the episcopal lands were concerned, and in 1612 it gave full legal status to the episcopal order.

But could Parliament or General Assembly make bishops? Up to this time they had both made and unmade them. But different ideas upon this point were now prevalent in England, and James had inhaled these. Archbishop Bancroft had bitterly attacked the Scotch Church, as an institution of Genevese origin. It had no divine right, no apostolical succession. The Scotch ministers designated to the Episcopate must therefore go to England and receive the Episcopal grace, and through the English line of succession link themselves with

the Apostles. Spottiswood, Lamb, and Hamilton went ; and having been consecrated by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, they returned, bringing with them a true Church. Shall we blame them for their subserviency? Not much, for 'he that desireth the office of a bishop, desireth a good thing ;' and we must remember that Anglican ideas were at that time telling powerfully on the Scotch clergy through kingly and courtly influences. Anglican influences are acting upon us now, and they always will.

But what of that unflinching presbyter, Andrew Melville? He was not a man to be bribed by mitres. He was not a scholar to be daunted by Bancroft, albeit he was an Archbishop. He had already pulled down a whole hierarchy ; and when James, timid and testy, would not listen to him, he had taken him by the sleeve and told him he was 'God's silly vassal.' James knew he must either be won over or got rid of. He was invited to the English court, and put through a course of Episcopal divinity—a very farcical proceeding ; but it appears to have done him harm rather than good. He amused himself with writing a Latin lampoon upon what he had seen in the Chapel-Royal. It unfortunately found its way into the king's hands, and the too witty presbyter was found guilty of a misdemeanour by the Privy Council, and sent to the Tower. There he lay for three years, when he was allowed to retire to France and accept a professorship at Sedan, now famous for the destruction of the French army and empire. He never saw his native country more. That was the way in which James used his invited guest—the ablest and honestest ecclesiastic in his kingdom.

Melville is undoubtedly one of the most massive figures in Scotch ecclesiastical history. In scholarship and manly grasp of mind, he excelled Knox. In courage and disinterestedness, he was equal to him. He was the great Northern apostle of high Church principles—the Hildebrand of Presbytery. These principles were not in much favour in England in those days, for

Henry would have taken off the head and Elizabeth would have torn off the frock of any priest who disputed the royal authority ; and James, though not so violent in his way, had quite as high conceptions of prerogative, in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil. But had Melville lived in our own more tolerant day, he might have been hailed as the greatest champion of the spiritual power on both sides of the Border.

The Church of Scotland was now Episcopal—more Episcopal than it had ever been since the Reformation. But its worship was somewhat balder and barer than in the sister Church. There were no sacerdotal vestments, no choral singing, no organs. James was determined there should be uniformity in all things. In 1617 he revisited his native country after an absence of thirteen years, and he took care that the service in the chapel at Holyrood should be conducted with all the splendour of the Anglican ritual. He explained to the bishops and nobles his views as to the future worship of the Church, told them he might make the changes by virtue of his own royal prerogative ; but that out of deference to popular prejudices, he would leave it to the General Assembly. Next year, 1618, the Assembly met at Perth, and a famous Assembly it was. The Dean of Winchester brought before it Five Articles which the ecclesiastical monarch had drawn up, and which he wished the Assembly to pass into law. They were : (1) That the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ should be received kneeling ; (2) That it might be administered in private to the sick ; (3) That infants might be baptised at home when they could not conveniently be brought to church ; (4) That all children of eight years of age, after having learned the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, should be brought to the bishop to be blessed ; (5) That the days commemorative of Christ's birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost, should be observed as holidays.

These Five Articles would not stagger us very much now

unless, perchance, the first. Two or three of them are less or more a part of our modern Presbyterian usage. But they did stagger and distress our ancestors two hundred and sixty years ago. They regarded the Articles as a reversion to Popery; and, moreover, they did not like to have them thus forced upon them by the king. Nevertheless, they were passed by the Assembly, for both bribery and intimidation were employed, and the cringing courtiers outvoted the independent ministers. But it was soon found that it was more easy to make such regulations than to get people to keep them. Some kept Christmas and Easter, others did not. Some ministers gave the sacrament to kneeling communicants; others adhered to the old communion table, in scenic representation of the last supper at Jerusalem. In many churches there were confusion and distress from the conflict between the old forms and the new.

So far as we can trace, the revolution which had set up the hierarchy had never greatly stirred popular passion. The jealousies and grudges, the ideas and arguments which it evoked, had not penetrated much below the clergy and the lairds. But these new questions about worship touched every man, woman, and child. Those who did not care a straw whether the ministers in the cathedral towns were called presbyters or bishops—it was no matter of theirs—did care that the worship to which they had been accustomed from their infancy should not be disturbed by king or courtier. We know what is happening in England at this day in many churches where an elaborate Ritualism is being introduced—the heart-burnings, the rioting, the appeals to the law-courts—and it may help to illustrate the state of feeling in Scotland for years after the Assembly of 1618. It was plain that a revolution of the national worship was not to be effected so easily as had the revolution of the Church's polity.

And yet, now in the nineteenth century, we feel it might be possible to conform the worship of the Church of Scotland to

that of England ; but its polity—never. Not that we think Presbytery divinely right and Episcopacy essentially wrong ; but because we think no form of Church government has a prescriptive right, and that that form, be it Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational, is the divinest and the best which works the best. We can never now belie our history by surrendering our Presbyterianism, or renounce our reason by believing that religion depends upon a trinity of Orders.

In 1625 James died—not much lamented in his native country. He was succeeded by his son Charles I., a man of graver manners, and greater earnestness, but bigoted and obstinate in the last degree. From this time on till 1633 the history of the Scotch Church is a dead flat, with no incidents of much interest rising above the ordinary level. In 1633 Charles came to Scotland to be crowned with the crown of his ancestors. He was accompanied by William Laud, then Bishop of London, and on the fair way to be Archbishop of Canterbury. On Sunday the 23d of June he came to this church (St Giles') to worship, but the ordinary officials were hustled out of their places ; two English chaplains, in surplices, read the lessons and the prayers ; and the Bishop of Moray, also in a surplice, preached the sermon. How different from this the conduct of our gracious Queen, when she goes to the humble church of Crathie, and joins in its worship according to the usual simple ritual of the country !

Charles was not idle while in Edinburgh, for he had resolved on a great deal of legislation, some of it of rather an explosive kind. An act which continued to him the paternal tailoring prerogative of prescribing vestments for the clergy, excited violent opposition. Curious that clerical costumes should have excited such agitations in all ages and all churches. But if Carlyle and other philosophers who have written about clothes, be right, perhaps chasubles, albs, stoles, birettas, hoods, capes are worth all the commotion they have caused.

There was another matter which caused still greater alarm in

a different quarter : the king had set his heart on recovering the Church lands and tithes, more especially those granted during his father's minority, but found he had undertaken an impossible task. The possessors held on to them with a death-grip ; but they were greatly alarmed, as they well might. He had, however, devised the scheme by which the stipends of the clergy are still paid out of the teinds of their parishes, and the Parliament of 1633 gave it its sanction. It was at the time a great improvement upon the older methods, and so far the Church is Charles' debtor ; but as it made the valuation of land at that time the valuation for all time, although the real value might have increased twenty-fold, it owes him no thanks. Every one is now crying out for a change in the teind laws.

Another good thing he did—he laid in that parliament one of the chief foundation-stones of our parochial school system.

There was another thing he did ; and I suppose that in this building, I must say it was a good thing too. He erected Edinburgh into a bishopric, for, strange to say, while such paltry towns as Dunkeld and Dunblane were bishops' seats, the metropolis, up to that day, was not. As the bishop must have a cathedral, the Collegiate Church of St Giles was by royal charter erected into the Cathedral Church of the diocese, with all the rights, liberties, and immunities belonging to a cathedral. There was still another thing which I suppose I must also say was good, though the Presbyterian writers of the time are against me. 'He did cause demolish the partition wall betwixt the Great and Little Kirk. Neither ministers nor magistrates in Edinburgh,' said honest Row the historian, 'did shew tokens of grief or sorrow for this ; but many good Christians, both in Edinburgh and the country, did heavily complain of it to God, knowing it to be an evident beginning of a huge desolation to come, for Edinburgh had too few kirks before, and now this was unfitter for hearing nor it was before.' But more than this. In order that the new cathedral might be made in every way worthy of its position, the Town

Council despatched the Dean to Durham, to sketch the choir of the cathedral there; but before these plans were carried out the country was in confusion; and it has been reserved for Dr Chambers to restore this noble church to its pre-Reformation beauty.

But another matter was arranged during the royal visit which led to much more important results than all the others. The Scotch bishops were instructed to prepare a Liturgy, after the model of the Anglican one, and transmit it to London for revisal. It was this which had brought William Laud to Scotland.

No student of Scotch history now makes the mistake of supposing that up to this time there was no Liturgy in the Scotch Church. Knox's *Book of Common Order* had been in ordinary use from the Reformation down to the time we speak of. It was read every Sunday morning by the Reader in this church, and in almost every other church in the kingdom; only the rubric gave the officiating clergyman liberty to diverge from it. There was, therefore, no national prejudice against a liturgical service; but there was a nervous dread of Popery, and a nervous dread that the national usages were to be abolished, and Anglican ones substituted in their stead, without the sanction of Parliament or Assembly, and simply by a stretch of the royal prerogative. The old stubborn spirit of independence—bred in the bone and hardened by the wars of Wallace and Bruce—could not stand that.

It was July 1637 before the Prayer-book was prepared and revised, and all the arrangements made for its introduction. But on the 23d of that month it was to be used for the first time in this church. At ten o'clock, the dean, in his surplice, entered the reading-desk, but he had scarcely begun to read when the congregation was in a state of wild uproar. The storm which had been slowly gathering since 1618 now burst out. 'They are bringing in Popery,' shouted some. 'Woe, woe!' cried others. The shrill voices of women were upper-

most. The half-mythical, half-historical Jenny Geddes hurled the stool upon which she had been sitting at the dean's head, screaming: 'Fause loon, dost thou say mass at my lug?' Other missiles of a similar character went hurtling through the air. Spottiswood, the Archbishop of St Andrews, who was present, and Forbes, the new Bishop of Edinburgh, tried to appease the people, but they only made matters worse. At length the magistrates managed to eject the principal rioters; and Forbes preached a short sermon, with closed doors, and amid comparative quietness. But when the church dignitaries came out to the street, they were mobbed by the people, hooted, hustled, stoned, and glad to escape with their lives. Sitting where you are, you must have a dull imagination if you cannot realise the whole scene as if it were happening before your eyes.

This riot was the spark which set the whole country in a blaze, and indeed kindled the civil war in England as well as Scotland. Knowing what they had to fear, the people began to organise themselves for defence. THE TABLES were formed; these being, in fact, four Committees representative of the Nobles, the Gentry, the Clergy, and the Burghers. But as the sky grew darker—and everything looked more threatening—it was felt this was not enough. The whole nation must be bound together in a religious covenant—such covenants having been well known and often used before this time, both for good purposes and for bad. The National Covenant was accordingly framed, in which the Covenanters swore by the great name of the Lord their God that they would continue faithful to the doctrine and discipline of the Church against all errors and corruption, that they would be loyal to his Majesty in defence of the laws, and true to one another.

On the 1st of March a solemn fast was called, and a vast assemblage gathered in the Church of the Greyfriars. After the religious services usual on such occasions, the Covenant was produced and eagerly subscribed by all who were present,

amid immense enthusiasm. It was then hawked through the city, then despatched to every Presbytery in the provinces, and everywhere it was received and signed amid prayers and tears. There was a volcanic outburst of religious feeling, and in the white heat generated thereby the whole population was welded together and became as one man. The excitement was not confined to any one class—almost all the nobles, the barons, the burgesses, as well as the clergy, had signed the Covenant. Aberdeen only and some of the Glasgow professors held back, and they were regarded as the opprobrium of the nation.

News of all this was swiftly carried to London, where some advised that fire and sword should be used as a remedy; but it was felt that this might be a dangerous experiment, more especially as the king 'had fish to fry at home,' as the people said, and so it was thought safer to send down the Marquis of Hamilton as a royal commissioner, to do what he could to punish or appease the rebels. The people demanded that there should be a General Assembly and a Parliament to settle their affairs; and after long hesitation and with much reluctance, the commissioner made the concession.

On the 21st November 1638, the General Assembly met in the Cathedral Church of Glasgow. No Assembly had met for twenty years, or, as many said, for more than thirty years; for they would not recognise as Assemblies the meetings from 1606 to 1618, which, at the dictation of the king, had overturned Presbytery and set up Episcopacy. But now there was a General Assembly once more. It was a wonderful gathering of all the notables of the kingdom. It consisted of one hundred and forty ministers, seventeen nobles, nine knights, twenty-five landed proprietors, and forty-seven burgesses. No Parliament which could have been convened at that time would have so fully represented the national feeling. The Marquis of Hamilton acted as the Lord High Commissioner; Alexander Henderson, minister of Leuchars, was raised to the Moderator's Chair; and he had deserved the honour by his heroic defence

of Covenanting principles, as well as by his moderation and learning. He is still honoured as one of the chief worthies of the Covenanting time.

The temper of the Assembly was evident from the first. It resolved to put the bishops on their trial; and when the Lord High Commissioner found he could not prevent this, he dissolved the Assembly in the king's name, and withdrew. But there was not a moment's hesitation—the business went on just as before. The Five Articles of Perth, the Book of Canons, and the Service-book were abjured and condemned. The bishops were all deposed from their bishoprics, and eight of them were excommunicated—'given over to the devil for the destruction of their flesh, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord.' The whole fabric of Episcopacy was thrown down, and Presbyterianism in its power and purity restored.

It was indeed a remarkable Assembly—remarkable for its courage, its thoroughness, its contempt of all authority but its own. It can only be compared to the French Convention at the outbreak of the Revolution. What did it matter to it that the hierarchy had been established by Acts of Parliament? It crumpled up Acts of Parliament like waste-paper. It treated king and council and the whole Three Estates as if they had no voice in the government of the realm. But it had good reason for its high-handedness. The country was with it.

Another thing is very remarkable about this Assembly—the rancorous hatred exhibited against Episcopacy. Episcopacy had now existed in Scotland for upwards of thirty years—the lifetime of a generation. Three-fourths of the clergy must have entered the Church during its existence, and received ordination from the bishops. The remaining fourth must at least have acknowledged the jurisdiction of their diocesans in many ways, and lived at peace with them, though it is possible some old men may have looked back with longing to 'the former days.' But now they were one and all seized with a revolutionary fury, and not only overturned the religious system under which

they had lived all their days, but charged their former patrons and friends with all imaginable and unimaginable crimes. The only possible explanation is, that the chief motive power in the Assembly was lay rather than clerical. The one hundred and forty ministers, though forming a majority of the Assembly, were scarcely a full representation of the Church; and scarcely a match for all the baronial and burghal power of the kingdom. We know that before the Assembly met, the Clerical Table had more than once come nearly to a rupture with the other Tables, more especially regarding the method of choosing representatives. That the laity, and especially the great landed proprietors, had for the nonce conceived a violent dislike of the bishops, is certain. Episcopal writers assert that the revocation of the Act of Annexation, and the fear of losing their Churchlands, lay at the bottom of the whole matter. There is certainly a curious contrast between the subserviency of the nobles in helping on the Episcopal schemes of James, when he was silent regarding the episcopal revenues, and their opposition to the schemes of Charles, when he told them that if there were to be bishops, they must be supported by the bishops' lands. However this may have been, it is certain the great body of the people still retained their affection for Presbytery and its simple ritual, or there would never have been such a general revolt. Episcopacy in their minds was associated with despotism and the loss of national independence.

When the Assembly had done its work and dissolved, a humble petition to the king, which had been agreed upon, was despatched to London, and the Marquis of Hamilton, after some hesitation, presented it on his bended knees. On hearing it, Charles said: 'When they have broken my head, they will put on my cowl;' and would not vouchsafe any other reply. Civil war was inevitable, and the Scotch army was soon encamped on Dunse Law Hill overlooking the Tweed. His Excellency Field-Marshal Leslie—'a little crookit soldier,' who had been trained to war under Gustavus Adolphus, and borne a

distinguished part in the terrible battles with Wallenstein and Tilly—held the chief command. Almost all the colonels were noblemen, who led their own vassals. At each tent-door there floated a flag, with the motto, 'FOR CHRIST'S CROWN AND COVENANT.' There was psalm-singing everywhere; preaching continually; but still strict discipline and daily drill were maintained; and the king, who was on the other side of the river with an English army, not very enthusiastic in his cause, began to think it would not be wise to test the fighting powers of the Covenanters. Accordingly, after some negotiation, articles of peace were agreed upon, the king undertaking to call a General Assembly and Parliament to settle the affairs of the country. It is characteristic of the time that the obligation to disband the forces and deliver up the strongholds of the country to the king, was signed by three noblemen, two ministers, and the Clerk of the Assembly. Things being thus arranged, the wags in the English camp said the Scotch bishops had been sent about their business, neither by canon law nor civil law, but by Dunse law.

Next year (1639) the General Assembly met, and Lord Traquair appeared as the Lord High Commissioner, to give to its proceedings the stamp of regal authority. As the king persistently declined to acknowledge the Assembly of 1638, this Assembly, to please his Majesty, did all its work over again. It declared the Assemblies of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, and 1618 to be no Assemblies; it condemned the Book of Canons and the Service-book; it declared Episcopal government unlawful 'in this Kirk;' it revived the Presbyterian polity. The Parliament afterwards virtually ratified all that had been done by the General Assembly. They went further; they declared that the country was threatened both by land and by sea, and appointed a committee to look to its defence.

In 1640 it was known that the king was doing his best to muster forces for the invasion of the kingdom; and the Covenanters resolved to anticipate him. In the month of August they were

again marching southward, and now crossed the Tweed—the Marquis of Montrose being the first to dash into the river; and in a few days more they were in possession of Newcastle. This bold step compelled the king to call the Parliament, now so well known as the Long Parliament. In the troubles which ensued, and which were daily becoming more menacing, Charles now saw that it was clearly his interest to conciliate his Scotch subjects. In 1641 he came to Scotland—a different man from what he was in 1633. He humbly took part in the Presbyterian worship; he agreed that none should sit in Parliament till they had signed the Covenant; he gave his sanction to the Acts of the Parliament of 1640; and finally showered honours and Church-lands on those who had thwarted him in everything. It must have been a bitter draught for him.

Next year the great Rebellion broke out in England. It is not for me to trace the ebb and flow of the bloody tide; but I may mention that even before the royal standard was erected at Nottingham in August 1642, the English Parliament had sent commissioners to the Scotch Assembly, craving its sympathy and friendship. Again, in 1643, commissioners from the English Parliament appeared in the General Assembly, asking its prayers and its help in the struggle they had begun. They narrated their achievements—how they had ejected the bishops from the House of Lords, overthrown Episcopacy, summoned an assembly of learned divines to meet at Westminster and settle the doctrine and worship of the Church. All this was music to the ears of the Scotch Covenanters. It is true the king had granted them all they had desired. But these Parliamentary commissioners promised them still more. There was to be Presbytery not only in Scotland, but in England and Ireland too. And had they not shewn they were in earnest by what they had already done! And what a proud thing it would be for Scotland—for the General Assembly to give religion and law to the three kingdoms! The Scotch divines became drunken with the thought. The English deputies hinted at a

civil alliance ; but no—it must be a religious covenant which would bind the nations into one. The Solemn League and Covenant was accordingly framed, and the Assembly with one voice gave it their assent. The Estates were sitting at the same time, and they also, on the same afternoon, gave it their sanction ; for the Parliament in those palmy days existed only to register the decisions of the Church. Next month it was sworn to by the English Parliament and the Westminster divines, and thus a solemn league, a holy alliance, was formed to extirpate every form of religious faith but one, and to drive Papistical Irishmen, Prelatic Englishmen, and Presbyterian Scotchmen into the one Church—by fire and sword if needful. The full meaning of the International Covenant was seen when in January 1644—two or three months after it was sworn to—the Scotch army crossed the Tweed and marched into England.

It would not become me, in this place, to follow the fortunes of the war—to describe the battle-fields in England and Scotland, where Cavaliers and Roundheads, King's-men and Covenanters struggled together. I would rather sit as an auditor in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster, and report the debates of the assembled divines when they were formulating the faith, worship, and discipline which our Church has inherited, though the Church of England has repudiated them. But neither my time nor my text allows me to go beyond Scottish ground. I can only look at these stirring incidents from this side of the Border. In 1645, the *Directory for the Public Worship of God* was laid before the General Assembly, and accepted by it, with a trifling exception regarding the administration of the Lord's Supper. It is curious that the Assembly never once refers to its own *Book of Common Order*—the Liturgy of the Church up to that time. But that book seems never to have taken a hold on the Scottish heart ; it had fallen in estimation since the disputes about prayer-books had begun and extempore prayer had come into vogue, and so its very existence was ignored.

The same Assembly gave its sanction in a general way not

exactly to the Westminster form of Church government, but to 'the propositions concerning the officers, Assemblies, and government of the Church, and concerning the ordination of ministers brought unto us as the results of the long and learned debates of the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster.' It protested, however, that certain points were to be open questions—admitting further discussion ; for the Scotch Church did not wish to bind itself hand and foot for ever. The fact is, there had been bitter disappointment that the Presbyterian polity had not been settled more definitely and declared to be *jure divino*. We may be glad it was as it was, thanks to the Independents and Erastians.

It was not till 1647 the *Confession of Faith* was laid before the Assembly. The Assembly approved of it, but in a very guarded way. They found it 'agreeable to the Word of God,' 'in nothing contrary to the received doctrine' necessary 'for the intended uniformity in religion.' They further judge it to be 'most orthodox,' and agree that it be a 'Common Confession of Faith for the three kingdoms.' They, however, take exception to its teaching on two different points, more especially regarding the authority of the civil power in ecclesiastical affairs. Knox's Confession is never referred to. Everything was to be sacrificed to the mad desire for Uniformity.

It is clear from all this the Scotch Church did not view these Westminster documents as absolutely true or as universally binding. They were to form the common basis, the rallying-point, the articles of union, the colours of the great united Church of the three kingdoms—nothing more. No attempt was made to compel every minister and elder to subscribe them. The Westminster divines had themselves disclaimed infallibility. Looked at in this light, they are worthy of high praise. The Confession is a logical compendium of the Calvinistic theology of the period ; while the Directory and Form of Government are plainly a compromise between the ideas prevalent among the English Puritans and Scotch Presbyterians

regarding worship and discipline. They will ever form a great landmark in the progress of religious thought; but how long a way have we travelled since they were set up! Looking to the new questions which have been opened since that time, they look like the cast-off slough of controversies long since dead.

While divines at Westminster and Edinburgh were thus fixing the religious faith and worship of a Church which was never to exist, the terrible arbitrament of war was going against the king. In May 1646, he came as a fugitive within the Scotch lines; on the 30th of January 1647, he was given over to the tender mercies of his English subjects; and on the same day of the same month in 1649, he was beheaded in front of Whitehall. Oliver Cromwell reigned in his stead as Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland. But the Scots were almost as loyal as they were religious. They refused to acknowledge the new government. They proclaimed Charles II. king, and invited him to come over from Holland and be crowned. He came, professed himself a Presbyterian, signed the Covenant, listened to no end of sermons in some of which the blood-guiltiness of his father and mother was proclaimed, and promised everything he was asked. The less shrewd of the Covenanters were rather proud of their convert; but they paid for it with their best blood at Dunbar and Worcester.

Cromwell was now supreme; and as he knew the General Assembly had for the last ten years overridden the Parliament and managed everything, he resolved to put it down. As he himself had shortly before entered the Long Parliament and stamped on the floor, and put an end to its palaver, so now by his orders one of his colonels in 1653 entered the Assembly, asked by what authority they met, and then told them to be-gone. And it was for this the Church of Scotland had given up its own Confession, its own Prayer-book, its own traditions! The glorious vision of a great united Church, on the Presbyterian model, in Scotland, England, and Ireland, had vanished

for ever ; and sectaries of every kind, who scorned the Covenants and preached universal toleration, carried everything before them.

Under the stern rule of the Protector, the Church of Scotland found the same liberty of faith and worship which was accorded to all who did not violate the law or shew themselves dangerous to the state. But it was torn by internal dissensions. The troublous times through which it had passed had left a legacy of bitterness behind. The religion of Scotland at this unhappy period, sometimes so much vaunted, consisted mainly in the rival parties hating, cursing, and excommunicating one another. There were Engagers, Remonstrants, Resolutioners, and Protesters, all symbolising special feuds, and doing their best to propagate them. The man who happened to differ from the prevailing party in any political or ecclesiastical affair was stigmatised as a Malignant, and compelled to do penance in sackcloth at the church-door before he was admitted to the meanest office in Church or State. And all this uncharitableness blossomed and bore its fruit in an atmosphere heated with religion, or at least what was thought religion at the time. Some of our worst bigotries—still living, though now fast dying—were generated amid these malarious exhalations.

Ever since the days of Melville, Presbyterian Scotland had been gradually becoming more and more Puritanic. In the days of Knox, our Church was emphatically a broad Church, anxious to be on good terms with every reformed Church of Europe, and more especially with the Church of England. Untroubled itself with any controversy about Vestments, the General Assembly in 1566 addressed a letter to the English bishops begging them not to press the use of 'surcloath, cornet, cape and tippet' upon those whose consciences rebelled against them. It speaks of these things as 'vain trifles'—will not determine 'whether such apparel is to be counted among things simple and indifferent or not ;' but 'in the bowels of Jesus Christ they crave that Christian charity may prevail,' seeing

‘how tender a thing the conscience of man is.’ This is truly admirable. But the course of events naturally drew the English Puritans and Scotch Presbyterians closer and closer together. Most of the Puritans were in fact Presbyterians; and the anti-Episcopal policy of Melville naturally widened the gap between the two national Churches. Bancroft’s pamphlet—*Dangerous Positions, or Scottish Genevating and English Scottizing for Discipline*—betrays the jealousy of the Anglican prelate. The Scotch Church was regarded as exercising a bad influence upon England, and as fostering Puritanism. It is evermore to be regretted that this rupture between the two Churches began, for otherwise they might have acted and reacted beneficially on one another. From this time a somewhat gloomy view of Christianity—a somewhat stern conception of Sabbath-keeping and church-going—began to grow up. What we now call the æsthetical was banished more and more from the Church services, and great virtue was attached to long sermons and prayers almost as long.

In so far as the clergy of those days did their best to enforce the Ten Commandments, we must heartily applaud them; and there was need for their severity; but some of their efforts in this direction seem strange to us now. They had great faith in the power of shame; and the pillory, the jugs, and the cutty-stool were the instruments they employed for reforming the manners of the age. Their excommunication was as terrible as the anathemas or interdicts of Rome. We see them busy at work in the minutes of the Assembly and of the inferior courts. The elders and deacons who attended Robin Hood Plays on the Sunday were put under discipline. All markets and fairs on the Sunday—all work, even in harvest-time—were forbidden. And the Church was no respecter of persons. Earls and Countesses frequently appeared before the kirk-session, and had to stand at the church-doors clothed in sack-cloth for their sins. The ministers, as often as occasion presented, took it upon them to rebuke King James for his

swearing propensity ; and he seems generally to have taken it well, and to have laughed at them good-naturedly. In 1591, a deputation of ministers visited Holyrood to see if the royal household was religiously conducted, and they urged upon James to have the Scriptures read at table both at dinner and supper. In 1596, he again had his sins set before his face, for he does not seem to have benefited by the advice he had received five years before. It would appear he frequently omitted to say grace before and after meat, that he rarely came to the week-day sermon, that he was 'bloated with banning and swearing,' and encouraged his courtiers by his evil example to do the like. It would further appear that the queen was little better than himself ; for she did not repair to the Word and Sacraments as regularly as she might, and was fond of balls and such-like amusements.

In the Assembly of 1638, among the crimes charged upon the bishops was Sabbath-breaking, playing at cards and dice, dancing, and the omission of worship in their families. It would appear the doing or not doing these things distinguished the Episcopalians and Presbyterians of those days. When Episcopacy was brushed away, and the high-flying Remonstrants and Protesters ruled the country, still stricter notions of Sabbath-keeping and church-going began. It was not unusual for the elders to make a round of the public-houses during divine service to see if there were any delinquents who preferred tipping beer to hearing the word ; and private houses were sometimes visited in this way too, and lazy housewives without an excuse were summoned before the session. The well-meaning but somewhat officious elders never hesitated to penetrate into the sanctities of domestic life ; and these intrusions were generally meekly submitted to.

But perhaps the most characteristic feature of the time was the stress laid upon days of fasting, preaching, and prayer. The diaries of the time are full of notices of such days with their protracted services. Spalding says 'the people were "vexed to

death" with their continual fastings and thanksgivings.' Bishop Burnet tells us of his uncle Johnstone of Warriston, that 'he would often pray in his family two hours at a time,' and that 'he had very high notions of lengthened devotions, in which he continued many hours a day.' And speaking elsewhere of the Presbyterians, he remarks: 'Long sermons and much longer prayers came to be the distinction of the party. This they carried even to the saying grace before and after meat sometimes to the length of a whole hour.' It is probable there is a little exaggeration in this, but it is certain there is much truth in it, and the practices of those days have in some quarters floated down to our own. We should not wonder at these excesses in fasting, preaching, and praying, when we remember how heated the atmosphere was both politically and ecclesiastically. They were the natural outcome of the existing conditions. It was an earnest age, and required to be so. These men who thus fasted and preached and prayed all the day long, were not vulgar ranters or hollow hypocrites; they were terribly in earnest, and they were wrestling with God for the salvation of their country and their Church. And we must remember that preaching then—when the country was all astir with emotion—must have been much more exciting than it is now. There were then no penny papers—no political leaders—no letters from special correspondents. The pulpit was the only source of 'light and leading.' The burghers in the towns, and the farmers in the rural parishes, sat for hours while the ministers declaimed against the vices of kings and courts and parliaments, or described the marching and the fighting of the Covenanted armies, or bewailed the victories of Montrose, or gave thanks to God for his defeat at Philiphaugh. The preachers of those days preached to the times, and therein lay their power. They educated the whole people to think as they did. It is impossible to deny that the influence of the pulpit was in the main good. It was all on the side of morality and liberty. It has never been charged with venality or time-serving.

The counsels of the Church during these stormy days were guided by a band of men, undoubtedly distinguished for learning and eloquence, though none of them rose to the rare altitude of greatness. The times were scarcely such as to make greatness possible. Knox and Melville were both great, partly from the times in which they lived. Knox pulled down Romanism, Melville set up Presbyterianism; and these were feats which could not be performed every day. Henderson, Douglas, Gillespie, Rutherford, Baillie, all did their part well; but after all, it was only in the see-saw struggle of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy. They were all ardent lovers of liberty, and Rutherford is well known to have been in principle a republican. It was in their time the great party-name of Whig was first used.

The fierce controversies and civil strifes I have described were only the ground-swell which necessarily followed the storm of the Reformation. It was impossible that after such a terrible upheaval, things should settle down all at once into calm, and contentment, and order. The Reformation in Germany was followed by the Thirty Years' War, the traces of which are said to be visible still, in tracts of land previously cultivated but now lying waste, and villages then burned and still unbuilt. Let us be thankful that though Montrose swept over our country like a fiery meteor, and though Cromwell made many a gallant though fanatic Scotchman bite the dust at Dunbar, all the physical vestiges of the struggle have long since disappeared; and though we may be still to some extent influenced by the traditions of the times, it is not altogether to be regretted, for they have given intensity to our religious faith and feelings. We are none the worse of having a little of the Covenanter in us to modify the indifferentism of the nineteenth century.