



# ST GILES' LECTURES.

---

FIRST SERIES—THE SCOTTISH CHURCH.

---

## LECTURE VIII.

THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT, 1690 TO 1707 A.D.<sup>1</sup>

By the Rev. ROBERT HERBERT STORY, D.D., Minister of Rosneath.

IF Episcopal benediction and subserviency could have saved King James VII., he would have been saved from the consequences of his own fanaticism and tyranny. Two days before the Dutch deliverer landed at Torbay, the Scotch bishops were engaged at Edinburgh in concocting a letter to the king, whom they poetically addressed as 'the darling of heaven,'

<sup>1</sup> The authorities for the period of the Revolution and the Union, to which the general reader may be referred, are Wodrow's *History of the Sufferings, Analecta, and Correspondence*; Dalrymple's *Memoirs*; Burnet's *History of His Own Time*; Defoe's *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*; with the recent histories of Mr Hill Burton and Dr Cunningham. So much of the same ground is traversed in the present writer's *William Carstares: a Character and Career of the Revolutionary Epoch*, that at two or three points short passages therefrom have been adapted to the uses of this lecture. Readers, who wish to make a more minute acquaintance with the period, may consult the *Coltness Collections*; the *Caldwell Papers*; the *Leven and Melville Papers*; the *Lockhart Papers*; the *Marchmont Papers*; and the *Carstares State Papers*.

assuring him of their unquenchable loyalty, praying God to give him 'the hearts of his subjects and the necks of his enemies,' and promising to do their best to promote in all his subjects 'an intemerable and steadfast allegiance' to his Majesty 'as an essential part of their religion.' The prayers of the right reverend fathers in God did not obtain for his Majesty the two impossible gifts they besought; nor could all the devotion of their order avail to thwart the will of a nation, whose strongest passion, burning most strongly in its noblest hearts, was a zeal for liberty—for liberty of conscience and of life. At the root of the long struggle against the manifold misgovernment of the Stuarts, as of all the least practical fanaticisms of the Hillmen, with their visionary Covenant, lay a deep conviction of the human right of personal freedom and personal responsibility, compared with which all assertions of divine right, whether of kings or prelates, were weak as water—strong for a time, no doubt, in the possession and unscrupulous use of brute force, but weak in all elements of moral strength, the only strength that endures, because having in it some measure of that will of God which 'abideth for ever.' King James fell in spite of his bishops' prayers; and his system of absolutism in Church and State fell with him. The convulsion which overthrew him was not a political revolution merely. It was an upheaval and change of the whole national life. The motive power in it was a religious, more than a political, force. It is not too much to say that of all the factors in the Revolution of 1688, Scottish Presbytery was the most radical, the most indomitable, the most triumphant; Scottish Presbytery, not simply, or mainly as the opponent of Prelacy, but as the representative and champion of the rights and liberties of the people.

Since those days in the summer of 1639, when the Scots army under Leslie encamped upon Dunse Law, until the hour that saw King James a refugee in France, the Ark of the Covenant of civil and religious liberty had been guarded by the

strong hands of that inextinguishable Presbyterian remnant, whom no diplomacy could cajole, and no persecution extirpate. Liberty, dear to them, as to all people of their blood and race, was specially dear because the possession of it was bound up in the same bundle with the most sacred treasures of their religion. What the Pilgrim Fathers had crossed the Atlantic to find beyond the seas, they were resolved to attain at home—freedom of life and thought; above all, ‘freedom to worship God.’ Their detestation of a certain order in the Church was no jealousy of hierarchical rank. It grew up in them and possessed them, too wholly perhaps, because they saw in that order the most offensive stumbling-block in the way of the triumph of their noble cause.

It is altogether an error to believe that preference for a non-liturgical service was implied in the popular enmity to the Prelacy, which got its death-blow in 1688. The error owes some of its vitality to the magic pen of Sir Walter Scott; but it is mainly traceable to that general ignorance of Church History, which allows people to suppose that because the present service of the Church of Scotland is non-liturgical, it has always been so; and that one of the chief differences between Episcopacy and Presbytery is that the one does, and the other does not, use forms of prayer. Like the Reformed Churches of the Continent, our National Church possessed, as you have already heard, its national Liturgy for nearly one hundred years after its reformation. It surrendered that invaluable possession to the sinister influence of English Puritanism; and the Prelacy of the Restoration made no effort to recall the unhappy forfeiture. The Revolution found Scotland without a Liturgy either among the established Episcopalians, or the disestablished Presbyterians. ‘We,’ says Sir George Mackenzie, speaking of the former—‘we had no ceremonies, surplice, altars, cross in baptism, nor the meanest of those things which would be allowed in England by the Dissenters, in way of accommodation.’ Such scraps of liturgical order as the use of the

Lord's Prayer and the Gloria Patri, the disuse of which had vexed the soul of Henderson more than forty years before, might be found among some of the Episcopalians; but in general, as far as ritual was concerned, there was as little to distinguish the Presbyterian service from the Episcopal, as there is, at the present day, to distinguish the service of the average Free Church congregation from that of the average parish church, perhaps not so much. In the parish churches, at the date of the Revolution, the Sunday's service commonly was begun by the precentor's reading, after the manner of the earlier 'Reader,' two or three chapters of the Bible; after which the curate entered the pulpit, and a psalm was sung. Then followed an extempore prayer, and a sermon, generally unread. After the sermon there was a second prayer, concluding with our Lord's Prayer. Then came another psalm, and the benediction; and this was all. In the meeting-houses of the Indulged, the service was the same, except that the Lord's Prayer had no place. The Holy Communion was administered by the curate, as well as by the 'ouied' or the 'indulged' minister, to recipients who sat about a table, and never thought of kneeling. At prayer, the attitude seems to have been sitting too. During the sermon, the Presbyterians were in the disrespectful habit of putting on their hats or bonnets. I do not know if the Episcopalians exhibited the same irreverence, or not. The prolonged services preliminary to the Communion, on the Fast-day and Saturday—the lengthy 'preachings' in the church and from the 'tent' on the Sunday, and the thanksgivings of the Monday—were unknown among the Episcopalians, as they were among the earlier Presbyterians. They originated with the Protesters, and established themselves pretty generally throughout the Church, soon after the Revolution.

The ritual of the conventicle was naturally subject to no law. The order which I have described as that of the usual Sunday's service, you will recognise as virtually in agreement with that prescribed in the *Book of Common Order* and in the

*Westminster Directory*, which is the basis of our more comely and elaborate usage in the present day. It lacked the liturgical element common to the Reformed Churches, and it excluded the people from that large share in the service, which adds unction and power to the inflexible devotional forms of the Anglican Church. Its weak point was the almost absolute power it confided to the minister, who, knowing no guide and no restraint except that of a general but not authoritative custom, could deal with the service in all its constituent parts pretty much as he chose. The traditions of days when, filled by Knox or Henderson, the pulpit had been a great political force—of the times of persecution, when the most stirring call to the defiance and resistance of a degrading tyranny had been the voice of the outlawed preacher on the bare hillside—were cherished in an age when preaching had lost its former political importance, and when its fiery testimony for freedom was no longer needed. The preacher still thought it fair and right to discuss in the pulpit all questions of public and local interest; but when such discussion no more affected national policy or involved personal danger, the independence which had before been courageous and noble could not retain that character. The pulpit was too often degraded to the uses of personal ill-will, sectarian spite, or professional intolerance; and, for a time at least, forfeited much of its power to edify and elevate the public mind.

The establishment of Episcopacy had wrought as little change upon the subordinate government of the Church as upon its ritual. That court of the Church which has generally been regarded as the most prominent feature of Presbytery—the Kirk-session—lasted throughout the whole of the Caroline Prelacy. Not only so; but King Charles, moved possibly by a pious admiration of the discipline of that court, had, on finding that the eldership was not a popular office under the ‘curates,’ issued a proclamation empowering them to make their own selection of elders in their respective parishes, and ordering those so chosen to

accept office, within fifteen days, 'under pain of rebellion.' The second court of the Church, the Presbytery, continued to hold its constitutional position and to discharge its ordinary duties, with the exception—no doubt, a radical exception—of ordaining candidates for orders. The Presbytery examined the candidates, but referred their ordination to the bishop, who also had the right of nominating the moderator. The Synods met as usual, but under the presidency of the bishop. There was no General Assembly. The ordinary parochial and Presbyterian government of the Church went on, as though the bishops had not existed. The restoration of Presbyterianism required to make no alteration beyond abolishing the bishops, and reopening the General Assembly.

Neither was it called to effect any change in doctrine. The Westminster Confession, which had been accepted by the General Assembly of 1647, had since that date retained, without dispute, such ecclesiastical authority as that acceptance implied, and had never been repudiated or renounced in any of the voluminous oaths which the government of Charles demanded from the clergy. The Revolution found it where the Restoration had found it. On the ritual, the subordinate government, and the doctrine of the Church, twenty-six years of Prelacy had left no mark. If anything could add emphasis to the national repudiation of that Prelacy, it is this simple fact.

'What have I done to be so loved?' said Louis XV.—Louis 'the well-beloved'—when he rose from his sick-bed at Metz. The poor perplexed bishops of the Stuarts might have asked: 'What have we done to be so hated?' as they gathered their tattered skirts around them and fled into those coverts from popular ill-will, which justified Dundee's sarcasm that they had become 'the Kirk invisible.' I find the answer in the words of the most dispassionate and sagacious of English historians—Henry Hallam—who, reviewing the Scotch Episcopacy of the seventeenth century, in calm and philosophical survey, says:

‘There was as clear a case of “forfeiture” in the Scots Episcopal Church as in the royal family of Stuart. . . . It was very possible that Episcopacy might be of Apostolical institution; but for this institution houses had been burned and fields laid waste, and the Gospel had been preached in wildernesses, and its ministers had been shot in their prayers, and husbands had been murdered before their wives, and virgins had been defiled, and many had died by the executioner, and by massacre, and in imprisonment, and in exile and slavery, and women had been tied to stakes on the sea-shore till the tide rose to overflow them, and some had been tortured and mutilated; it was a religion of the boots and the thumbscrew, which a good man must be very cool-blooded indeed, if he did not hate and reject from the hands that offered it. For, after all, it is much more certain that the Supreme Being abhors cruelty and persecution than that he has set up bishops to have a superiority over presbyters.’

The representatives of a vicious system may sometimes be able, by their own personal character, or genius, or merits, to redeem their office from popular odium and contempt; but the prelates of 1688 had no such power. Of the twelve deprived bishops, none could raise a voice to which the nation would listen, or exert the slightest sway over the turbid currents of revolution. There was not one of them round whom the people of his own diocese, even, would rally. ‘And shall Trelawney die?’ chanted the Mendip miners, when they heard that James had sent their bishop to the Tower:

‘Then twenty thousand under ground will know the reason why.’

The incarceration of all the bishops in Scotland would have evoked no such loyal sentiment, in any region between Whit-horn and Kirkwall. Not a hundred of their countrymen could have been found to strike a blow for them. They fell, and no one held out a hand to lift them up. They were hustled out of Church and Senate, and no man bade them stay, or said

God bless them, as they and their hated order and tarnished honours passed away.

The mind and conscience of the country felt relieved when they were gone. Men breathed more freely. It became easier to believe in that old article of the Reformers' creed—a divine government and a righteous Kingdom of Christ—when the mean curate, with his weekly list of defaulters from his Sunday's services, no longer sought the alliance of the sergeant of dragoons to coerce his recreant flock; when the victims of the boot and the thumbscrew were no longer watched, during their torture in the Laigh Parliament House, by the cruel eyes of the right reverend fathers in God of the Privy Council.

The Scotch people had, at the time of the Reformation, and for several years after it, no fanatical hatred of Prelacy—not even any bitter jealousy of it. Knox himself exercised his ministry, for a time, in the English Church; and when asked by the Privy Council to explain his refusal to accept the preferment offered him by King Edward, he never alleged that Anglican Prelacy was at the bottom of it. The early Scottish Reformers communicated, without scruple, in the Church of England, and in their own worship used her Liturgy. The altered feelings of a later age owed their birth to the fact, emphasised by the Duke of Argyll in his *Presbytery Examined*, that while the Scottish Prelacy of the Regencies was without any principle, Scottish Presbytery was not. 'It was founded on passionate conviction; and every opposition it encountered, springing from motives less earnest than its own, tended to strengthen that conviction, and give to all its principles additional value in its sight. If, in the main, those principles were great and true positively, every scrap of them appeared great and true by contrast.' This, true of the earlier, was doubly true of the later, Prelacy. Its existence had been an outrage on the liberties of a people whose passion for liberty had sometimes raged with even too fierce a flame. Its overthrow lifted the weight of a nightmare-like oppression from the national breast.



At the same time, we must not overlook the fact that, by the end of the twenty-six years of the Caroline Prelacy, the policy of the Stuarts and the bishops had not altogether laboured in vain, or spent its strength for nought. Hanging, shooting, torturing, banishing, imprisonment in foul dungeons, confiscation of goods, ruinous fines, all the agencies of a reign of terror, had done their part. Persecution had rooted out of the population thousands—how many thousands, it is hard to tell now—of its best and bravest—had cowed many into a sullen submission. Many others, moved probably by dread of new changes, or under the influence of the Court, or finding Episcopacy most in accordance with their political principles, had become the partisans of that form of government. The Revolution Settlement met with little or no favour among the nobles and gentry, that had been the minions or adherents of the Court; among the party that hated popular rights, and believed in the *jus divinum* of kings; and among the half-civilised Highland clans, many of whom had no religion but their loyalty to their chief, and among whose glens and islands the Reformation had left not a few savage retreats, as wholly Papal as the passes of the Apennines or the Pyrenees.

The only Lowland region (besides some districts of Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, and Moray) where Episcopacy had gained a decided hold on the general community, was that which stretches from the Tay to the Dee, between the Grampians and the ocean; a region even then still liable to the incursions of the Gael, and, except in the towns of the sea-board, exhibiting but a moderate standard of civilisation. The country from the Tay to the Border—and especially the well-peopled and strong-minded west and south-west—was enthusiastically Presbyterian, and rejoiced to see the State renounce the ecclesiastical associate of regal despotism, and prepare to restore its former establishment and endowment to a free Church in sympathy with a free people.

The populace in several districts, exasperated by the memories of twenty-six years of outrage and injury, did not wait till the orderly process of the law should expel the alien 'curate.' Giving the rein to their own indignant sense of ill-usage, and in the first turbulence of a recovered freedom, they took on themselves the work of driving the intruder from kirk and manse; in some cases with slight violence and insult, in none with even an approach to the brutality with which the soldiery of Dalziel and Claverhouse had harried the homes of the Covenanters. This was that 'rabbling of the curates,' over which their representatives and apologists may, to this day, be heard to bleat and whimper. Never were enormous wrongs so leniently retaliated. Never, in the day when power had passed from the oppressors to the oppressed, was the oppression so lightly revenged.

As soon as a Convention representing the true mind of the mass of the nation was summoned, Prelacy was doomed. The voice of righteousness and freedom was heard asserting the people's 'Claim of Right.' The Claim of Right formed the basis of the Revolution Settlement; and one of its clauses was, 'That Prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above presbyters 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.' This frank acknowledgment of the will and welfare of the Christian people as a higher law of Church polity than any *jus divinum*, royal or ecclesiastical, must have struck terror into the hearts of the bishops, who owed their existence to the king's will, and entrenched their office behind the Church's tradition. The terror must have deepened into despair when they found that the Parliament, into which the Convention was transformed, passed, among its earliest measures, an Act abolishing Scottish Prelacy—which was succeeded by another abolishing Charles II.'s 'Act

of Supremacy.' The first steps of the free representatives of the people, acting in their constitutional capacity, were to abolish the office and order which had embodied ecclesiastical tyranny, and to rescind the servile concession by which a former Parliament had degraded itself to own the galling yoke of regal despotism.

We must, however, trace the stages of this history in more exact and chronological detail.

William was essentially an Erastian. Born and bred a Presbyterian, under the wing of that National Dutch Church, which is Presbyterian to this day, he had no covenanting enthusiasm for that, or for any form of Church government. He wished to gain the crown of Scotland, and to rule the Scottish people according to their own law, in Church and State. Had their ecclesiastical constitution been reconcilable with that of England, he would have been well pleased, knowing that this reconciliation would have been a strong element in that international union, which he foresaw must ultimately be effected, if Great Britain was to hold its proper place in Europe. As this reconciliation appeared to be impossible, he preferred that the nation should settle for itself what form of Church government should be established. Its choice would relieve him of an irksome responsibility, and would transfer to other shoulders than his own the load of that Anglican odium, which must follow the subversion of Episcopacy and triumph of Presbytery. Those exiles who had been around him in Holland were all Presbyterians; and had, no doubt, represented their party in Scotland as the only one to be consulted, or recognised. In London, William met many representatives of Episcopacy, whose version of affairs in Scotland opened his eyes to the diversity of feeling and opinion beyond the Tweed. The Episcopal party there, after all, was stronger than he had supposed. He was beset by the pertinacious emissaries of both parties. Carstares introduced to him an influential deputation of the Presbyterian ministers. Sir

George Mackenzie and Bishop Rose, of Edinburgh, attended him on behalf of the Episcopalians. At this juncture, it is evident William was inclined to waver between supporting Episcopacy and supporting Presbytery. As I have said elsewhere, the ecclesiastical settlement of Scotland perplexed him. He saw that Presbytery had lost ground; and he saw also that Episcopacy was Jacobite and intolerant. He did not wish to put it down; but if it would not abjure Jacobitism and intolerance, it must be put down. He had the promise of hearty Presbyterian support. Rose might have given him a promise equally gratifying, on behalf of the Episcopalians. Those whom he represented were not the men to quarrel with his policy, if its result should be to keep them in safe possession of their sees. William, through Compton, Bishop of London, intimated to Rose that if the Scotch bishops and clergy would give him their support, he would give them his, and 'throw off the Presbyterians.' Rose would not take the hint. At length he was admitted to an interview. '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 answer 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 Scotch Episcopal establishment was virtually sealed.

The Convention of the Estates of the realm, summoned by William, met in March 1689. It consisted of one hundred and fifty members, of whom nine were bishops. When the resolutions declaring the throne vacant, and inviting William and Mary to ascend it, were proposed, only nine members voted against them. Of the nine, seven were bishops. When these resolutions had been carried, and the Claim of Right adjusted, three delegates of the Convention—the Earl of Argyll, Sir John Dalrymple, and Sir James Montgomery, were sent to London, empowered to offer the

crown to William and Mary, and to tender to them the coronation oath. Argyll read the words of the oath, which they, with uplifted right hand, repeated after him, clause by clause. At the last clause, William paused, for it bound him to root out all heretics and enemies of the true worship of God. 'I will not,' said he, 'lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor.' On the commissioners' replying that no such obligation was involved, 'In that sense, then, I swear,' said William; and the ceremony was concluded.

The incident was significant. It announced that the era of the Covenant was past; that the sword of the civil power was not again to be drawn at the bidding of the Church, or employed in ecclesiastical feud. This was gall and wormwood to the Cameronian remnant, who looked with indignation on the progress of a revolution which was to achieve results so far below the height of their Utopian principles, and which they felt they could neither control nor arrest. 'They held excited meetings and used violent language; but the dragoons no longer dispersed their conventicles, and their stern military spirit was judiciously allowed to expend itself in legitimate warfare. The "Cameronian" regiment, eight hundred strong, was drafted from their ranks, and under the gallant Cleland played a noble part in retrieving the disaster of Killiecrankie. The main body of the grim religionists, thus reduced in aggressive strength, and no longer stimulated by persecution, watched in sullen acquiescence the progress of events. They had done their work. Their injuries, their martyrdoms, their passionate protests, their inextinguishable vitality, their armed resistance to a "tyrant's and a bigot's bloody laws," had been powerful agents in producing the Revolution. But in the political settlement which followed it, the remnant of the Covenanters and the Protesters had no part; nor indeed were they fit to have any.' The General Assembly, at its first meeting, received their three remaining ministers into the Church. The fighting strength of the Societies themselves was dispersed, or absorbed into the

army. The ideal of a Covenanted Reformation faded away. The Dutch king was hopelessly unlike the hero of a new crusade against Popery, Prelacy, and profaneness. I question if a sharper iron of angered and embittered disappointment entered into the heart of any Prelatist or Royalist, in these days of revolution, than that which pierced the proud, though fanatical, spirit of the Cameronians. To them, as they saw the Covenant quietly ignored by Laodicean politicians, while lukewarm Churchmen calmly looked on, it was small comfort to know that their old foe, Prelacy, fell in the same convulsion which engulfed the ark of their testimony.

The Convention denounced Prelacy: the Parliament abolished it; but it did nothing more. Episcopacy was put down; but Presbytery was not set up. Nothing was done to evict the Episcopal incumbents, unless they shewed disloyalty by refusing to pray for the new king and queen, for which refusal one hundred and seventy-nine of them were expelled by the Privy Council. No steps were taken to call a General Assembly. A General Assembly indeed, such as the clergy in the North clamoured for, would have been too wholly Episcopal to be safely summoned. It was not till June 1690, that the Act was passed ratifying the Confession of Faith; settling Presbyterian Church government; and vesting that government in those ministers who had been ousted since 1st January 1661, and such other ministers and elders as they might receive into co-operation with themselves. 'This famous Act was not passed without some difficulty and opposition. When the House was about to consider the article which ratified the Confession of Faith, the Duke of Hamilton moved that the Confession itself "be read all over with a distinct and audible voice." The Laird of Craignish preposterously proposed that this should be done on the Lord's Day, if done at all. The Duke's motion was adopted, and the long Confession was read. When the reading was finished, it was proposed that the Catechism and the Directory for

Public Worship should come next. But this was too much for the wearied senators; the reading of the Confession was voted to be enough, and the Catechism and Directory were passed over, and so escaped embodiment in the Act. At various points the Duke of Hamilton offered an opposition to the Bill, in the interests of a more indulgent treatment of the Episcopal ministers, which did not fail to rouse the suspicion of being dictated by resentment at Melville's preference to the commissionership, quite as much as by real charity and liberality. At last, before the House divided on the article which, with undeniable injustice, proposed to confirm the ejections by the "rabble," the Duke's temper gave way. "The vote should stand," he cried, "approve or not approve the deed of the rabble;" and when the article had passed, "he was sorry," he said, "that he should ever have sat in a Scottish Parliament where such naked iniquity was established into a law;" and, much in wrath, he marched out of the House, followed by several other members. As soon as he was gone, it was proposed to pass the whole Act *in cumulo*. A voice was heard: "Fie! make haste! despatch, lest he return again, and create more trouble." It came from a Presbyterian minister, who had made his way into the house, and in the excitement of the moment called out to the members near him. The hint was taken. The whole Act was approved, and laid on the table to await the royal assent. It erred, as the legislation of the Parliament of the Restoration had erred, in an assertion and in exercise of powers which, even though tempered by William's impartial tolerance, were too harsh and absolute. The extreme measures of the Restoration were sure to beget a reaction of like extremes when the oppressed gained their opportunity of becoming oppressors; and the knowledge of the near danger of Jacobite plots, which might overthrow the still insecure fabric of the Revolution, disposed William's Scottish supporters to be more jealous and rigid than their master.'

The legislature, having settled the government and creed of the Church, next adjusted its Patronage. The patronages were taken from the old patrons, and conferred upon the heritors and elders—in burghs, on the Town Council and elders—reserving to the congregation the right of laying objections to a presentee before the Presbytery, with whom should rest the decision of their validity. Now that Patronage, in its old sense, has finally been abolished in the Church, it is unnecessary to occupy time in criticising this stage in its chequered history. We cannot fail to see, however, that this settlement of it involved all the elements of that conflict between the Presbytery, the people, and the civil law, which came to its crisis in 1843.

The ground was now cleared for the meeting of a General Assembly. The clearance had been effected, in the most Erastian way, by the authority of the State alone. As in earlier crises of her history, secular policy had ruled the destiny of the Church, without her own assistance or consent. It is one of the ugliest features of the epoch, and worst signs of the generally low standard of the national religion, that it was obviously thought unsafe to trust the settlement of Church affairs to Churchmen. Such was the suspicion of their principles—of their patriotism—of their integrity; such the dread of their rancorous jealousies—of their lust of power—that the clergy of neither persuasion found the politicians ready to hand over to them the settlement of their own affairs, until there was comparatively little left to settle. The politicians themselves—we may remark in passing—were, as a rule, singularly corrupt and untrustworthy. The very bench of justice was defiled with bribery, favouritism, and servility. The religious contentions of the Church, or some other equally noxious cause, had been fatal to a high tone of public or private morality.

The General Assembly met on 16th October 1690—for the first time since Cromwell's dragoons had interrupted its debates thirty-seven years before—and was once more the Supreme



Court of an Established Church. It met in no very good humour. It had been made to wait the pleasure of the king. Though the Presbytery, which it represented, had been established as agreeable to the Word of God, the Prelacy, which it supplanted, had been deposed on no higher principle than because it was contrary to the inclinations of the people. The older members, who had been outed or exiled or ruined under Prelacy, and who still retained some of the 'protesting' zeal of earlier times, felt it chilled by the king's message recommending, above all things, 'Moderation.' 'Moderation,' said the royal letter, delivered by the Commissioners to the Assembly, 'is what religion enjoins, neighbouring churches expect from you, and we recommend to you.' This word, much needed as it was, and not yet of evil omen, was no doubt chosen by the king's confidential adviser and friend, the cautious, wise, and liberal Carstares.

The temper of this great Churchman's nature had been tested by a long course of political vicissitude and personal trial, of adversity, imprisonment, and exile. He had stood the cruel torture of the thumbscrews with patient courage, and had baffled the inquiries of his torturers with rare discretion. His sterling honesty, his diplomatic skill, his varied experience, and large sagacity, had long secured to him the thorough esteem and confidence of William. His influence was predominant in the settlement of the Scotch ecclesiastical affairs. He had been by William's side in Holland during all the delicate negotiations which preceded the invasion of England. He had crossed with him in the same ship from Helvoetsluys to Torbay. He had conducted, at the head of the army, the religious service which consecrated its first day's occupation of English soil. His counsel had guided the king through the critical time when the balance of policy wavered between Episcopacy and Presbytery; and he had revised, along with William, the drafts of the Act for the re-establishment of the Church. And now he came to Edinburgh, armed with the king's instructions,

which were but the embodiment of his own ideas, to keep a watchful eye upon the doings of the resuscitated ecclesiastical court.

Upon the whole, the Assembly acted calmly and fairly on the advice of the king. It was inevitable that among men, the older of whom had borne the brunt of the persecution, the younger of whom had been either trained in Holland in enforced exile, or had exercised a fugitive ministry in defiance of the law, there should be some bitterness of feeling and warmth of prejudice. But these were held in check, partly by the influence of Carstares, partly by a common-sense, which convinced its possessors of the practical folly of indulging personal fanaticisms, or straining after unattainable ideals. The Covenant was dropped by the Assembly, as it had been dropped by Parliament. There was no anathematising of Prelacy as Satanic, or glorifying of Presbytery as divine. The ministers of the Covenanting remnant were, as I have already said, received into communion, on the one hand; and, on the other, full liberty to stay in their parishes was extended to all such Episcopal curates as should subscribe the Confession, and promise allegiance to the Presbyterian government. High-flying Churchmen would have liked much more rigid exclusions—much more dogmatic assertions of divine right—much sharper discipline. But ‘men must take what they can have in a cleanly way, when they cannot have all they would,’ wrote Lord Melville, the Secretary of State, to Lord Crawford, president of the Parliament, a stanch Presbyterian, with a keen eye and a tight grip for the rents of abolished bishoprics.

A moderate Presbyterianism, tolerant of rival theories and systems, a Church established on liberal and comprehensive principles, and not on extreme dogmas and rigorous exclusiveness, was all that was practicable; and what was practicable was what was most desirable. The devout theocratic imaginations of John Knox, the haughty Hildebrandism of Andrew Melville, the Judaic intensity of the leaders of the Covenant, had all

passed away. It was a tamer and less heroic time than theirs—a time, not for the vehement assertion of absolute claims, or the desperate maintenance of imperilled causes, but for the quiet and patient reconstruction of a system of religion and framework of society, disordered and ruptured by long years of insolent oppression and exasperated resistance, of conflicting jealousies and misunderstandings, during which hearts had grown bitter and consciences perverse.

To prosecute this work of reconstruction, the Assembly, ere it rose, appointed two Commissions, the one for the regions lying to the south, and the other for those lying to the north, of the Tay. These Commissions, in virtue of the powers conferred on them by the Assembly, and by the Act of Parliament which had authorised the Assembly to correct the disorders of the Church by a system of visitations, were to go through the country, purging out all obnoxious ministers. Although an Act of the Revolution Parliament had taken what most people felt to be its sharpest sting from ecclesiastical discipline, by forbidding, for the future, any civil penalty to follow a spiritual sentence; yet the powers of this executive of the Assembly were very real, and extended to deposition from function and benefice. To the south of the Tay the visitation proceeded without disturbance or scandal. It was not so in the north. The moderation of the Assembly was not reflected in the Commission; and the Presbyterian fervour, which had bridled itself in Edinburgh, ran riot through the northern provinces, driving out ministers, shutting up churches, stirring evil and sectarian passions, under the cloak of enforcing ministerial purity and efficiency. Where the incumbent was Episcopal, it is to be feared charges of negligence, or immorality, or heterodoxy, were only too readily framed and sustained.

What with the number expelled by the Privy Council for refusing to acknowledge William and Mary, and those extruded on various pleas by the Commissions, the Church in the north was stripped of a host of her clergy, whose places no

new race of candidates had yet arisen to supply. In some of the northern parishes, when substitutes for the deprived incumbents were found, the people, resenting the loss of the ordinances of religion through the expulsion of their old pastors, resisted, and sometimes successfully, for months, and even years, the induction of the new. At Inverness, for example, which, though the capital of the Highlands, was then but a wretched village of some five hundred thatched houses, the people defied for no less than ten years the attempts of the Presbytery to settle a minister among them. At Inch, upon the parish falling vacant, the parishioners called an Episcopalian curate, who did not even take the oaths to government, but who remained in possession of the living for many years. And these were not solitary cases.

Those Episcopal curates who had accepted the terms of the government and remained in their parishes, were not allowed to act as members of the Church courts. The Presbyteries, accordingly, in the north, where Episcopacy was strong, were mere skeletons. The whole Synod of Aberdeen, comprising eight Presbyteries, had to concentrate itself into one; and even after the lapse of seven years, could only muster sixteen clerical members. The desire to increase the strength of the Presbyteries, no doubt, was one of the motives which spurred the zeal of the Commission to substitute Presbyterian for Episcopal parsons. But the bad blood engendered by the process began to inflame the whole body of the Church and State.

William was inclined to suspect the Commissioners of harshness and injustice, and to blame the general temper and policy of the Presbyterians. The relations between the Crown and the Church became strained. The annual meeting of the Assembly was postponed by the royal command. The Church grumbled at this interference with its right of convening at its own pleasure. When at last the king summoned a meeting for 15th January 1692, the members assembled in a some-

what irritated and irreconcilable mood, which was not soothed by the receipt of a royal letter urging them to admit the Conformist Episcopal ministers into the Church courts, on subscribing a simple formula, of which the king sent them the draft. The Assembly consigned the formula to the consideration of a committee—a method of indirect strangulation still dear to the heart of that venerable court—and having by the 13th of February done nothing else, was abruptly dissolved by the Commissioner, who declined even to name a day for its next meeting. This was a direct repudiation, by the Crown, of the Church's claim of a right to hold its annual Assembly; and also rendered impossible that harmonious coincidence by which the Commissioner and the Moderator, each naming the same day, evaded any conflict of jurisdiction or confusion of dates. The Moderator, in spite of the Commissioner's refusal, appointed the next Assembly to be held in August 1693. This was a mere assertion of the Church's rights. When the day came, no attempt was made to hold an Assembly. Before the critical date, Parliament had intervened with an Act 'for settling the quiet and peace of the Church,' in which provision was made for the summoning of an Assembly by the sovereign. While, by this clause, the Act averted the impending danger of a direct collision between the royal and ecclesiastical authority; by another, it provided for the admission to a share in the government of the Church of those Episcopal incumbents who should subscribe the engagements set forth in the Act. One of these was the 'Oath of Assurance'—a new declaration which had been devised to circumvent those who made a distinction between a king *de facto* and a king *de jure*, and who were ready to own William in the one sense, but not in the other. The oath of assurance expressed allegiance to him as king both *de facto* and *de jure*. No one was to sit in the Assembly unless he had taken this oath.

This enactment, so far from helping to settle the quiet and peace of the Church, produced nothing but ill-will and

clamour. It exasperated Presbyterian and Episcopalian alike. What right had 'Cæsar' to make a civil oath the condition of entrance to an ecclesiastical court? Was it to be borne that a king, by popular election, should wring from the exigencies of an ill-used priesthood a renunciation of the sacred doctrine of hereditary right? The remonstrances of the clergy, however, had no effect. The Assembly was summoned for the 29th March 1694; and the Commissioner was instructed to exact the oath, and if it was refused, to dissolve the Assembly. The crisis was perilous. The Crown was inexorable; the Church's patience was exhausted; the perfervid Scotch blood was stirred. But for some averting providence, Church and State must come into fatal collision, and the Revolution Settlement perish in the crash. The averting providence took the shape of the Church's best and wisest friend, William Carstares. Among the events of a somewhat monotonous and unpicturesque period, the episode of his interposition is sufficiently striking to excuse its being once more related, in the words of his first biographer, M'Cormick. The Commissioner, Lord Carmichael, he tells us, had been assured by the clergy that they could not and would not give in. He 'saw that all his attempts to bring them to better temper would be vain and fruitless. At the same time, he was sensible that the dissolution of the Assembly would not only prove fatal to the Church of Scotland, but also to his Majesty's interest in that kingdom. From a sincere regard to both, therefore, he undertook to lay the matter, as it stood, fairly before the king; and, for that purpose, sent off a flying packet, which he expected to return from London, with the king's final determination, the night before the Assembly was appointed to meet. At the same time, the clergy sent up a memorial to Carstares, urging him to use his good offices, in this critical conjuncture, for the preservation of that Church which he had so active a hand in establishing.

'The flying packet arrived at Kensington in the forenoon of that day upon which Carstares returned [he having been absent

from Court]. But before his arrival, his Majesty, by the advice of Lord Stair and Lord Tarbat, who represented this obstinacy of the clergy as an act of rebellion against his government, had renewed his instructions to the Commissioner, and sent them off by the same packet.

‘When Carstares came to Kensington and received his letters, he immediately inquired what was the nature of the despatches his Majesty had sent off for Scotland ; and, upon learning their contents, he went directly, and, in his Majesty’s name, required the messenger, who was just setting off, to deliver them up to him. It was now late at night ; and, as he knew no time was to be lost, he ran to his Majesty’s apartment ; and, being informed by the lord-in-waiting that he was gone to bed, he told him it was a matter of the last importance which had brought him at that unseasonable hour, and that he must see the king.

‘Upon entering the chamber, he found his Majesty fast asleep, upon which, turning aside the curtain, and falling down upon his knees, he gently awaked him. The king, astonished to see him at so late an hour, and in this posture by his bedside, asked him what was the matter ? He answered he had come to ask his life. “And is it possible,” said the king, “that you have been guilty of a crime that deserves death ?” He acknowledged he had, and then produced the despatches he had brought back from the messenger. “And have you,” says the king, with a severe frown—“have you indeed presumed to countermand my orders ?” Carstares begged leave only to be heard a few words, and he was ready to submit to any punishment his Majesty should think proper to inflict.’ He then entered into an exposition of the situation of the Church in Scotland, and of the arguments against the oath, which M’Cormick gives at length ; and at the close of which, ‘the king, having heard him with great attention, gave him the despatches to read, and desired him to throw them in the fire ; after which, he bade him draw up the instructions to the Commissioner in what terms he pleased, and he would sign

them. Carstares immediately wrote to the Commissioner, signifying that it was his Majesty's pleasure to dispense with putting the oaths to the ministers; and, when the king had signed it, he immediately despatched the messenger, who, by being detained so many hours longer than he intended, did not arrive in Edinburgh till the morning of the day fixed for the sitting of the Assembly.

'By this time, both the Commissioner and the clergy were in the utmost perplexity. He was obliged to dissolve the Assembly; they were determined to assert their own authority independent of the civil magistrate. Both of them were apprehensive of the consequences, and looked upon the event of this day's contest as decisive with respect to the Church of Scotland; when, to their inexpressible joy, they were relieved by the return of the packet, countermanding the dissolution of the Assembly. Next to the establishment of Presbytery in Scotland, no act of King William's administration endeared him so much to the Presbyterians as this.'

This incident, as I have remarked elsewhere, marked a crisis in the history of the Church. Henceforth the Presbyterians believed in William's honesty and good-will, as they had not believed before. They were now convinced of his firm intention to maintain Presbytery, and of their own secure position. Conscious of a confirmed power, they were able to use it with greater generosity. The Assembly proceeded to receive, and empowered its Commission also to receive, the Episcopal clergy who should apply for reception upon the reasonable terms recently approved by Parliament. Those who thus conformed were amicably admitted. Many of those who would not conform were allowed, and even entitled, under the protection of an Act of the Parliament of 1695, to remain, and to officiate in their parishes, though debarred from a place in the Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies, in which the Presbyterian government was vested. The waste and empty places were gradually reached, and filled up. In the north, force was no longer employed to



expel Episcopal, or to intrude Presbyterian, incumbents. The complete organisation of one homogeneous establishment was left to the healing and restoring influences of time. That no harsh pressure was used to hasten the action of these, and that the policy and practice of the Church were vastly more lenient after the Revolution than after the Restoration, is sufficiently attested by the fact that even as late as 1710 there were one hundred and thirteen Episcopal ministers, of whom nine had not even taken the prescribed oaths to government, still ministers of parishes; and that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not celebrated in Aberdeen, according to the Presbyterian use, until the year 1704. The Episcopal Church, as a Church, was now, however, practically broken up. Those of its clergy who conformed were henceforth politically powerless, and were merged, more or less completely, in the Establishment. Those who kept aloof, and who maintained a furtive relation to the surviving bishops of the deprived Episcopate, became, in the natural development of their original tendency, a body of political dissidents, whose bond of union was primarily Jacobitism, and only in a far inferior degree, Episcopacy. The lonely exile at St Germain's was the true source of the Scotch Episcopacy of the eighteenth century. The Scotch Episcopacy of the nineteenth has no longer any sympathy with, in few cases has it any knowledge of, its own historical ancestry. It retains no relic or recollection of its old Scotch simplicity of ritual, and of its Calvinistic creed. It acknowledges no admiration of the royal absolutism, to which it owed its temporary establishment. It has adopted the English Articles, and has clothed itself with all the forms of Anglicanism of which it could lay hold. It owes its vitality now to causes which did not exist, and were not even thought of in 1694; but it is still, as it has always been, essentially an alien on Scottish soil; and in any of the great movements of thought, whether theological or political, exercises but little influence. That midnight interview of Carstares and William decided that, for evil

or for good, Scotland in future was to be emphatically Presbyterian.

Since that critical year of 1694, there has been no break in the regular annual meetings of the General Assembly, under the sanction of the sovereign, as represented by the Lord High Commissioner. There has been no attempt to subvert the arrangement by which—the Moderator and the Commissioner each naming the same day for its next meeting—the independence of the Church and the prerogative of the Crown are mutually recognised and adjusted.

The period between this year and that of the Union is not marked by any special interest. The Assembly of 1694 began a process (which was continued, with intervals, up to 1711) of exacting, with a growing stringency, from both ministers and elders subscription to the Confession of Faith. An overture approved by this Assembly contains the earliest draft of the formula, which was subsequently required from ministers and elders; and which, originally devised with a view to scare undesirable Episcopal applicants, or, at least, to entrap them into professions of orthodoxy, has bequeathed an embarrassment to the Church in days when no such safeguards are required. Orthodox zeal took a more untoward form, when it prompted the sacrifice on its cruel altar of a foolish lad of eighteen, who had rendered himself amenable to a savage law of Charles II., by spouting some juvenile irreverences about certain doctrines of the Church. A great deal has been made of his execution, as an index of the relentless and persecuting temper of the Presbyterian clergy. Lord Macaulay, in particular, has described their part in Aikenhead's unhappy fate, with much rhetorical exaggeration, and says, 'Wodrow has told us no blacker story of Dundee.' The lad, it must be remembered, was condemned, not by the Church, but by the High Court of Justiciary; and recent investigation has proved that the voice of the clergy was by no means raised so unmercifully and unanimously against him, as the eloquent historian has represented.

That the spirit of the dominant religion, as embodied in the clergy of the Revolutionary Epoch, was somewhat harsh, intolerant, and narrow, it would be vain to deny. Persecution does not favour the growth of 'sweetness and light.' Breadth of Christian culture and charity is not developed under penal laws. 'The ministers of the Revolution,' as Mr Hill Burton justly says, 'were no more a fair specimen of the literary fruit of the Presbyterian system, than the fugitives of a routed force are a fair specimen of the discipline and morality of an army.' Nor were they a fair specimen of that noble type of character, of which the Church had since the Reformation produced many shining examples, in which unselfish patriotism and varied learning illustrate personal piety and charity. It says much for the statesmanlike ability and governing power of Carstares, that out of the somewhat rough materials, that lay to his hand, he was able to build up the fabric of the restored Church so skilfully as he did, and to keep so steadily to the rule of 'Moderation.' It says much for the substantial reasonableness and good principle of the clergy—despite their defects in culture, in tolerance, in the 'philosophic mind'—that amongst a people which still believed in witchcraft there were no serious outbreaks of religious bigotry; that in a country seething with Jacobite intrigues, and national discontents, and preyed upon by a gigantic pauperism, there was no explosion of political or social disorder. The earlier fathers and leaders of the Church, of whom you have heard, reckoned among their number many men of marked genius, learning, and literary power. There is no greater name than Buchanan's among the names of the European scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Melville, Baillie, Rutherford, Calderwood, Gillespie, were all learned divines and accomplished men of letters; and there were many of the same class and character among the Churchmen of the first half of the seventeenth century. But we find no such names in the roll of the Revolution clergy. The greatest man among them, Carstares, was a good scholar,

and had enjoyed the advantage of the best training that Holland—that generous nurse and shelter of Presbyterianism—could afford him; but his destiny and the bent of his mind led him to the region of diplomacy and politics—ecclesiastical and secular—and not of literature. The most prolific writer of the period, Wodrow, cannot take high rank among scholars and authors. The theological and literary dearth is not relieved by the superabundance of controversial pamphleteering—of all forms of literary activity the most barren and unedifying.

Yet it is to the Church at this era of intellectual sterility—as far as its literature is concerned—that we owe the measures which have done more than any other to develop the intellectual life of our country. Public education had been neglected during the internecine strifes of Prelacy and Presbytery. Now, however, the Assembly and the Parliament found time and opportunity to carry out, at last, one long-postponed portion of Knox's great scheme of Education. Since the Restoration, no effort had been made to establish the system of parochial schools: but the Church of the Revolution was not content until Parliament had passed an Act compelling the heritors of every parish to erect and endow a parish school; which was followed by an Act of Assembly enjoining Presbyteries to see this law obeyed. It was duly carried out, and the result was soon apparent. 'It made,' says Mr Lecky, in his *England in the Eighteenth Century*, 'the average level of Scotch intelligence superior to that of any other part of the Empire.' Now that the system, which brought such good for our forefathers, has been superseded by another, it is well to remember that they owed it to the Church of the Revolution.

The industrial and commercial life of Scotland, which had long been paralysed by the distractions of the country, began to revive after the re-establishment of the National Church, but had scarcely grown into any strength or stature, when it was stupefied by the crushing disaster of Darien. The only hope of

its renewal lay in a union with England. Social and political ambition, commercial enterprise, and the desire to secure the Protestant succession to the throne, all pointed in the same direction.

The Church had no liking for closer connection with Prelatic England; but wise Churchmen knew that Established Presbytery had nothing to lose by being made a part of the constitution of the United Kingdom, and put under the protecting wing of the stable legislature of Great Britain. The Church's interests, in prospect of the Union, had often engaged the Scottish Parliament; and Belhaven and his friends had been zealous to maintain that the treaty offered no security to the Church adequate to the danger which she would incur. The Jacobites eagerly tried to fan the flame of discontent and apprehension; but the great majority of the clergy were wise, and were wisely counselled by Carstares, who after William's death had come to Scotland to be the Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and minister of this ancient church. They refused to be led away by the zeal of injudicious allies or the false sympathy of covert foes. The Commission of the General Assembly, which, in virtue of its ordinary powers, continued to act when the Assembly was not in Session, represented the Church during the progress of the treaty with calmness and dignity; and in its addresses to Parliament temperately stated those points in the measure which were considered defective. The Commission complained of the English Sacramental Test as the condition of holding civil and military office, and urged that no oath or test of any kind, inconsistent with Presbyterian principles, should be required from Scottish Churchmen. They recommended that an obligation to uphold the Church of Scotland should be embodied in the Coronation Oath. They represented the necessity of a 'Commission for the Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Teinds;' and they concluded their fullest and most formal representation with an intimation

that knowing, as they did, that twenty-six bishops sat in the House of Lords, which, on the conclusion of the treaty would have jurisdiction in Scottish affairs, they desired to state, with all respect, but all firmness, that it was contrary to the Church's 'principles and covenants' that 'any Churchman should bear civil offices and have power in the Commonwealth.'

These representations had due effect. The bench of bishops of course could not be removed. The operation of the Test Act in England could not be meddled with, though its scandal and injustice were undeniable; but as a kind of equivalent for this grievance, and to guard the Scotch universities and schools against the dreaded infection of Prelacy, it was enacted that every professor and teacher should, ere his admission, subscribe the Confession of Faith as the confession of his faith, and bind himself, in the Presbytery's presence, to conform to the discipline and worship of the Established Church. It was provided that the unalterable establishment and maintenance of the Presbyterian Church should be stipulated by an Act prior to any other Act that should ratify the treaty, and should then be embodied in the Act of ratification; and that the first oath the British sovereign should take, on his accession, and before his coronation, should be an oath to maintain 'the government, worship, discipline, rights, and privileges of the Church of Scotland.' The minor points, as to kirks and teinds, were satisfactorily disposed of, and the Church saw her firmness and moderation crowned with an adequate success.

A General Assembly had been held in the spring of 1707, ere yet the Act of Union had come into operation. There is no reference to the Union in its printed records; and we may conclude that its leaders, finding that their brethren would not bless the treaty, thought it best to pass it by in silence. Their patriotic calmness and self-control were highly appreciated by the government; which was well aware that had the clergy thrown their influence into the same scale with the popular

passion and hatred of the Union, it never could have been accomplished.

By the time the Assembly of 1708 met, the ancient Parliament, which the ecclesiastical Convention had so often controlled, so often withstood, had passed away for ever. With the demise of the Scottish Legislature much of the strength and glory of the Supreme Court of the Church departed. The Assembly could never again expect to influence the British, as it had influenced the Scottish, Parliament. The leaders of Scotch political life, attracted to St Stephen's, and exposed there to all the influences of English society and of a powerful and predominant Episcopacy, were no longer likely to take their seats as elders in the Scotch Church court, and to lend their weight to its deliberations.

It was of importance that the first Assembly that met in these altered circumstances should choose as its president one whose Presbyterianism and Churchmanship had stood keen tests, and who yet enjoyed the confidence of the government, and had been a promoter of the Union, and who, by the worth of his character and dignity of his position, would do honour to the Moderator's Chair. The choice naturally fell upon Carstares.

The queen's letter to the Assembly made no special reference to the Union, although referring, in commendation, to the 'zeal and affection' which the Church had shewn, during the recent attempt at a French invasion in the Jacobite interest. Neither in the Acts of Assembly, nor in its address to the queen, is the great change in the constitution of the nation named. Carstares' opening speech is occupied with the threatened invasion, rather than with the abolished Legislature and the new condition of things. 'The Presbyterians of Scotland,' he said, 'have too great a concern for the Protestant Churches, and too great a detestation of Popery and tyranny, and see and hear of too many dismal instances of French government, not to have an abhorrence both of the designs of Versailles and the pretences of St Germain's.'

This avoidance of a subject which could not but be uppermost in all men's minds indicates no indifference to it, nor any unanimity regarding it; it rather reveals a state of feeling and opinion in which it was tacitly admitted that the subject could not be approached without danger. National pride had been too recently wounded, ecclesiastical jealousy too freshly irritated, the practical effects of the Union, in Church and State, in society and in trade, too little tested, to allow of any body of Scottish Presbyterians giving it an unprejudiced discussion. Carstares' wisdom and moderation were rewarded by, as they were reflected in, the dignified reticence of the first post-Union Assembly. The predominating control of that great Moderate party, which he had largely helped to consolidate, and which he now led—a control that was to last for more than a century—was already established.

I have reached my limit. If, throughout this lecture, and now at its close, I should be thought to have trenched too much on the domain of civil history, it must be remembered that the rights of the people were inseparably connected with their Church's cause; and that it was, in point of fact, the sturdy Presbyterianism of Scotland, of which their Church was the embodiment, that won the liberties of the Revolution, and secured the blessings of the Union.