



BX 9070 .L43 1860 v.2
Lee, John, 1779-1859.
Lectures on the history of
the Church of Scotland

LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT

BY THE LATE

✓
VERY REV. JOHN LEE, D.D. LL.D.

PRINCIPAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

WITH NOTES AND APPENDICES FROM THE AUTHOR'S PAPERS

EDITED BY HIS SON

THE REV. WILLIAM LEE

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

MDCCCLX

CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

LECTURE XIII.

PAGE

Episcopacy introduced by the convention at Leith—John Douglas appointed Archbishop of St Andrews—Knox's disapproval of the appointment—Dissatisfaction of the Church—Death of Knox—Regency of the Earl of Morton—His relations to the Church—Resolution to frame a constant policy—Arrival of Andrew Melville in Scotland—His speech on Episcopal Church Government in 1575—Conclusions agreed upon by the Assembly—Visitors appointed—Functions of these office-bearers—Adamson, Archbishop-elect of St Andrews—Refuses to be tried by the Assembly—Progress of the Second Book of Discipline—James assumes the government—Struggles between the Court and the Church—Episcopal office abolished by the Assembly—First edition of the Bible printed in Scotland—The National Covenant, 1

LECTURE XIV.

Object of the King's Confession—Scheme for the erection of Presbyteries, the redistribution of parishes, and provision for the Ministry—Second Book of Discipline engrossed in the Register—Exposition of its general principles—First erection of Presbyteries—Reformation of the University of St Andrews—General Assembly of October 1581, 34

LECTURE XV.

Foundation of the University of Edinburgh—Appointment of Robert Rollock as first master—The method of teaching adopted in Edinburgh—Raid of Ruthven—Influence of that event on the Church—Acts of the current Parliament of May 1584—Protested against by the Church—Petition for their repeal—Archbishop Adamson excommunicated—The ministers' alleged refusal to pray for Queen Mary, 67

LECTURE XVI.

General Assembly, June 1587—Proceedings of the Parliament in that year—Corruption of manners among the poor at this period—Complaint of the Assembly relative to the disposal of patronages—The King's professions of

	PAGE
attachment to Presbytery—Archbishop Adamson—Assemblies, 1591 and 1592—Meeting of Parliament—Act establishing Presbyterian government in Scotland—Importance of this Act—Prosperity of the Church from 1592 to 1596—Octavians—End of the sincere General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland,	93

LECTURE XVII.

Case of David Black—Declinature by the ministers of the King's jurisdiction in matters spiritual—Tumult in Edinburgh—Convention at Perth—General Assembly at Dundee, 1597—Progress of the King's measures for altering the constitution of the Church—Arrogant proceedings of the general commissioners appointed by the Assembly—Act for giving the Ministry a vote in Parliament—Gowrie conspiracy,	125
---	-----

LECTURE XVIII.

Succession of James to the English crown—Severe measures against the Presbyterian ministers in Scotland—The millenary petition—The conference at Hampton Court—Dr Barlow's account of the conference—Book of canons of 1604—Persecution of the English Puritans a presage of the King's subsequent proceedings in Scotland—Act of the Parliament of Perth regarding the restitution of the estate of bishops,	150
---	-----

LECTURE XIX.

Protestation against the Act restoring the estate of bishops—The reasons of the protest—Assembly at Linlithgow, 1606—Appointment of permanent moderators for presbyteries and synods—erection of the High Commission Court—The right of ordination and other powers conferred on bishops by the Assembly—The oath of canonical obedience—Consecration of the bishops—Visit of the King to Scotland—Parliament of June 1617—Protestation against further innovations,	173
--	-----

LECTURE XX.

Perth Assembly, 1618—Order of procedure—Interference with the freedom of debate in the Assembly—The vote—Articles of Perth—Accuracy of Calderwood's account of the proceedings—Refusal of the people, and many ministers, to conform to the new ceremonies—The Articles ratified by Parliament—Severities against Nonconformists—Death of James VI.	197
---	-----

LECTURE XXI.

Character of Charles I.—His resolution to enforce the Articles of Perth—Representation from the ministers to the King on the decrease of communicants—Archbishop Laud—Further innovations in Scotland contemplated—Severities against Nonconformists—Sufferings of Dr Alexander Leighton—The Scottish bishops at this period—The King's visit to Scotland—Introduction of the English liturgy into the Chapel-royal,	220
--	-----

LECTURE XXII.

PAGE

Laud's influence over the Scottish bishops—Introduction of the Book of Canons and the Scottish Liturgy—Tumult in Edinburgh—The Tables—Renewal of the National Covenant—Mission of the Marquess of Hamilton—General Assembly of 1638—The King has recourse to arms,	242
--	-----

LECTURE XXIII.

First campaign of the Covenanters—Proceedings of the General Assembly of 1639—Proposal for a uniformity of worship and discipline in England and Scotland—Westminster Assembly of Divines—Commissioners from Scotland to the Westminster Assembly—Solemn League and Covenant—Scottish Covenanters,	268
--	-----

LECTURE XXIV.

Protest of the Church of Scotland against the King's trial—Controversies between the Presbyterians and the Sectaries—Disputes in the Westminster Assembly respecting Church government—Conclusions of the English Parliament—Papers between Charles I. and Alexander Henderson—The Engagement—Resolutioners and Protesters—New mode of preaching introduced by Robert Leighton and Hugh Binning—Restoration of Charles II.—James Sharp—Episcopacy restored in Scotland,	296
---	-----

LECTURE XXV. ✓

Re-establishment of Episcopacy—The new bishops—Burnet's character of the silenced ministers, and of their successors—Penal laws against English Nonconformists—Court of high commission in Scotland—Military violence—Proposals for an accommodation—The Indulgence—Laws against conventicles—Sufferings of the Covenanters—The Cameronians—The Test Act—The Revolution Settlement,	319
---	-----

APPENDIX.

No.		
X.	George Buchanan,	345
XI.	The Views of the Church of Scotland relative to Forbidden Degrees in Marriage,—Marriage with the Sister of a Deceased Wife,	355
XII.	Demand for Books in Scotland after the Reformation,	361
XIII.	Claims of the Church of Scotland to an Independent and Co-ordinate Jurisdiction with the State,	365
XIV.	Notes on Church Patronage,	378
XV.	Early Records of the General Assemblies,	387

No.	PAGE
XVI. Provision for the Poor, and Expenditure of Kirk-Session Funds in Scotland,	392
XVII. Extracts from Proceedings of Church Courts, showing how the laws against Sabbath-breaking were administered in Scotland,	406
XVIII. Extracts and Notes relating to the Second Book of Discipline,	416
XIX. Forms relating to the Settlement of Ministers, from the Book of the Presbytery of Haddington, 1590, &c.,	422
XX. Notices of Parochial Schools in the Church Records of the 16th and 17th centuries,	428
XXI. State of the Church from the year 1648 to the year 1661,	442



LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

LECTURE XIII.

EPISCOPACY INTRODUCED BY THE CONVENTION AT LEITH—JOHN DOUGLAS APPOINTED ARCHBISHOP OF ST ANDREWS—KNOX'S DISAPPROVAL OF THE APPOINTMENT—DISSATISFACTION OF THE CHURCH—DEATH OF KNOX—REGENCY OF THE EARL OF MORTON—HIS RELATIONS TO THE CHURCH—RESOLUTION TO FRAME A CONSTANT POLICY—ARRIVAL OF ANDREW MELVILLE IN SCOTLAND—HIS SPEECH ON EPISCOPAL CHURCH GOVERNMENT IN 1575—CONCLUSIONS AGREED UPON BY THE ASSEMBLY—VISITORS APPOINTED—FUNCTIONS OF THESE OFFICE-BEARERS—ADAMSON, ARCHBISHOP-ELECT OF ST ANDREWS—REFUSES TO BE TRIED BY THE ASSEMBLY—PROGRESS OF THE SECOND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE—JAMES ASSUMES THE GOVERNMENT—STRUGGLES BETWEEN THE COURT AND THE CHURCH—EPISCOPAL OFFICE ABOLISHED BY THE ASSEMBLY—FIRST EDITION OF THE BIBLE PRINTED IN SCOTLAND—THE NATIONAL COVENANT.

The convention of the Church which was held at Leith in January 1571 (or 1572, according to our mode of calculation), authorised, as we have seen, a form of policy very different from that which had been traced in the First Book of Discipline. Who was the original contriver of this scheme is not known with any certainty ;

LECT.
XIII.
—
1571-(2.)

LECT.
XIII.
1571-(2.)

but as the Commissioners for the Church and for the Privy Council met only a very short time, it is to be presumed that all the articles were preconcerted. It was resolved that archbishops and bishops should be appointed to the same dioceses as before the Reformation, but that their jurisdiction should not be more extensive than that of the superintendents. The superintendents were not to be superseded by the bishops, but the bounds of their provinces were abridged. The mode of electing bishops is particularly described. Twenty-one persons were nominated to be the chapter of the Archbishop of St Andrews, after the death of the then convent of the abbey, consisting of the same number. So many of the old chapter as were still alive and were ministers, were to continue in the chapter during their lives—namely, the dean, Robert Stuart, bishop of Caithness, commendator of the priory (afterwards Earl of March), John Wynram, prior of Portmoak, and eight or nine more.

John
Douglas
appointed
Arch-
bishop of
St An-
drews.

Part of this arrangement was intended to prepare the way for the regular admission of John Douglas, provost of the New College, to the dignity of Archbishop of St Andrews, who is said to have given proof of his gift by preaching in the church of St Andrews. He had been previously nominated to that station, and had been required to vote in the parliament which sat at Stirling the former year. The superintendent of Fife prohibited him to vote, and threatened him with excommunication. Morton charged him to do his duty as a peer of Parliament, under pain of treason. Douglas appears to have been a man whose mind was never strong, but who, by accommodating himself easily to the opinion of others,

had been allowed, in times of the greatest discord and commotion, to occupy stations of eminence and authority without giving offence to the great, or exciting the envy of his inferiors. He was now advanced in life; and after having long enjoyed the quiet of an academical retreat, in which, though he could not possibly be idle, he had comparatively few opportunities of mingling with the world, he can scarcely be conceived to have formed the requisite qualifications for holding the exalted rank of primate of Scotland. But this method of judging is excessively vague and uncertain. All the accounts of Douglas which I have ever seen in modern books abound with errors. He is represented as having been an obscure Carmelite friar whom the Earl of Argyle chose to employ as his chaplain, and for whom the Archbishop of St Andrews expressed the strongest aversion. He was quite a different man—a man of family undoubtedly, and most probably related to James Douglas the Earl of Morton, son of Sir George Douglas of Pinky, and, like him, a branch of the great family of Angus. He had maintained his influence under a succession of different governments both in the Church and in the State. He had been indebted for his preferment in the university to the partiality of James Stuart, commendator of the priory (afterwards Earl of Murray), who, with the brethren of his convent, possessed the patronage of the college during the vacancy of the archiepiscopal see which succeeded the murder of Cardinal Beaton. He had been continued in his office when Archbishop Hamilton altered and extended the foundation, for the very purpose (as Crawford allows in his *Lives of the Officers of State*) of keeping up the spirit of Popery

LECT.
XIII.

1571-(2.)

Crawford's
*Lives of the
Officers of
State*, p.
377.

LECT.
XIII.
1571-(2.)

in the nation ; and indeed, almost immediately after Hamilton succeeded to the see, he had been advanced to the office of rector, which office, in opposition to the ancient statutes, he held without interruption not only for ten years preceding the Reformation, but for thirteen years after it. I do not imagine that he would have been continued in office after the Reformation, if his character had been understood, or if it had been easy to get rid of him. I have no doubt that it was in concert with him that the Earl of Morton prepared those articles which were submitted to the convention of Leith, and by them hastily approved. And it is believed on very strong grounds, that the superintendent of Angus, Erskine of Dun, though at first adverse to the introduction of episcopacy, was induced by regard to the head of his family, the Earl of Mar, at that time regent, to comply with a measure which he is understood to have inwardly disapproved. It was thus that the ties of relationship combined with the love of pre-eminence and the desire of augmenting the power of the Church, to obtain the consent of some of the leading men to a scheme of ecclesiastical discipline completely at variance with the views of the original Reformers.

Knox's dis-
approval of
the appoint-
ment.

Douglas was inaugurated as Archbishop of St Andrews on the 10th of February. The order observed was the same which was followed in the admission of superintendents. Knox refused to take any part in the ceremony, and was so much dissatisfied with the whole transaction, that he denounced anathema to the giver, and anathema to the receiver. It has been alleged, however, that the opposition of Knox did not result from disapprobation of Episcopacy itself as being hostile to the doctrine of Scripture, but

from his apprehension that the election of Douglas would only be a veil to conceal the robbery of the Church, and from a suspicion which he derived from his respected friend Theodore Beza, that the readmission of bishops might open a door to the restoration of Popery. As Wynram, who had generally been on habits of friendship with Knox, officiated at the consecration of Douglas, it has been also concluded that this could not have been done if Knox had been clearly convinced that the proceeding was altogether unwarrantable. It seems to me inconceivable that an upright man could approve of that conduct in a friend to which he had insuperable objections himself.

Douglas, along with his archbishopric, retained for two or three years the principality of the New College and the office of rector. When Knox heard that this multiplicity of functions was permitted by the General Assembly to be united in a person of whose abilities he was a competent judge, he lamented that an old man should be burdened with offices which twenty men of the best gifts were not able to bear; and he added emphatically, "He will be disgraced and wrecked." Douglas by this time (Calderwood says), "as he was unable of his body to travel, so was he more unable of his tongue to teach; yet little respect had the Court to the abilities of the person, so that commodity could be reaped by virtue of his title." It was insinuated by John Rutherford, principal of St Salvator's College, that Knox's disapprobation arose from envy, and that he would not have repined if the preferment had been granted to himself. On the following Sunday, Knox, in the course of his sermon, took notice of this injurious surmise, and said with that animation which never forsook him even in the

LECT.
XIII.

1571-(2.)

[Fundamental
Charter of
Presbytery,
pp. 114,
117.
Cook's His-
tory of the
Church of
Scotland,
i. 188.][Calder-
wood, p.
57.]

LECT.
XIII.

1572.

languor of sickness and the decay of his natural strength, "I have refused a greater bishopric than ever this was, which I might have had by the favour of greater men. It is true that I did repine for the discharge of my conscience, and I do still repine." It is understood that Knox might have been Bishop of Durham; and if he really thought so favourably of Episcopacy as some writers have pretended, it is very unaccountable that he should have declined an offer, the acceptance of which would have enabled him to exert his influence equally to the advantage of England and of his native country.

Soon after Douglas was promoted to the primacy, James Boyd was made Archbishop of Glasgow, John Paton was advanced to the bishopric of Dunkeld, and Andrew Graham to that of Dunblane.

Dissatisfac-
tion of the
Church.
[Booke of
the Univ.
Kirk, 238,
245.]

That the ministers were in general dissatisfied with these arrangements, is abundantly evident. In the Assembly which met at St Andrews about six weeks after the convention at Leith, twenty of them were appointed to meet in Knox's house, to take into consideration the heads of the agreement entered into with the commissioners of the Privy Council; but it does not appear that any report was made by this committee to the Assembly. Another Assembly met at Perth in the month of August following, in which a smaller committee was selected for the same purpose. It has sometimes been said that no objection was made to the essential parts of the system, and that, though a wish was expressed to change some of the titles as savouring of Popery, Episcopacy was in fact confirmed in this Assembly. How far this account is consistent with the protestation presented to the Assembly, does not require to be particularly

[Fund.
Charter of
Presb., p.
245.]

stated to those who have ever looked into this part of the records of our Church. The brethren appointed to revise the scheme protested that "the heads and articles agreed upon at Leith be only received as an *interim* till more perfect order may be obtained at the hand of the King's majesty's Regent and nobility, for which they will press as occasion shall serve." They also protested that, by using the names archbishop, dean, archdeacon, chancellor, chapter (and so on), which were "found slanderous and offensive to many of the brethren," they "did not mean to agree to any kind of papistry or superstition, wishing rather the names to be changed into other names that are not scandalous and offensive." To this protestation the whole Assembly in one voice adhered. The same brethren were continued for further revising of the conclusions till further opportunity. It is obvious, indeed, that the Church had this constitution forced upon it; and its acquiescence cannot fairly be construed into a voluntary acceptance of the scheme, which the Government had determined to impose. The new bishops had little power and little honour among their brethren. Their conduct was vigilantly marked, and several of them were accused for neglect of duty. The Bishop of Dunkeld even suffered deposition for dilapidation of benefices. It is a singular indication of the feelings of the Church generally towards the order, that, with the exception of Boyd, no bishop was ever chosen to be moderator of the General Assembly.

While the Church was thus in commotion, the strict presbyterians were thrown into deep despondency by the death of John Knox. His uncommon exertions had wasted his strength; and an attack of apoplexy which he had suffered some years before, though it

LECT.
XIII.

1572.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
246.]Death of
John Knox,
24th Nov.
1572.

LECT.
XIII.
1572.

did not impair the vigour of his faculties, rendered it imprudent for him either to expose himself to bodily fatigue, or to undertake intellectual labour. The death of the Regent Murray, and the massacre in France on St Bartholomew's day, depressed his manly spirit; but he never lost sight of his public duties, and when he found that his departure was rapidly approaching, he used all possible diligence to obtain a successor in his ministerial charge. The person on whom he fixed as being best qualified for the station was James Lawson, sub-principal and professor of philosophy at Aberdeen,—a man of no ordinary acquirements as a lecturer in the university, but still more eminent as a preacher of the gospel. The magistrates and the kirk-session of Edinburgh, guided by Knox's recommendation, gave an invitation to Mr Lawson, who arrived in time to be admitted to the charge by the extraordinary person whom he was chosen to succeed. This was the last act of his public life.^a I forbear to describe the concluding scene of his earthly existence, or to attempt a delineation of his character: I think it sufficient to refer you to the excellent account of his life published by Dr M'Crie, who has done much to illustrate the principles of the Reformers, and to whose

^a For a few weeks before Lawson's admission, Knox had been obliged by his increasing infirmity to transfer his public ministrations from St Giles' to the smaller church of the Tolbooth.

"Aug. 31, 1572.—Because his voice was feeble and waik, and therefore culd not be hard of the whole multitude that convened, he desired them to provide for that place, for he confessed that his voice was never able (the best time that ever he was) to extend to all that come together in St Geiles kirk, and mekle less now was

it able to satisfie the auditor, seeing that he was so waik, and his voice so far spent. Therefore he desyrit them that some other place might be appointed for him, where his voice might be hard, gif it were but unto ane hundred persons,—which afterwards was done."

"Sept. 21.—Mr Knox began and preached in the Tolbuith, whair he contineweth to preach every Sunday so lang as God gave him strenth." —[Bannatyne's *Memorials*, p. 263; Bann. ed.]

labours it is^a to be hoped that our Scottish literature will soon incur still greater obligations. The short funeral oration pronounced on Knox by the Earl of Morton has been often quoted,—“There lieth a man, who in his life never feared the face of man, who hath often been threatened with dag and dagger, but yet hath ended his days in peace and honour.”

LECT.
XIII.

1572.

The Earl of Morton, who was raised to the important office of Regent on the day of Knox's death, soon succeeded in reducing to submission the partisans of the Queen. For the purpose of more effectually crushing her adherents, an act of Parliament was passed, ordaining that none should henceforth be reputed loyal and faithful subjects to the King or his authority, but be punished as rebels, who did not give their confession in favour of the true religion,—and that those who had made defection from the obedience due to their sovereign should, before being restored to his Majesty's favour, make the profession of their faith anew, and promise to continue in the true religion in time coming, and to the utmost of their power maintain and assist the true preachers of the Word against all their enemies.^β

Earl of
Morton
appointed
Regent.Jan. 26,
1572-3.[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
72.]

The Regent never got the credit of having intended this or any other measure for the benefit of the Church. On the contrary, he took every opportunity of abridg-

His rela-
tions to the
Church.

^a [Feb. 10, 1817.]

^β [This was the first time when the subscription of the Confession of Faith was required by law. In the same Parliament another Act was passed ordaining “that the adversaries of Christ's evangel shall not enjoy the patrimony of the kirk.” This act peremptorily required that not only “every minister of the Word and sacraments, but every one having or

bruing any benefice, use of the fruits, stipend, pension, or portion furth of benefice, and not already under the discipline of the true kirk, shall give his assent, and subscribe the articles of religion contained in the acts of our sovereign Lord's Parliament, and give his oath for acknowledging and recognising our sovereign Lord his authority, and shall bring a testimonial in writing thereupon.”]

LECT.
XIII.

1573.

ing its power and diminishing its resources. He craftily withdrew from the ministers the thirds of benefices, on the pretence that he would provide a more convenient mode of supporting them by allocating a stipend to every one of them out of the teinds of the parish of which he had the charge. He promised that if this method were not found satisfactory, he would restore them to the possession of the thirds. But after he had laid his hands on this property, he evinced a determination to apply it to other purposes than the maintenance of the religious teachers. His plan was to require one minister to do the duty of two, three, or four churches, and to assign to him a very moderate income. As the minister preached in these different churches in rotation, a reader was appointed to each church, with a salary of from twenty to forty pounds Scots, to read prayers on those days when the minister was absent. The ministers could not obtain payment of their little allowances without continually importuning the Court—a most humiliating and irksome task, and very often unsuccessful. When the superintendents applied for their stipends, they were told disdainfully that their office was now unnecessary, as bishops were restored, with the jurisdiction of the dioceses. The course thus followed by the Regent tended to prevent the increase of labourers; and one of his devices for diminishing their number and their influence was the appointment of additional bishops to exercise a jurisdiction independent of the General Assembly.

The General Assembly, however, determined to resist this encroachment on its privileges. It refused to accept the resignation of any of the superintendents, and prohibited the bishops to interfere with the superintendents in their visitations without their consent

and approbation. Thus, though Perthshire and Lothian and Angus were in the see of St Andrews, the bishop was required to visit in Fife only. Wynram was appointed to visit Strathern, Spotswood to visit Lothian, and Erskine to visit Angus. Bishops, too, were bound to the same rules with superintendents in the collation of benefices; they were never to give collation without the consent of three qualified ministers within their province. The Assembly also ordained that "howbeit sundry kirks be appointed to one man, yet shall the minister make his residence at one kirk, which shall be properly appointed to his charge, and he shall be called principally the minister of that kirk; and as pertaining to the rest of the kirks to which he is nominated, he shall have the oversight thereof, and help them in such sort as the superintendent or commissioner shall think expedient, as occasion shall serve, from his own principal charge, which on no ways he may neglect, and this order is only to remain till God of his mercy shall send out more labourers to his harvest."

In the Assembly which met at Edinburgh 6th March 1573-4, it was resolved to take means to establish a constant policy for the Church. This was a work which occupied the attention of the ministers several years, and the result of their labours was the Second Book of Discipline. The age or incapacity of the bishops of this period prevented any strong opposition to the proposal. Douglas and Boyd, the archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, were both pronounced by the General Assembly unfit for their duty; and a few weeks afterwards, Douglas, having gone to the pulpit with the intention of preaching, dropped down dead.

LECT.
XIII.

1573.

[Booke of
the Univ.
Kirk, 294.]Second
Book of
Discipline.

LECT.
XIII.

1574.

Arrival of
Andrew
Melville in
Scotland.

In the year 1574, while the disputes concerning episcopal power were warmly agitated among some of the ministers, Andrew Melville, a man distinguished equally by his great erudition and his ardent temper, arrived from Geneva. He had been partly educated at St Andrews during the commotions attending the Reformation, and had gone to the Continent in early life to pursue those studies to which he was enthusiastically devoted. At Geneva he had become a favourite of Beza, who, when he expressed a desire to return to his native country, parted from him with the greatest reluctance, considering his departure as one of the greatest losses which the Swiss Church could suffer, though it promised, in his judgment, to be the greatest benefit to the Church of Scotland.

[Fund. Ch.
of Presb.,
254, 287.]

Episcopal writers represent the arrival of Melville as the date of the first attachment of this Church to presbyterian government; and they say it was by giving a high character to the discipline of Geneva that he persuaded most of the ministers to adopt the same sentiments with himself. One would conclude from their account that Knox had been a zealous admirer and promoter of prelacy, and that such a thing as parity of power had never been thought of till the influence of the first Reformers declined. The office of superintendents had in fact been rendered necessary in consequence of the paucity of ministers, and the distance of their abodes from one another. It was not possible for them to hold frequent presbyteries for the exercise of discipline, and the superintendents did the duty which afterwards devolved on the presbyteries. The experiment of governing the Church by bishops gave no satisfaction; but though the Church was continually censuring them for negligence and irregu-

larity, the Regent's support kept them in countenance, and prevented any attempts to reform the system. The Church had therefore no alternative, except either to acquiesce in those abuses which they had not the power to remedy, or to declare that they would no longer sanction a state of things which appeared to be inseparably connected with the grossest corruptions.

In the Assembly which met in 1574, it was ordained that bishops should be considered as pastors only of one parish. In the following year, according to the common account, John Dury, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, at the instigation of Andrew Melville, proposed a doubt with respect to the lawfulness of the episcopal function, and the authority of chapters in their election. After the business was thus opened, Melville, who was a member of the Assembly, being now appointed principal of the college of Glasgow, rose up and delivered a long speech, in which he affirmed that none should bear office in the Church except those whose designations are found in the Scriptures, and that though the title of bishop does occur in the New Testament, it does not denote an order of men superior to ministers. He concluded by saying, that so great were the corruptions in the state of bishops, that unless they were removed, religion could not be maintained in its purity. This opinion, supported by many powerful arguments, produced a deep impression on the Assembly, and six members were appointed to confer and reason upon the question. John Row, minister of Perth, George Hay, and David Lindsay, minister of Leith, were named to defend the lawfulness of Episcopacy. James Lawson, Knox's successor, John Craig, another minister of Edinburgh, and Andrew Melville, were chosen to support the con-

LECT.
XIII.

1574.

His speech
in the
General
Assembly
on Episco-
pal Church
government.

LECT.
XIII.

1575.

Conclusions
agreed upon
by the
Assembly.
[Booke of
the Univ.
Kirk, 342.]

trary opinion. After long and frequent discussions, they reported their conclusions to the Assembly in writing to the following purpose:—They thought it not fit to answer the question whether bishops, as they are now in Scotland, have their function from the Word of God; but if any bishop was chosen who had not qualities required by the Word of God, he should be tried by the General Assembly. They judged the name of a bishop to be common to all ministers that have the charge of a particular flock; and that, by the Word of God, his chief function consisted in the preaching of the Word, the ministration of the sacraments, and exercise of ecclesiastical discipline with consent of his elders. They judged further, that out of the number of ministers some one might be chosen to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds, besides his own flock, as the General Assembly should appoint, and that the ministers so elected might in those bounds appoint preachers, with advice of the ministers of the province, and the consent of the flock to which they were to be appointed,—as also, that he might appoint elders and deacons with the consent of the people. They found, lastly, that such a minister might, upon reasonable causes, and with consent of the ministers of the bounds, suspend ministers from the exercise of their office.

[Spotswood,
p. 276.]

These answers are less peremptory than we may conceive Melville desired; but they were such as must have been much less gratifying to the episcopalian party. Yet there were in this Assembly six bishops, besides two superintendents; and it is owned by Spotswood that they do not seem even to have opened their mouths in defence of their office. He supposes it possible that they expected the Regent to disconcert any scheme hostile to their interest, or that they

affected the praise of humility; but it is rather more likely that, as the highest talents were enlisted on the opposite side, they might be afraid of the disgrace of sustaining a public defeat.

The General Assembly about this time also resolved to change the commissioners of provinces from year to year, lest by continuing longer they should take a passion for pre-eminence, and fancy themselves entitled to permanent authority. All civil offices and avocations were condemned as being inconsistent with the character of ministers, and particularly the employment of collector or chamberlain under bishops, as being a distraction from their proper vocation. There might be another reason for discharging this occupation. It would have made a considerable number of the ministers in a great measure dependent on the bishops, and would thus have furnished them with a temptation to support the hierarchy.

In the Assembly which met in April 1576, it was represented that the bounds assigned to bishops, superintendents, and commissioners, were so great as to render the due exercise of discipline in every parish impracticable; and it was determined to appoint from time to time a more numerous class of ministers, to whom should be committed the charge of inspecting districts more moderate in their extent. These persons were denominated visitors. Their duty was nearly the same as that of commissioners. Every one of them was empowered to hold synodal assemblies, in which he was to sit as moderator; he was to try ministers, and to have the oversight of schools; in the bounds of his visitation he was to appoint ministers, with advice of the ministers of the province—at least of six of the most learned men in his bounds, or in the adjoining district,

LECT.
XIII.

1576.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
337.]

[Ib. 302.]

Visitors
appointed.
Petrie, 387.
Spot., 277.
[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
357.]

LECT.
XIII.

1576.

Origin of
Presby-
teries.

and with the consent of the people thus to be supplied with pastoral care. He was to take notice of the regular attendance on the weekly exercise and the reparation of churches, with such matters as pertained *ad decorum ecclesiae*. The appointment of the visitors was the first step to the erection of presbyteries. As the superintendents and commissioners presided in the provincial assemblies, which corresponded nearly to our synods, so three or four visitors within the bounds of a diocese, or synodal province, were the moderators of the smaller judicatories, to which, though the name of presbyteries was not then applied, nearly the same description of business was intrusted as is now committed to the presbyteries.

Patrick
Adamson,
Archbishop-
elect of St
Andrews,
refuses to
be tried by
the Assem-
bly.

One of the first great struggles between the Court and the General Assembly on the subject of church government arose out of the nomination of Patrick Adamson, who had lately been minister of Paisley, to succeed Douglas, archbishop of St Andrews.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
367, 385.
Spotswood,
277.]

Adamson was a man of acknowledged talents and learning. It was no slight tribute to his merit to have been selected by Buchanan to succeed him in the principality of St Leonard's College; and although the office was bestowed upon another, it must not be forgotten that the Privy Council of Scotland approved the nomination. He occupied a prominent, but, as we shall find, not always very creditable position, in the history of the Church for several years. It was proposed that, as bishop-elect, Adamson should be tried by the Assembly (according to the rule lately prescribed) before he was inaugurated or admitted by the chapter. He was asked if he would submit to the examination, and receive his office according to the injunctions and conditions registered in their books. He

answered that he could not; and when he was further pressed, he admitted that the Regent had discharged him to yield to any terms of accommodation. At the same time, the chapter received orders to elect him without regarding the mandates of the General Assembly. The Assembly required the Superintendent of Fife, with Robert Pont, James Lawson, and David Ferguson, as a special commission, to summon Adamson before them, to take cognisance of his usurpation of the episcopal office, and his desertion of his ordinary calling as a minister, and to report to the next General Assembly,—in the mean time prohibiting him to exercise the jurisdiction of a bishop.

LECT.
XIII.

1576.

The preparation of the Book of Discipline had not, meanwhile, been lost sight of. About this time more than twenty brethren were nominated by the Assembly to meet in different parts of the country, to prepare an overture on the policy and jurisdiction of the Church. They were repeatedly called to give an account of their progress, and it appeared that they had distributed the labour into different heads, assigning a particular portion of the work to every member of the committee. Liberty was given to all the ministers, whether on the committee or not, to communicate their views, and to reason either publicly or privately with those to whom the work had been intrusted, that every doubt might be removed before they digested the heads into a system.

Progress of
the Second
Book of
Discipline.

While these discussions were proceeding, the Regent was daily losing his influence over the nobility; and in March 1577 he was compelled to resign his authority into the hands of the King, who was now in his twelfth year. The change brought little advantage to the Church. The King had no sooner accepted

The King
assumes the
government.
His early
antipathy
to presby-
terian prin-
ciples.

LECT.
XIII.

1577.

the government, than he manifested that decided antipathy to the General Assembly and the presbyterian ministers which never forsook him. Morton, who soon regained a great ascendancy at Court, was believed to be secretly employed in fomenting and strengthening these prejudices of the youthful prince. The prospect of a succession to the English crown, and the desire of ingratiating himself with the churchmen of that nation, were probably the considerations which, if not already, at all events in more mature life, most powerfully swayed the King to aim at the supremacy over his native Church, and the establishment of uniformity of worship throughout the British dominions.

Episcopal
office abo-
lished by
the As-
sembly.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
pp. 397 and
404.]

The Assembly, however, proceeded as if they were determined to resist being dictated to by the Court. They employed themselves in collecting and maturing the different heads of the policy, and also in carrying out their opposition to the encroachments of Episcopacy. In October 1577 the scheme of church government was completed, with the exception of a few articles of minor importance, was solemnly approved by the Assembly, and ordered to be laid before the King. A few months afterwards they suppressed the titles of the bishops, and required every one of them to be called by their own names only. And when, in spite of the fair promises of James, who gave them to understand that he would not only concur with the Church in all things that might advance the true religion, but would ever be their protector and friend, nothing determinate could, after many conferences, be obtained from him or his Council, they resolved to act upon the Book of Discipline, and to proceed against all the bishops who opposed it. It is needless to enter in detail upon the discussions which took place. During their pro-

gress, a letter was sent to the General Assembly by the King, dated at Stirling 6th July 1579, requiring them to stay proceedings, and to refer all the matters still undetermined to the decision of the next Parliament. The concessions, however, which the Church had formerly made to the Court, were now found to have been used as weapons against themselves, and they perceived that the Court was only meditating greater encroachments on their privileges. In reply to the King's letter, they prayed for a further conference (to be conducted on his behalf by "persons unspotted with such corruptions as were desired to be reformed"); but they showed their determination at the same time to persevere in the steps which they had taken for the abolition of the episcopal order. The Assembly that met in Dundee in July 1580, unanimously found that the authority claimed by bishops was an antichristian usurpation, having no warrant in the Word of God, and that all who held the episcopal office should be charged to resign it on pain of excommunication. Most of the bishops complied with the order; but the minutes containing their submission were afterwards torn out of the register by the Archbishop of St Andrews.

[A number of the entries in the register about this time relate to the "Bassandyne Bible," the first edition of the holy Scriptures ever printed in Scotland, either in English or any other language.^a

LECT.
XIII.
1579.

First edition
of the Bible
printed in
Scotland.

For a long period the inhabitants of Scotland had no means of obtaining copies of the Scriptures, other-

^a [This account of the Bible of 1579 is supplied, in an abridged form, from the author's *Memorial for the Bible Societies*, to which work the reader is referred for full information on early

Scottish editions of the holy Scriptures, as well as for a number of incidental notices relating to the history of Scottish literature during the period embraced in these Lectures.—ED.]

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

wise than by importing them either from England or from the Continent. It is a well-known fact, that many copies of the translation by William Tyndale, first printed at Antwerp or Hamburg, about the year 1526, were introduced into Scotland, and were circulated and read with great avidity. Till it was remodelled in some degree by Cranmer, this version never obtained the approbation of the English government. Its author, through the influence of Henry VIII., was seized, imprisoned, and executed in the neighbourhood of Brussels; and the work, which had been repeatedly condemned in England during his life, was, in the year 1542, ordered by Parliament to be "forthwith abolished and forbidden to be used and kept." In the year subsequent to this enactment, an application was made to the Parliament of Scotland by part of the nobility and the commissioners of burghs, that it might be enacted "that it should be leasom (lawful) to every man to use the benefit of the translation which then they had of the Bible and Testament." The clergy generally resisted the proposal, and alleged that the translation referred to was not *true*; but according to the account of Knox, the only objection which they were able to produce was that the word *love* was substituted for *charity*. At last, as we have already seen, they were compelled to yield to the general voice; "and so, by Act of Parliament," says Knox, "it was made free to all men and women to read the Scriptures in their own tongue, or in the English tongue."

[Knox,
Hist., p.
34.]

It is somewhat difficult to decide what translations were used by some of our Scottish writers after the Act authorising the use of the English Bible. In the *Complaynt of Scotland*, written in 1548, the Scrip-

ture is frequently quoted from the Latin, which is inserted on the margin ; and the words introduced into the text bear little resemblance to any of the printed versions. Thus, Deut. xxviii. 22, &c., “ He sal persecut thee quhil he hef gart the perise, thou sal thole iniuries and spulze ; thou sal spouse ane wyfe, bot ane uthir sal tak hyr fra the be forse ; thou sal big ane house, bot thou sal nevyr dwel in it ; thy ox sal be slane befor thy ecene, and thou sal get nane of hym tyl eyt—the oncoutht ande straynge pepil sal eyt the frute of the eyrd that thou hes laborit,” &c. “ The Confession of Faith, compiled by M. Henry Balnaves of Halhill, one of the Lords of Session and Counsell of Scotland,” in the year 1548 (printed at Edinburgh in 1584), contains many passages of Scripture, apparently translated, or sometimes paraphrased, by the author himself. Thus, John iii. : “ God send not his Sonne into the world ; that he shold accuse, condemne, or judge the world ; but that the world should be made safe by him.” At the time these books were written, great difficulties must have been experienced in obtaining copies of the Bible from England, as the two kingdoms had been several years at war.

When the Reformation was established in Scotland, there was no English translation of the Bible, except that which had been originally executed by Tyndale and Coverdale, and which, having undergone several modifications, was successively published under the names either of Taverner, or Matthews, or Archbishop Cranmer, whose editions are generally denominated the Great Bible. The English refugees at Geneva, perceiving that “ most of the English Bibles were ill-translated and falsely printed,” undertook a new version, which was completed about the time when

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

Discourse
of the
troubles
begun at
Frankfort
in Germany,
A. D. 1554.

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

the first General Assembly met, in the year 1560 ; and it appears, from the early productions of Scottish divines, that this version was generally adopted in this country, as it was also to a very great extent in England.^a

It was not till five or six years after the Reformation in Scotland that any printer obtained a direct title to publish any part of the Scriptures in the language of the natives of the country, nor until the year 1575 that effectual means were employed for the

^a I may mention a few instances. (1.) John Knox seldom follows any of the printed translations very closely ; but it is evident that he had sometimes in his eye Tyndale's, and sometimes the Geneva version. His earliest publications appeared before the Geneva Bible existed. "The coppie of the ressoning betwix the Abbot of Crossraguell and John Knox in Mayboill, concerning the Masse in 1562," contains a quotation from the Geneva version on the title-page, and more frequently paraphrases than expressly transcribes the passages of Scripture employed in the argument. In a small work, written in 1568, and printed at St Andrews by Lekprevik in 1572, a few months before the Reformer's death, entitled, "An Answer to a Letter of a Jesuit named Tyrie, by Johne Knoxe," the Geneva Bible is almost uniformly quoted. (2.) David Fergusson, minister of Dunfermline, in his Answer to Renat Benedict, written in 1562, and printed in 1563 ; and also in his "Sermon preachit befor the Regent and Nobilitie, in the kirk of Leith, at the time of the General Assemblie, on Sunday the 13 of Januarii, Anno Do. 1571," has made use of the Geneva translation in the former tract, almost *verbatim* ; and in the Sermon, with the slight variations necessary to accommodate

the language to the Scottish pronunciation and idiom ; substituting *gif* for *if*, *quhilk* for *which*, *behauld* for *behold*, *teindis* for *tithes*, &c. (3.) A similar remark applies to the two volumes of Sermons by M. Robert Bruce, "printed be Robert Waldegrave, Printer to the King's Majestie. 1591, *Cum Privilegio Regali*." (4.) "The Sermons of Mr Robert Rollok, printed at Edinburgh by Henrie Charteris, 1599, *Cum Privilegio Regali*," have all the quotations from Scripture according to the Geneva version, altered nearly in the same manner as in the cases of Fergusson and Bruce, only the Scottish expression is somewhat broader. (5.) "An Exposition upon some Select Psalms of David, written by M. Robert Rollok, and translated out of Latine into English, by C. L. (Charles Lumisden), Minister of the Gospel of Christ at Duddingstone. Edinburgh, printed by Robert Waldegrave, Printer to the King's Majestie. 1600. *Cum Privilegio Regio*." This work exhibits admirable specimens of translations of fifteen psalms, probably from the original (for Lumisden, who was son-in-law to the famous Robert Pont, was a superior scholar) ; but when other parts of the Scripture are quoted, the translator generally adheres to the Geneva Bible.

attainment of this object. In that year an edition of the Old and New Testament, according to the Geneva version,^a was undertaken by two printers in Edinburgh, Alexander Arbuthnot and Thomas Bassandyne. The work was completed in 1759.

As this first Scottish edition of the Bible was brought out under the sanction and by the direct encouragement of the Church, it may be proper to give a short account of it. Its importance certainly in relation to the religious history of the country is not very great. If the people of Scotland had been dependent for copies of the Scriptures upon the operation of their own press, the comparatively late period of the publication of the first Scottish Bible, with the additional fact, which may here be also noticed, that no other edition was published in Scotland for the next thirty years, would have implied an indifference to religious knowledge, and a destitution of the means of religious

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

^a [It has been stated, on the authority of Mr Robert Wodrow, that the Bible undertaken to be printed by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne was not the Geneva version, but a new translation, executed under the auspices of, and authorised by, the General Assembly. The Bible printed by Arbuthnot and Bassandyne is, however, *verbatim* a Bible of the Geneva translation, with all the Geneva notes. Even the wood-cuts introduced into several parts of the Old Testament are fac-similes of the cuts in the Geneva Bible; and in the maps, the French words *orient, occident, aquilon, midi*, &c., are all retained. If the translation had been a new one, the rapidity of its execution would have been miraculous. The application was given in to the Assembly at the eleventh session. The day of the month is not mentioned; but the

Assembly began on the 7th of March 1574 (5). The Kirk promised to "deliver the authentic copy which they (the printers) shall follow, betwixt and the last day of April." This is an interval of only six weeks; and it is to be remarked that the Assembly named only six persons, or any three of them, to oversee every book before it be printed, and likewise to oversee the labours of others that have travelled therein, betwixt and the last of April. In the Assembly's Dedication, however, they expressly ascribed the translation to "the godlie men (of the nation of England for the maist part) banished from their country for the Gospel's cause, and convenient at Geneva, quha did faithfullie and learnedly translate this booke out of the pure fountaine of the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek tongues."]

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

[Knox, Hist.
p. 34.]

instruction, which we know were in fact very far from characterising this country in early times. How extensively the Scriptures were read in Scotland before any edition of them was printed in this country, we are assured on the most direct and unimpeachable authority. Referring to the period which followed the passing of the Act of 1542, Knox says, "Then mycht have been seen the Bybill lying upon maist every gentlemannis table. The New Testament was born about in mony menis hands;" and in the dedication to the edition of 1579 itself, the General Assembly speaks of the Bible as already being found "almaist in every private house." The truth is, that while the passion for reading in Scotland was greater in proportion to the population than it was in England, the facilities for importing Bibles as well as other books from that country and from the Continent, and the extent to which this traffic was carried, though they did not by any means supersede the operations of the Scottish press, abundantly supplied its deficiencies. Not only was the importation of books an established and privileged trade in Scotland,^a but books were printed in other countries,

^a [On the 25th of June 1591, John Norton, an Englishman, with his factors and servitors, received full power, liberty, and license from the King to continue to exercise and use his "tred and traffique of inbringing and selling of all sortis of bukis in all lantageis and provin scienceis within this realme."—*Reg. Sec. Sig.* lxxii. 88. Before this time I find that liberty to import books from England had been occasionally solicited by the government of Scotland. Thus we find among the Burleigh State Papers, in the collection of Lansdowne manu-

scripts, an application from the Regent of Scotland to the Lord Burghley for a license to one Hooper to carry books into Scotland, June 12, 1573. It appears also that Andrew Hart, in conjunction with John Norton, had been several years engaged in the speculation of importing books. Hart presented a petition to the Privy Council, 8th February 1589, representing the hurt sustained by the lieges through the scarcity of books, and to what exorbitant prices books had risen, which were brought from England, and sold in this realm at the

for the express purpose of supplying the Scottish market.^a Although, therefore, we cannot ascertain the extent of the demand for copies of the Scriptures in Scotland at this time, or the degree in which it was met, neither can, at all events, be estimated by means of any considerations connected with the date or number of editions printed in the country itself: both were probably very great. Ireland was far behind Scotland in point of religious instruction, as well as in attachment to the principles of the Reformation; yet, even in that country (as we are informed by Ware in his *Annals of Elizabeth*), so great was the desire of reading the Bible, that in the year 1566, John Dale, a bookseller, imported 7000 copies from London, and sold the whole within two years.

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

The following is the account preserved by Cal-

third hand, in consideration of which he and Norton enterprised two years before (in 1587) to bring books from Germany, whence England was chiefly supplied with the best books, and whence this town is furnished now with better books than heretofore, as cheap as they are sold in London. They asked to have their books custom free, as in all other States. The Lords ordained the *customers* of Edinburgh, and the other burghs and ports, to desist from asking custom for any books or volumes brought and sold by them within this realm, &c., a privilege confirmed by the Lords of Exchequer in 1597. On the subject of the demand for books in Scotland at the period referred to, the reader is referred to Appendix, No. XII.]

^a [*E. g.* On the rolls of June 1589, a gift was confirmed by the King to John Gibson, for "printing within the realm, or causing to be printed within or without the same, the Bible in our vulgar tongue, with the Psalm

Book, the double and single Catechise," and generally, all books tending to the glory of God and the good of the commonwealth. That he availed himself of his right to print *without* the realm appears from the preamble to another licence granted him in July 1599, in which it is stated that "John Gibson has, on his awin grit chargeis, and be his privat mean and devyse, *causit imprent within Middleburgh in Flanders* a new psalme buik in littil volume, containing baith the psalmes in verse, as likewise the same in prose upon the margin, in ane forme never practisit nor devisit in any heirtofor, and tending gritly to the furtherance of the trew religion." He therefore received "free and only licence and liberty to bring hame and sell the said impression, at convenient prices, for seven years."—*Reg. Sec. Sig.* lxxi. (See also *Supra*, vol. i. p. 34, *note*, and *Memorial for Bible Societies*, *passim*.)

LECT.
XIII.
1579.
Calder-
wood's MS.
Hist.

derwood of the proposals for printing Bassandyne's Bible, as laid before the General Assembly in March 1575, and in substance assented to by the Assembly :—

“ Anent the godly proposition made to the bishops, superintendents, visitors, and commissioners, in this General Assembly, by Alexander Arbuthnot, merchant burgess of Edinburgh, and Thomas Bassanden, printer and burgess of the said burgh, for printing and setting forward of the Bible in the English tongue, conforme to the proof given and subscribed with their hands ; it is agreed betwixt this present Assembly and the said Alexander and Thomas, that every Bible which they shall receive advancement for, shall be sold in albis for £4, 13s. 4 pennies Scottis, keeping the volume and character of the saids proof delivered to the clerk of the Assembly.

“ Item, For advancement of the godly and necessary work, and furtherance thereof, and home-bringing of men, and other provisions for the same, the bishops, superintendents, and commissioners, bearing charge within this realm under written—viz., James, Archbishop of Glasgow, &c.—have, in presence of the Assembly, faithfully bound them, . . . that they shall do their utter and exact diligence for purchasing of such advancement as may be obtained within every one of their respective jurisdictions, at the hands of the lords, barons, and gentlemen of every parish, as also with the whole burghs within the same, and shall try how many of them will be content to buy one of the volumes, and will advance voluntarily the price, whole, or half at the least, in part of payment, and the rest at the receipt of their

books, and we shall try what every burgh will contribute to the said work, to be recompensed again in the books. . . .

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

“Item, That every person that is provided of old as well as of new, be compelled to buy a Bible to their parish kirk, and to advance therefore the price” And because the said act appertains and is expedient to be ratified by my Lord Regent’s Grace, and the Lords of the Secret Council, and an Act of Council to be made thereupon, the Assembly ordains Mr David Lindsay, minister of Leith, Mr James Lawson, minister of Edinburgh, and Alexander Hay, Clerk of Council, to travel with his Grace and their Lordships for the obtaining the same, together with the privilege of the said Alexander and Thomas for imprinting of the said work. The Kirk ordains the said Mr James and Mr David to travel with Mr Andrew Polwart and Mr George Young, or any of them, for correcting of the said Bible, and to appoint a reasonable gratitude therefore at the cost of the said Alexander and Thomas.

“Item, The Kirk hath promised to deliver the authentick copy, which they shall follow, to them betwixt and the last day of April. . . .”

It was also stipulated that the work should be completed before the end of March 1576; but the printing was retarded by various causes.^β The New

^α [A similar injunction with regard to Hart’s Bible (1610) was imposed by the provincial assemblies. Thus, in the Records of the Diocesan Synod of St Andrews, which sat down on the 2d of April 1611, we find the following minute: “Forasmuch as it was thought expedient that there be in every kirk ane commoune Bible, it

was concludit that every brother sall urge his parochiners to buy ane of the Bybles laitlie printed be Andro Hart, and the brother failzing either to caus buy ane as said is, or ellis to gif in his exact diligens, sall pay at the next synod 6 lib. money” (*i. e.* 10 shillings sterling.)

^β [One of these causes may be

LECT.
XIII.

1579.

Testament, however, was printed in 1576; the Psalms of David in metre, with the Book of Common Order and Calvin's Catechism, in 1578, and, in the following year, the Old Testament, when the whole volume was published, with an epistle dedicatory (to the King) prefixed by the General Assembly, and dated the 10th of July 1579. A number of other particulars relating to the work might be added. Although the measure of printing this edition of the Bible did not originate with the Government, it was thought expedient to apply for a licence from the Privy Council, as in the case of all other books. Accordingly, letters of privilege were obtained (June 30, 1576), authorising Arbuthnot and Bassandyne "to prent, or cause be imprentit, set furth, and sauld, and sauld within this realm, or outwith the samen, Bibles in the vulgar tounge, in hail or in partes, &c." It appears further, from the "Obligation for Prenting of the Bybill," inserted in the Register of the Privy Seal, 18th July 1576, that the Regent Morton, who granted this licence, also caused to be advanced to the printers a great proportion of the sum requisite for the furthering of the work: not, however, out of the public purse, but by contribution of the parishioners of the parish kirks, collected by the diligence of the bishops, superintendents, and visitors of the dioceses, "accord-

learned from the Records of the Privy Council (Jan. 11, 1576), when we find a "complaint maid to my Lord Regent's grace and Lordis of Seereit Counsell be Alexander Arbuthnott, burges of Edinburgh, makand mentioun that quhair thair is ane contract maid betwix him and Thomas Bassinden buke binder, contemand in effect that he sould deliver to the said Alexander with all possible diligence the

werk of the bybill ellis prentit with the prenting hous and necessaris appertening thereto meit for setting furthwart of the said werk, as the said contract at mairlenth beris. Nothwithstanding he on nawayis will do the samyn without he be compellit, quhair throw the said werk lvis ydill in the meintyme, to the greit hurt of the commoun weill of this realme," &c.]

ing to the agreement allowed and authorised by the Regent's Grace." A more singular means of promoting this undertaking, and extending generally the circulation of the Scriptures, was also adopted by the Government. In the General Assembly's preface (a valuable historical document throughout, which has been already frequently quoted), his Majesty is most earnestly exhorted "to remember diligently how the setting forth and authorising of this book chiefly pertains to his charge." The meaning of this expression may probably be inferred from an Act of Parliament passed in the course of that year, ordaining every householder worth 300 merks of yearly rent, and every yeoman or burges worth £500 stock, to have a Bible and Psalm-Book, in vulgar language, in their houses, under the pain of ten pounds.]^a

In the next Lecture I shall request your attention to the principles embodied in the Second Book of Discipline. In the mean time, it must be mentioned

The National Covenantant.

^a [A searcher was appointed to visit every householder described in the Act; and it appears from the Records of the Privy Council that he was not idle. In the year 1580, the Magistrates and Town Council of Edinburgh issued a proclamation commanding all the householders to have Bibles, "under the pains contained in the Act of Parliament, and advertising them that the Bibles are to be sauld in the merchant burth of Andrew Williamson, on the north side of this burgh, besyde the Meill Mercat." On the 11th of Nov. 1580, "Alex. Clerk of Balberry, provost, &c., ordanis the hail ny^{bo} of this bur^r to be callit in before the bailies be their quarters for not keeping of the said Act to be adjudgeit in the unlaw therein contenit, and for eschewing of all fraud, ordanis sic as sall bring their bybills and psalm buiks

to hafe their names writtin and subscrivit be the clerk; and thereafter the buiks deliverit to them." On the 16th of November there was an order to pursue all persons "that has incurrit the payne of the Act for not having aue bybill or psalme buik."—Andro Selater and Thomas Aikinheid, masters of the hospitals, were appointed "Collectors of the paynes."—*Edinburgh Council Record*, vol. vi. fol. 90, 95, &c. Two years afterwards, John Williamson, "general searcheour throughout the hail boundis of this his hienes realm," obtained decret in the Privy Council against Andro Ballingall and John Weland, sheriffs-depute of Fife, for not concurring, fortifying, defending, and assisting him in the execution of his duty.—*Reg. Sec. Council*, 16 Apr. 1582.]

LECT.
XIII.

1581.

that, to counteract the secret devices of Jesuits and other papists, who were plotting in every part of the kingdom to overthrow the Protestant religion, John Craig, the King's minister, drew up a short Confession of Faith, commonly known by the name of the National Covenant, which was solemnly sworn to by the King and the Council on the 28th January 1580-(1), and afterwards required to be subscribed by all the subjects. It was signed by all corporate bodies, and by all the masters and students of universities. That you may know precisely what this Covenant was in its original form, I shall conclude this Lecture by reading to you the greater part of it.

[Dunlop's
Confessions,
ii. 103.]

“ [We all and every ane of us underwritten believe with our heartis, confesse with our mouthis, subscribe with our handis, and constantlie affirme before God and the hail warld, that this only is the trew religioun, pleasing God and bringing salvation to man, quhilk is now, be the mercie of God, revealed to the warld be the preaching of the blessed Evangell; and is received by mony and sundrie notabil kirkis and realmes, but chiefly be the Kirke of Scotland, the King's Majestie, and three Estatis of this Realme, . . . as mair particularly is expressed in the Confession of our Faith, established and publicly confirmed by sundrie Acts of Parliaments, and now of a lang tyme hath been openlie professed by the King's Majesty and hail body of this realme, both in brugh and land. To the quhilk Confession and forme of religion we willingly agree in our consciences, in all pointis, as unto Godis undoubted trewth and veritic, grounded only upon His written Word. And theirfoir we abhorre and detest all contrare religion and doctrine; but chiefly all kynde of Papistrie in generall,

and particular headis, even as they ar now damned and confuted by the Word of God and the Kirk of Scotland. But in special we detest and refuse the usurped authoritie of that Romane Anti-Christ upon the Scriptures of God, upon the Kirk, the civill magistrate, and consciences of men ; all his tyranous lawes made upon indifferent thingis againis our Christian libertie ; his erroneous doctrine againis the sufficiencie of the written Word, the perfection of the law, the office of Christ, and his blessed evangell ; his corrupted doctrine concerning originall sinne, our natural inhabilitie and rebellion to Godis law, our justification by faith onlie, our unperfect sanctification and obedience to the law ; the nature, number, and use of the holy Sacraments ; his five bastard Sacraments, with all his ritis, ceremonies, and false doctrine, added to the ministration of the trew Sacraments without the Word of God ; his cruell judgement againis infants departing without the Sacrament ; his absolute necessitie of baptisme ; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation, or reall presence of Christis body in the elements, and receiving of the same by the workers, or bodies of men ; his dispensations with solemnity aithis, perjuries, and degrees of marriage forbidden in the Word ; his crueltie againis the innozent divoreit ; his divilish masse ; his blasphemous priesthood ; his prophane sacrifice for the sinnis of the deade and the quicke ; his canonization of men ; calling upon angelis or sanctis depairtet ; worshipping of imagerie, reliques, and crocis ; dedicating of kirkis, altares, dayes ; vows to creatures ; his purgatory, prayers for the deade ; praying or speaking in a strange language ; his processions and blasphemous letany ; his multitude of advocates or mediatours, with his manifold orders, and

LECT.

XIII.

1581.

LECT.
XIII.

1581.

auricular confessions ; his despered and uncertain repentance ; his general and doutsum faith ; his satisfactionis of men for their sinnis ; his justification by workis *opus operatum*, workis of supererogation, merites, pardons, peregrinations, and stations ; his holie water, baptising of babbis, conjuring of spreits, crocing, saining, anointing, conjuring, hallowing of Godis gude creatures, with the superstitious opinion joined therewith ; his wardlie, monarchic, and wicked hierarchie ; his three solemnit vows, with all his shavelings of sundrie sortes ; his erroneous and bloodie decreets made at Trente, with all the subserjvars and appliances of that cruell bloodie band, conjured against the Kirk of God ; and finallie, we detest all his vain allegories, rites, signes, and traditions brought in the Kirk, without or againis the Word of God and doctrine of this trew reformed Kirk ; to the quhilk we joyn ourselves willinglie in doctrine, faith, religion, discipline, and use of the holy Sacraments, as livelie members of the same, in *Christ* our head : Promising and swearing be the great name of the Lord our God, that we sall continow in the obedience of the doctrine and discipline of this Kirk, and sall defend the same, according to our vocation and power, all the dayes of our lyves, under the pains contained in the law, and danger baith of bodie and saul in the day of Godis fearfull judgement. . . . And because we perceve that the quyetness and stabilitie of our religion and Kirk doth depend upon the safety and good behaviour of the Kingis Majestie as upon ane comfortable instrument of Godis mercie granted to this countrey for the meinteining of his Kirk and ministration of justice amongst us, we protest and promise solemnetlie with our heartis, under

the same aith, handwreit, and paines, that we sall defend his personne and authorotie with our geare, bodies, and lyves, in the defence of Christis Evangell, libertie of our country, ministration of justice, and punishment of iniquity againis all enemies within this realme or without, as we desire our God to be a strong and merciful defendar to us in the day of our death, and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, to Whom, with the Father and the Holy Spreit, be all honour and glorie eternallie. Amen.”]

LECT.
XIII.

1581.

LECTURE XIV.

OBJECT OF THE KING'S CONFESSION — SCHEME FOR THE ERECTION OF PRESBYTERIES, THE REDISTRIBUTION OF PARISHES, AND PROVISION FOR THE MINISTRY — SECOND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE EN-GROSSED IN THE REGISTER — EXPOSITION OF ITS GENERAL PRINCIPLES — FIRST ERECTION OF PRESBYTERIES — REFORMATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS — GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF OCTOBER 1815.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

IN the conclusion of my last Lecture, I mentioned that in the year 1580 the General Assembly declared the authority claimed by bishops to be unlawful, as having no warrant in the Word of God. Of the proceedings of the Church at this period you will find ample information in many books which are easily procured, particularly in the Histories of Calderwood and Petrie, compared with Spotswood, who, by including in his narrative a full detail of civil affairs, is generally more interesting, though much less correct, than either of the former writers. The same facts are related in a very agreeable form in Dr Cook's *History of the Church of Scotland*, the first volume of which is more especially valuable. As all these writers are well known, I shall pass more rapidly than I would otherwise do over this part of the account of our Church.

Before the negative Confession (or the King's Confession, as it is sometimes called) was subscribed, and

while the Second Book of Discipline was in preparation, Patrick Adamson, Archbishop of St Andrews, subscribed a number of propositions favourable to presbyterian church government, acknowledging that the power of all pastors is equal; that the name of bishop is relative to the flock, and not to the eldership; that the pre-eminence of one pastor over others is the invention of men; that to the presbytery belongeth all ordinary power of judgment in matters ecclesiastical, removing of slander, electing worthy persons, deposing the unworthy, expounding the constitutions of the Church, rooting out of heresies, and the interpretation of the Word; that every bishop or pastor should bestow his labours at one church; and that even the office of visitor approached too nearly to an assertion of supremacy. These, and many other articles deliberately subscribed by Adamson, were conformable to the views of the Presbyterians, but, nevertheless, he thought fit to vote in opposition to them as a peer of Parliament.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

The short Confession of Faith, in condemning the wicked hierarchy of the Roman antichrist, was understood afterwards by all the Presbyterians to condemn the episcopalian distinctions of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. But I cannot help owning that the supposition that this was the meaning in which it was understood by all who subscribed it, is quite at variance with the account which every writer of those times has given of the cause for which the negative Confession was composed. It is known that the dissensions between the King and the Church encouraged many Jesuits and other Papists to avow their tenets openly. Nicol Burn, one of the masters of St Leonard's College, apostatised to Popery, as Archibald and John Hamil-

Object of
the King's
Confession.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

ton, members of the New College, had done some years before. Ninian Dalzel, an eminent schoolmaster in Dumfries, instilled into the minds of the youth the principles of the Roman Church ; and though he afterwards recanted, yet in other parts of the country the greatest diligence was still exerted to bring over proselytes. With this view, dispensations from Rome were obtained by the priests, giving full permission to the Catholics to swear and subscribe to any obligation which might be required of them, provided that in mind they continued firm, and secretly used their diligence to advance the Roman faith. Some of these dispensations, having been intercepted, were shown to the King, who required his minister, John Craig, to write an abjuration of Popery, in which not only all the doctrines and rites as well as corruptions in discipline which had so long prevailed under the Romish hierarchy, were solemnly renounced, but a protestation was added, in which the subscribers called God to witness that they were not moved by any worldly respect, but were persuaded only in their consciences to defend the purity of the gospel and liberty of the realm against all enemies within the realm or without. This, then, was the avowed object of the short Confession ; but so long as any credit was given to the Pope's dispensations, the security thus granted to the principles of the Reformation was no better than before, as the declaration that there was no double-dealing or hypocrisy would never startle those who conceived themselves to be authorised to swear to whatever was dictated, if they mentally determined to be true only to the Pope.

Scheme for
the erection
of Presby-

In the General Assembly which met at Glasgow on the 24th of April 1581, Wm. Cunningham of Capring-

ton, who appeared as commissioner for the King, presented a letter containing certain demands from his Majesty, which were referred, in the first instance, to the consideration of several members from every different province.

These articles proposed that a form should be drawn for the constitution of elderships or presbyteries out of a number of adjacent parishes, for the union of small parishes and the division of large ones, for the better sustentation of the ministers, and the more commodious resort of the people to their churches. His Majesty also communicated the substance of a letter to the principal nobility and gentry, and certain ministers in the bounds of every eldership, requiring them to consult for the better provision of ministers, and the completion of the plan of ecclesiastical discipline, and particularly to determine what causes should be submitted to the judgment of presbyteries, what should be referred to synods, and what to General Assemblies. The Assembly were also required to declare how many sufficient and well-qualified ministers were at that time in Scotland, and in what place it was thought most expedient that they should serve, and likewise to advise how other churches should be supplied till a greater number of ministers could be procured, and till the old possessors of the benefices were extinct. The Assembly's advice was farther asked with respect to the method of paying the taxes of spiritual persons, with respect to the persons who should in future represent the temporal estate in Parliament, with respect to the form of presentations to benefices to be given in time coming by the King, as also the order of trial, and admission or collation, and with respect to the establishment of a rule of judg-

LECT.
XIV.

1581.
teries, the
redistribu-
tion of
parishes,
and provi-
sion for the
ministry.
[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 476.]

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

ment for depriving ministers on account of neglect of duty, and meddling with secular business.

In answer to these demands, the Assembly suggested the following outline as the groundwork of a permanent scheme:—That besides the dioceses of Argyle and the Isles (of which no rentals had ever been given in) there were in Scotland about 924 parishes, some very small, some having the churches demolished, and some so large that the inhabitants could not conveniently resort to their parish churches. It was thought meet that the 924 churches should be reduced to 600, every one of which was to have a minister of its own, their stipends to be in four degrees—100 of them at 500 merks each; 200 at 300 merks; 200 at 100 pounds or 150 merks; and 100 at 100 merks each, or somewhat more or less according to the extent of the rent paid in the place. Wherever the parsonage and vicarage at any church were separate benefices, it was proposed to unite them for the better sustaining of the minister. These 600 churches were to be divided into 50 presbyteries, each containing 12 parishes, at an average,—and three of them in common cases, in others two, and in others four, to form a synod or provincial assembly, so that there might be 18 synods in all. It was intended that the General Assembly should consist of persons directed from the synod. Young men newly come from their education were only to be provided to benefices of the lowest degree, and the eldest, of greatest learning, judgment, and experience, were to be advanced to the highest rank, to which they were to ascend gradually, as they should be judged worthy upon trial, from three years to three years, for the better avoiding of ambition and avarice. The charge of the greatest congregations was

never to be committed to the youngest ministers at the first, nor they preferred to the eldest of gravity and judgment. The state of prebendaries was to be considered, that it might be ascertained which of them were founded on temporal lands, and which on the tithes of parish kirks, and that such as were founded on tithes might be added to the provision of the minister serving the cure, and such as were founded on the rents of temporal lands might be granted for the support of schools. The lay patronages were to remain entire, and undivided without the consent of the patrons. Certain brethren were named to see presbyteries constituted in different towns, and every presbytery or eldership was to choose a moderator out of its own number, to continue till the next General Assembly.

In this Assembly other important affairs were considered. All abbots, commendators, priors, prioresses, and bishops enjoying the revenues of the Church, without exercising any spiritual function, or acknowledging the true Church, devouring and daily diminishing the rents of their benefices, were ordered to be summoned by the presbyteries to appear before the next General Assembly, to answer for their conduct. The office of reader, which was concluded in former Assemblies to be no ordinary office in the Church, was ordered henceforth to be discontinued, or, at least, it was resolved that no new admissions to the office should take place. The office, however, continued to be exercised for more than half a century afterwards, under the various changes in the ecclesiastical constitution. The Assembly also unanimously approved the late Confession of Faith set forth by the King's proclamation; and it resolved to register the book of policy agreed to in former Assemblies, that it might

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 513.]

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

Second
Book of
Discipline.
[Calder-
wood, 102.
Dunlop, ii.
759.
Pardovan,
264.
Spotswood,
289.
Collier, ii.
563.
Heylin,
Hist. of
the Presby-
terians,
p. 214.]

remain engrossed among the Acts, *ad perpetuam memoriam*, and that copies might be taken by every presbytery.

Correct copies of the Second Book of Discipline are to be found in Calderwood's *History*, Pardovan's *Collections*, and Dunlop's *Collection of Confessions*. Spotswood has also given a copy of it, not in the precise words which were finally adopted, but in the form in which it was submitted to the Assembly two or three years before. From his account, it might naturally be inferred that the greater part of the book was left undetermined; and Collier, who has given an imperfect abstract of the book (not a copy, as some writers say), has left us as much in the dark as Spotswood, on whose authority he implicitly depends. Dr Heylin, another violent Episcopalian writer, has given a still more defective representation of the scheme of church polity.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. I.

I think it unnecessary to comment upon it in detail; but the general principles which it maintains deserve to be kept in view as the fundamental and constitutional laws of our national Church. It declares all ecclesiastical power to be derived from God, grounded in the Scriptures, and exercised by the members appointed by the Word for that particular end, either in their individual or conjunct capacities. This ecclesiastical policy, otherwise denominated the power of the keys, is stated to be distinct in its nature, in its object, and in its application, from all civil rule or the power of the sword—being in its nature spiritual, having no temporal head on earth, aiming at the improvement of the hearts and consciences of men, and applying only spiritual means for the attainment of its ends. But while the supremacy of any civil gov-

error over the Church is renounced as an antichristian usurpation, the magistrate is admitted to have no inconsiderable power in matters of religion.^a It is said that the magistrate ought neither to preach, to minister the sacraments, nor execute the censures of the Church, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done; but he ought to command the ministers to observe the rule commanded in the Word, and to punish the transgressors by civil means. He ought also to assist, maintain, and fortify the jurisdictions of the Church. On the other hand, the spiritual rulers should require the Christian magistrate to minister justice and punish vice, and to maintain the liberty and quietness of the Church. And finally, as ministers are subject to the judgment and punishment of the magistrate in external things, if they offend, so ought the magistrates to submit themselves to the discipline of the Church, if they transgress in matters of conscience and religion.

LECT.

XIV.

1581.

A few of the articles in this first chapter are said by Spotswood to have been referred — particularly some which were conceived to be essentially inconsistent with the exercise of Episcopalian authority; one of which was that the exercise both of civil and ecclesiastical rule cannot ordinarily be vested in one person; and another, that the minister must not exercise the civil jurisdiction, but teach the magistrate how it should be used, according to the Word.

[Spotswood,
290.]

Notwithstanding all the anxiety of the Presbyterians to define the bounds between the power of the Church and the commonwealth, it must be owned that they had always a great tendency to interfere in questions of State policy, and even to discuss them

^a Appendix, No. XIII.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

from the pulpit, when they conceived them to be in any degree interwoven with the interests of religion. They had many provocations to introduce animadversions on the conduct of public affairs. Their privileges were often invaded, their hopes were deluded, their liberty endangered, their persons insulted, their motives misrepresented, and their most blameless actions calumniated. They thought it their imperative duty to speak their minds boldly and freely whenever opportunity offered, whether to the sovereign or to the subjects ; and in taking this liberty they occasionally indulged in personalities too acrimonious, and in conclusions which appear to us to have been almost as uncharitable as they were unceremonious ; but though they were thus severe and impartial in speaking to the consciences of all ranks, admonishing and reproving them as much with regard to their public as to their private transactions, they were anxious to guard, with the utmost vigilance, against all intermixture of civil offices with sacred functions ; and it cannot be said of them that they attempted to intrude themselves into stations of secular trust or magisterial power.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. II.

The second chapter enumerates the different orders of office-bearers to whom the administration of the Church is committed, and the different constituents of Church policy. The whole policy is said to consist in three things—in doctrine, discipline, and distribution. Corresponding to this division, there is a three-fold distinction of officers, ministers to preach the Word and administer the sacraments, elders to govern or to assist in the exercise of discipline, and deacons to take charge of the distribution of the alms of the faithful—all of whom, in a general sense, may be

denominated ministers, and all of whom should rule with equality of power and with mutual consent. Some of the ecclesiastical functions are declared to be ordinary, and others extraordinary. The apostles, the evangelists, and the prophets were of the second description; and the ordinary, or perpetual functions, suited to all varieties of times and circumstances, are said to be—(1) The pastor, minister, or bishop, which three terms are synonymous; (2) The doctor or teacher; (3) The presbyter, elder, or senior; and, (4) The deacon—all of which are necessary for the government of the Church, whereas all others are superfluous and inadmissible; for which reason, all ambitious titles, with the offices depending on them, which were invented in the kingdom of antichrist, and in his usurped hierarchy, ought to be utterly abolished and rejected.

LECT.
XIV.
1581.

The third chapter prescribes the method of admitting the several ecclesiastical functionaries to their offices. Without lawful and regular calling, no person (whatever his qualifications may be understood to be) ought to bear any ecclesiastical office. The extraordinary calling immediately by God himself, as that of prophets and apostles, has no place in established churches already well reformed. Ordinary calling is the lawful approbation of men, and their outward judgment expressed according to the Word of God, in addition to the inward testimony of a good conscience. This outward calling has two parts—election and ordination. The first is the choosing of a qualified person by the judgment of the eldership—that is, the presbytery—and the consent of the congregation. The general qualifications are soundness of religion and godliness of life. No person ought to be intruded into an office contrary to the will of the congregation, or

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. III.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

without the voice of the eldership. Ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed, after due and satisfactory trial. The outward ceremonies accompanying ordination are fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of hands of the eldership—*i.e.*, the presbytery. (Imposition of hands, in the First Book of Discipline, had not been acknowledged as an essential ceremony, even in the admission of ministers to the pastoral office; but here it seems to be extended to all office-bearers whatsoever, to ruling elders and deacons, as well as to ministers and doctors.) All office-bearers should have their particular flocks; all should make residence with them, and take the oversight, every one in his vocation,—taking those names and titles only which the Scripture allows, all of which import service and labour, and not idleness, dignity, or worldly pre-eminence.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. IV.

The fourth chapter begins the account of the particular office-bearers by describing the duties of ministers. These are called sometimes pastors, because they feed the particular congregation to which they are appointed; sometimes bishops, or *episcopi*, because they watch over their flock; sometimes ministers, by reason of their service; and sometimes presbyters, or seniors, for the gravity of manner which they ought to have in taking care of the spiritual government. No man should be elected to the ministry without some particular flock being assigned to him. This article proves not only that our Church has from the earliest times disallowed the *ministerium vagum*, but also that the term election signified rather an appointment by the presbytery than a nomination by the people. If it signified a nomination by the people, it would not have been possible for any man to be

elected otherwise than by a certain flock. No man ought to usurp this office ; and after being called of God, and duly elected by man, they who accepted the charge of the ministry might not leave their functions. It was considered unlawful and dishonourable, in any case, to abandon the profession ; but, in perfect consistency with this principle, it was declared by the General Assembly (October 20, 1580), that, upon grave and good considerations, a minister might leave his charge in the pastoral office, and exercise the office of a doctor in a college or university, at the command of the General Assembly. Deserters of their charges were to be admonished, and, in case of obstinacy, to be excommunicated. The duty of the pastors was stated to be—to teach the Word of God, publicly and privately ; to administer the sacraments ; to pray for the people, and bless them in the name of the Lord ; to watch over the manners of the flock ; to pronounce the sentence of binding and loosing, after lawful proceeding by the presbytery ; to solemnise marriage ; and to make all public denunciations concerning the ecclesiastical affairs.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

[Book of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 469.]

The fifth chapter, of Doctors and their office, requires more particular notice, as it seems to be less understood than some of the others.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. V.

This is affirmed to be one of the ordinary and perpetual functions in the Church. The doctor may be designed also “ prophet, bishop, elder, catechiser, or teacher of the rudiments of religion.” His office is to open the Scriptures simply, without such applications as the ministers use, that the purity of the gospel may not be corrupted through ignorance or evil opinions. He differs from the pastor in name, and in diversity of gifts. To him is given the word

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

of knowledge, to open up the mysteries of the faith by simple teaching ; to the pastor the gift of wisdom, to apply the word by exhortation. Under the office of doctors is comprehended the order in schools, colleges, and universities, which has been maintained from time to time, as well among Jews and Christians as profane nations. The doctor, being an elder, should assist the pastor in the government of the Church, and concur with the elders, his brethren, in all assemblies, by reason the interpretation of the Word, which is the only judge in ecclesiastical matters, is committed to his charge. But to preach to the people, to minister the sacraments, and to celebrate marriages, pertain not to the doctor, unless he be otherwise called ordinarily. The pastor, however, may teach in the schools, as he who has the gift of knowledge oftentimes meet for that end, as the examples of Polycarpus and others testify.

All the old copies end with “&c.,” from which it may be inferred that something more was intended to be supplied.

There were afterwards several Acts of the General Assembly regulating this office, concerning which we have much fuller information than might have been obtained, if it had not been one of the great subjects of dispute with the Episcopalians, who, while they attempted otherwise to multiply the distinctions of churchmen, denied that there was any such office authorised in the Word of God as that of the doctor. They were fond of the dignified title of Doctor of Divinity, which they could not pretend that they found in the Scriptures ; but such a distinct office as a teacher of religious knowledge, they would no more admit to sit in Church judicatories than ruling elders.

Their bishops and other dignitaries were almost universally raised to the highest degree in theology ; and as they thought it no part of their business to instruct the people, it is to be supposed that (on the same principle as *lucus*, a shady grove, is said to be derived *a non lucendo*) they were designed doctors for no other reason than that they did not condescend to teach. We shall find enough of this, if we have leisure to attend to it ; but we have not yet done with the teaching doctors.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

On a very remarkable occasion, Adamson, the Archbishop of St Andrews, objected to the moderator of the synod of Fife that he was a layman and a master of a school, having no ordinary function in the Church ; but the synod found that to maintain that the office of a doctor is no ordinary ecclesiastical function, is heresy. Archbishop Adamson still insisted that doctors were but masters of schools, and laickmen. In James Melville's answer to the Archbishop's appellation, he stated that Mr Robert Wilkie, the moderator of the synod, was appointed by the Act of Reformation of the Colleges to teach theology and expone the Scriptures, as Origen had done in the church of Alexandria, being but *ludi magister*, and yet approved by the best bishops in Palestine, before whom he taught in divinity. Robert Wilkie had been upon the exercise sixteen years before (that is, from the year 1570), and at the first erection of the presbytery of St Andrews, he was, by common vote of the brethren, elected and ordained an elder of the same, and had from that time *unremittingly* laboured in word and doctrine. As for those whom the Archbishop called schoolmasters (so he termed the professors of theology), they are, by their office, members of the presbytery, and to

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

their office it pertains to interpret the Scriptures, and to resolve all questions and doubtful matters.

In a very useful tract, printed at Edinburgh 1641, entitled *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland* (which Pardovan wishes to be in the hands of every minister in this national Church), it is said that our Church has had “no other doctors but masters and professors of divinity in universities and colleges, and the teachers of more private schools. They used to be examined and tried, both in their learning and life, by the presbytery; and their charge is not only to bring up their scholars in human literature and liberal arts, but also in civil conversation and good manners, but especially in the grounds of Christian religion, by way of catechism. As the doctors of colleges keep the meetings of the Presbytery, and by course do prophesy, or make the exercise with the ministers, so also do the masters of private schools for the greater part of them, who therefore are a part of the seminary of the public ministry, are numbered among the expectants how soon they are enabled to enter upon the exercise, and sometimes are employed by the ministers to help them in teaching and catechising of the people.” Universities were visited by commissioners from the national Assembly, in the same manner as the more private schools were by the presbyteries.

In the form of church government proposed by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and ratified by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 10th Feb. 1645, the title of teacher or doctor is continued among the ordinary officers of the Church. The doctor is said to be a minister of the Word as well as the pastor, and to have power of administration of the

sacraments,—and it is asserted that the different gifts of the pastor and the teacher may be exercised by one and the same minister, who may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gain-sayers. The article, however, which maintains that the doctor hath power of administration of the sacraments, was allowed to be farther discussed and examined in future Assemblies ; but it was not disputed that, if the doctor was ordinarily called to the ministry, he might minister the sacraments as well as preach, or that the pastor might teach in the schools.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

There is considerable inaccuracy and confusion in Pardovan's account of this matter ; and, indeed, the principles originally entertained by the Church concerning it have been almost entirely lost sight of. It is long since the country ceased to prefer the expectants for the ministry as the fittest persons for exercising the offices of regents and professors in universities, and it seems now to be generally considered as a disqualification for the obscure, but most useful and honourable occupation of a parochial schoolmaster, that a man has any views of the Church as his profession. This is a most senseless idea, which every minister ought to discourage and oppose. The race of schoolmasters was never so respectable or so useful as when a great proportion of them were preachers of the gospel, or students of divinity ; and the youth were never so well instructed in this country as when their teachers considered themselves not as being permanently doomed to a severe and uninteresting drudgery, but as being entitled to look up to the first preferments in the Church.^a I could mention some of the

^a [At the commencement of last century, the parish schools in Scotland were generally taught by persons who were licensed as preachers of the gospel. In the year 1690, the schoolmasters capable of teaching

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

greatest of our divines who rose from this station to the chief places in the Church and the universities ; and it would be better both for religion and for learning if these times were to recur, so that every minister might consider the schoolmaster of his parish rather in the light of a younger brother, who might soon, by the diligent exertion of his talents, ascend to an equality with himself, than as an inferior, whose faculties must be cramped, and whose spirit must be depressed, by the mortifying necessity of resigning himself to a situation which almost precludes the hope of advancement. Of all the employments in an enlightened

Latin were reported to the Parliamentary Visitation. In Edinburgh and the suburbs there were twenty, including five in the High School. In fourteen of the country parishes in Mid-Lothian there were twenty-three such teachers—two in Duddingston, two in Liberton, three in Inveresk, four in Dalkeith, two in Newton, two in Lasswade, and in the parishes of Corstorphine, Currie, Midcalder, West-Calder, Newbattle, Pennycook, Cockpen, and Heriot, one each ; and of these the whole appear to have been Masters of Arts. In the county of Haddington there were at least twenty schoolmasters at that time capable of teaching Latin. I have seen, in some parish records, the names of very distinguished persons, who acted as schoolmasters before the year 1700, and I know that families of high rank sometimes sent their sons to parochial schools. Thus, I learn from the journal of Mr Adam Ferguson, father of the late Professor Ferguson of Edinburgh, that in the year 1687, Lord George Murray, son of the Marquis of Athole, learned Latin along with him at the parish school of Moulin. In that Highland parish, more than one teacher at that period

had the advantage of a college education ; and the parish school was taught by a succession of persons who became ministers of the Church. The same remark applies to the neighbouring parish of Logierait, the records of which, from 1640 to 1680, I have lately examined ; and I can state, very confidently, that in many of the lowland parishes the schoolmasters were Masters of Arts, and preachers licensed by the Established Church. . . . Of the eminent men of the last century who were educated at parish schools, I may mention Principal Robertson, educated at Dalkeith ; Principal Leechman, at Dolphinton ; Dr Reid, at Kincardine ; Dr Macknight, at Irvine,—all respectable scholars, and particularly Dr Leechman, who was educated at a very obscure country school, but who was himself, in very early life, the tutor of several of the most elegant scholars in this country, and among the rest Mr Geddes, author of a learned Essay on the Composition of the Ancients. Dr Beattie, a man of classical taste, was educated at the school of Laurencekirk, as Ruddiman, the grammarian, had been before him. —(*Evid. before Univ. Com. Scotland.*)]

country, the most important is that of the teachers of youth,—and perhaps in a much greater degree than any of the rest, that of those who, being stationed in rural districts, not only instruct the labouring classes of the community, but generally have the merit of bringing to light those young men of genius and industry to whom the greatest improvements in literature owe their birth, and from whom the higher ranks are in most cases content to receive the principal part of their tuition. That such men receive so little encouragement is a reproach to the present age, and an unfavourable omen to the progress of civilisation.

The sixth chapter treats of elders and their office. They are said to be those whom the apostles call presidents or governors. Their function is said to be spiritual, as is the ministry. Dr Cook holds that the Book of Discipline draws a line between the *clergy* and *laity*; but the truth is, that the distinction of the clergy and laity was regarded as popish and antichristian, and as one of the grounds whence the mystery of iniquity had its origin. The name “lay-elders” was not admitted by our Church, and the name of clergy was considered as being full of pharisaical pride and vainglory. Elders once lawfully called to the office, and having gifts meet to exercise it, might not leave it again,—but such a number might be chosen in certain congregations, that part might relieve the others for a reasonable time.^a It was not thought necessary that all elders should be teachers of the Word, but the chief elders ought to be such, and so to be counted worthy of double honour. Their

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. VI.[Cook's
Hist. of
Church of
Scotland,
i. 284.]

^a In the General Assembly, Oct. 1580, it was decided that a man who had once been a minister, and left his office, ought not to be permitted to

sit as a ruling elder in a church court, but should be censured for deserting his flock.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

office is, as well severally as conjunctly, to watch over the flock, both publicly and privately, to assist the pastor in examination and in visiting the sick, to cause the acts of synods and Assemblies to be put in execution, to admonish all men of their duty, and to hold assemblies with the pastor and doctors, who are also of their number.

It is very much to be suspected that the office of elders, as described in the Second Book of Discipline, is still more completely out of fashion than the office of doctor. The best treatise that I know on the subject of ruling elders, is entitled *An Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland*, by George Gillespie, an eminent minister, who died in the year 1647. The book to which I refer was published in 1641. Another useful work on the same subject was published in 1646, by Robert Baillie, minister of Glasgow (afterwards principal of the college there). It is *An Historical Vindication of the Government of the Church of Scotland from the Manifold Calumnies of the Prelates,—particularly from a Pamphlet entitled “Issachar’s Burden,” published by Jo. Maxwell, a Scottish prelate, and a Declaration made by King James in Scotland, written by Patrick Adamson, pretended Archbishop of St Andrews*. Baillie was one of the commissioners from the Church of Scotland to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and one of the most minute and faithful accounts of the proceedings of that Assembly is to be found in his Letters, of which a selection was published in two volumes in 1775.^a

^a The other tracts by which he is best known are (1.) *The Cantaburians’ Self-Conviction*, 1641. (2.) *The Anatomie of the Service Book*, 1643. (3.) *Time*, 1646. (4.) *Sermons before the House of Commons*. (5.) *Anabaptism, the true Fountain of Independancy*, 1647. (6.) *Review of Dr Bramble, his Fair Warning*, 1649.

The seventh chapter treats of the Elderships, Assemblies, and Discipline. It is much too long to be introduced here, and the chief heads of it will come under our notice hereafter.

LECT.
XIV.
1581.

The eighth chapter concerns Deacons and their office, the last ordinary function in the Church. This order of persons, properly speaking, included those only to whom belonged the collection and distribution of the alms of the faithful, and ecclesiastical goods. The office is stated to be an ordinary and perpetual function, to which it was necessary to be called and elected in the same manner as the rest of the spiritual offices were. The deacons were to exercise their office according to the judgment and appointment of the presbyteries or elderships, of which the deacons were not to be members. In this last particular, the Second differs from the First Book of Discipline, in which it is said that the deacons may assist in judgment with the ministers and elders.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. VIII.

The ninth chapter is entitled "Of the Patrimony of the Church, and the Distribution thereof." In this chapter the province of the deacons is still more particularly described than in the former.

The tenth chapter is an important one, treating of the office of a Christian magistrate in the Church. It pertains to the magistrate to see that the Church be not invaded or beset by false teachers, and that sufficient provision be made for the ministry, the schools, and the poor; to assist the discipline, and punish them civilly who will not obey the Church censures; to make laws for advancement of the policy of the Church, without usurping anything that belongs to ecclesiastical offices; to defend both the persons of the ministers and their possessions from injury and

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. X.

LECT.
XIV.

1551.

open violence, and to restore the true service of God, when the Church is greatly corrupted and out of order.

Second
Book of
Discipline,
Chap. XI.

Following out this last idea, the eleventh chapter expresses a desire that the abuses remaining in the Church may be reformed by the magistrate. The first abuse is the "admission of men to papistical titles of benefices," as abbots, commendators, and priors. Another is the continuation of chapters and convents, of abbeys and cathedrals, which served no purpose but to "set feus and tacks" in prejudice of the kirk-lands and teinds. The titles of deans, archdeacons, chanters, treasurers, and chancellors, were required to be abolished. Churches united together, and joined by annexation to their benefices, ought to be separated, and given to qualified ministers. Abusers of the patrimony of the Church ought not to have vote in Parliament, or to sit in Council under the name of churchmen, to the hurt of the liberty of the Church. "Much less is it lawful that any person among these men should have five, six, ten, twenty, or more churches, all craving the cure of souls, and enjoy the patrimony, either by admission of the prince or of the Church." "For it is but a mockery to crave reformation where such practices are allowed."

From this paragraph we may have an idea of the shocking extent to which pluralities of benefices were permitted, and permitted too by those very men who represented it as a most dangerous irregularity to give leave to those whom they called schoolmasters to preach in churches, or to vote in ecclesiastical courts.

[Spotswood,
298.]

Spotswood says that this article was answered by the Act of Dissolution. Which Act of Dissolution he means is not quite certain; but if it was an Act

favourable to the interests of the resident ministers, Spotswood knew very well that it was rescinded a few years afterwards, for the purpose of restoring the bishops in some degree to their ancient consequence.

It is next insisted that bishops should addict themselves to a particular flock, and not usurp lordship over their brethren; that they should not be pastors of pastors, or of many flocks, that they should not be exempted from the correction of their brethren; and that they ought not to have criminal jurisdiction, or seats in Council or Parliament, in name of the Church. It is allowed, however, that ministers may and should assist their princes when required in Council or Parliament, or otherwise, providing always that they neither neglect their own charges, nor hurt the public state of the Church. The holding of chapters in cathedral churches, abbeys, colleges, and other conventual places, is said to be a corruption which ought to be discharged; and the dependences of papistical jurisdiction ought to be abolished, of which sort is the mixed jurisdiction of the commissaries, in so far as they meddle with ecclesiastical matters.

In conclusion, it is declared that those who, under the popish titles, possessed two-thirds of their ecclesiastical rents, ought not to have farther liberty, but to enjoy the portion allotted to them during their lifetimes, and on no account to set feus, and otherwise dispoise the rents at their pleasure, to the great injury of the Church.

In the twelfth chapter certain special heads of reformation are pointed out as "craved." The following is a summary of the principal objects thus contemplated by the Church as desirable:—

In every considerable parish should be placed one

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

or more pastors. No minister should be burdened with the particular charge of more flocks than one. Parishes in landward or small villages may be joined, two or three, or more—the principal kirks being allowed to stand, and qualified ministers placed at them—but the others may be suffered to decay. In other places a large parish may be divided into two or more. Doctors should be appointed in universities, colleges, and other places needful, and sufficiently provided for, to open up the meaning of the Scriptures, and have the charge of the schools, and teach the rudiments of religion. In every congregation there should be one or more elders for censuring the manners of the people, but an assembly of elders only in principal towns, where men of judgment may be had, and where the elders of the particular kirks convening may have a common eldership, to treat of all things concerning the congregations of which they have the oversight. (These elderships corresponded to the presbyteries.^a Such a court as a kirk-session is not expressly mentioned, but there was likewise an assembly of that nature in the principal towns.) The national Assemblies ought to be retained in their liberty. None

^a [A misapprehension was early entertained by some of the leaders of the Covenanters with respect to the precise meaning of the word eldership. No person who reads the Second Book of Discipline can have the slightest doubt that eldership, wherever it occurs, means presbytery. But in a book (and this is not a single case) which has been regarded of some authority, entitled *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, which is said to have been written by Mr Alexander Henderson (it is indeed sometimes ascribed to George Gilles-

pie), I find that the author understood the word to signify the kirk-session. Calderwood, on the other hand, who ought to have understood the subject better, perhaps, than almost any one else of that period, because he had been born in the pure time of Presbytery, and from his laborious researches had a complete knowledge of the forms of that Church, always maintained that the kirk-session was to be looked upon as little else than as a committee of the Presbytery.—(*Evidence before Committee on Church Patronage*.)]

should be intruded as ministers without lawful election and the assent of the people, as the practice of the apostolical and primitive Church and good order required. As patronages and presentations to benefices had flowed from the Pope, and corruption of the canon law, without warrant in the Word of God, they ought not to have place in the light of reformation;^a but patronages to chaplainries, and prebendaries founded on temporal lands, might be reserved to the ancient patrons, to be disposed of to scholars and bursars, "as they ar requirit be the Act of Parliament."^β

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

^a See Appendix, No. XIV.

^β [An Act was passed, Dec. 20, 1567, "Anent the disposition of provostries, prebendareis, and chaplanreis, to bursaris to be fundit in collegis," ordaining that "all patrounis havand provostreis or prebandereis of collegis, altarageis, or chaplanereis at their giftis and dispositioun, may in all tymescumming at their plesour present the samin to ane bursar quhome they pleis to name, &c."—(*Act. Parl. Scot.* iii. 25.) Before the Book of Discipline had been completed, another Act of Parliament, of date 25th July 1578, ratified and extended to all the universities letters of gift by the King and his Council on the 27th of January of that year, in favour of St Salvator's College, St Andrews, providing that "albeit be ye lawes, custome, and ordour ressavit within our realme, all benefices of befor at ye donatioun and presentatioun of prelatiis ar now cum in use, and ar ordinit be Parliament to be at" the King's "patronage, nevertheles it hes bene always meanit and expresslie providit that ye universities . . . sall still bruik the privilegis of the kirkis, chaplanreis, and prebendareis annex to their collegeis, presentand qualefeit personis to ye kirkis and bursouris within their awin collegeis

to the chaplanreis, Therefoir . . . it sal be lesun and permittit to ye saidis provest and maisteris to dispone quhatsumever provostries, chaplanreis, prebendareis, and utheris benefices erectit and given to their said college queir and cheplour thair-off to qualefeit personis, hable to travell in schuillis, kirk of God, and common weill of the same."—(*Act. Parl. Scot.*, iii. 106.) Previously to this time such appropriations had to some extent been made. Thus, in Feb. 20, 1564, John Rutherford, provost of St Salvator's College, made a presentation in favour of David Spens "de Bursa sive Capellania divæ Virginis in claustro dict. coll. per M^{ra}m Hug. Spens fundat." In 1570 (Oct. 9), the prebendary of Rungay and Dura, founded within the College Kirk-heugh, situate beside the city of St Andrews, was gifted by James VI. to William Russell, on condition that after his decease it should be united to St Leonard's College, for sustaining a bursar. It was annexed 30th and 31st Oct., 1579. In the University papers of St Andrews are found a great many documents on this subject, including an account of the prebendaries, chaplainries, and bursaries in St Salvator's College at the time of the Reformation, which seems to have

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

I find that this regulation was put in practice to a considerable extent. Several prebendaries and chaplainries were held by the students in this university. Some of them, indeed, were disposed of among the regents or teachers; but it must be remembered that the ordinary provision of these teachers was little better than some of the bursaries, and that it was not uncommon to begin to act as regents before they ceased to be students. In these circumstances it was not dishonest to retain these slight additions to their income till the usual time of holding them expired, especially as the patrons were not always very careful to substitute more deserving persons in place of those who resigned.

The remainder of the chapter relates chiefly to the application of ecclesiastical property. The last chapter points out the benefits which might be expected from this reformation.

It has been said that the authors of this book pretend that the whole scheme is not merely agreeable to the Word of God, but expressly authorised and enjoined by divine authority, and that from this radical error much evil afterwards arose. I have not been able to

been presented to the archbishop as Chancellor of the University. (The list includes fourteen prebendaries, eleven chaplainries, and three bursaries.) In one paper without date, but after 1579, entitled the Articles to be proponit to the Parliament, are the following clauses:—"Concerning ye collegis of philosophie. . . . (4) Item y^t ye prebendaries, bursares, alterages, chapalanres, and comunis be applyit for the sustentation of bursaris. Concerning ye New Colledge, . . . (3) The number of students being verie few, the number of bursars to be augmentit, and ye provisione

of ye put bursars to be alsua augmentit. For augmenting of ye number of bursars, it is to be cravit of his Majestie that all the monkis portiones gevine, or to be gevine, be dolit to ye New Colledge, or at least quhan they sall happen to be vaccand; and felzing yrof, annuatis of grit benefices, or the first zerlie dewties to be given for that effect. Or felzing hirof, let ane Act of Parliament be maid that everie presbyterie w^hin this cuntrie, or at least ewerie provins, sall sustene ane bursar or twa."—*Notes from papers of University of St Andrews, abridged.*]

discover any authority for this assertion. The General Assembly, in approving this book, and in passing other Acts conformable to it, often declare that the practices which they disapprove are not warranted by the Word of God, or are expressly repugnant to it ; but when they introduce other regulations in place of those which they abolished, they seem in general to have been satisfied with the assurance that they were acting in consistency with the written Word, though they could not find in it rules adapted to all the particular circumstances in which they were placed. They were convinced, in general, that the substance of their plan might justly claim a divine warrant ; and where there was any doubt, they did not disdain to appeal to the practices sanctioned by the immediate successors of the apostles, and even to the ancient canons. Thus they quote the example of Polycarp and others in support of the assertion that the pastor may teach in the schools ; and in treating of the office of deacons, as exercised in primitive times, they say that the canons make mention of a fourfold distribution of the patrimony of the Church—one part applied to the pastor or bishop, for his support and hospitality ; one to the elders and deacons ; the third for the poor, the sick, and the strangers ; and the fourth to the extraordinary affairs of the Church. Our Reformers added the schools and schoolmasters, who, they say, ought to be sustained of the same goods, and to be comprehended under the name of those who are commonly called clergy. For this purpose, and for the allowances of the clerks of Assemblies, synods, and presbyteries, as well as other necessary officers, they pretend no other warrant except the dictates of expediency and prudence. In other cases they profess to be guided

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

[Chap. v.
§ 6.][Chap. ix.
§§ 3 and 4,
and Chap.
xii. § 12.][Chap. ix.
§ 4.]

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

[*e. g.* Chap.
xi. §§ 16,
17.]
[Chap. vii.
§ 25.]First erection
of Pres-
byteries.Reforma-
tion of the
University
of St An-
drews.

by common and municipal laws, and universal custom ; and in speaking of general councils of the Church, they express their approbation of the principle on which some of them were called by godly emperors, for settling controversies and putting an end to schisms.

About the time when this Book of Discipline was registered, presbyteries were first erected. The presbytery of Edinburgh was the first (being erected on the 30th of May 1581). It consisted of fifteen or sixteen ministers of the churches within four or five Scots miles. The chief business of the presbyteries at first was the censuring of vice, the confutation of error, and the confirmation of sound doctrine.

I ought to have mentioned that, about five months before this time, the celebrated Andrew Melville, through whose exertions the Book of Discipline was matured, was removed from the principality of Glasgow College to be provost or principal over the New College of St Andrews. Two other masters were appointed to co-operate with him, namely, Mr James Melville, and Mr John Robertson, “ a man of no great literature.” At this time there were no doctors within the realm, except such as were allowed for a time to leave their pastoral charges and to exercise that office. Melville’s translation took place in consequence of the Act of Parliament, passed 11th November 1579, commonly called Buchanan’s Reformation, in which the foundations of all the colleges were new modelled ; and this college, which Archbishop Hamilton had intended to be the chief bulwark of Popery, was ordered in all time coming to be a school for teaching divinity.

That part of the Act which relates to the teaching in this college, is supposed to have been suggested by

Melville himself. It provided that five masters daily teaching were in four years to complete the whole course. The first master was to read the common-places (as they were called), or, in other words, the principal topics of systematic divinity, which were then arranged under the four following heads: De Deo Creatore, De Deo Redemptore, De Deo Sanctificatore, and De Ecclesia; the second master was to teach the New Testament out of the Greek tongue, conferring with the Syriac; the third was to explain the Prophets; the fourth was to explain the Law of Moses and the history of the Old Testament; and the fifth was to teach the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Syriac tongues. In this account of the departments assigned to each professor, I have enumerated the masters according to the rank which they held, and not according to the order in which they were required to teach. It was provided that the first and second professors should lecture to the students during a course of four years; that the fifth professor should teach the students of the first year only during a period of nearly twelve months; that the fourth professor should lecture during the second year, and the first half of the third year; and the third professor, the last half of the third year and the whole of the fourth year. In this manner it was intended to complete the education of the candidates for the Church; and it was expected that thus "heiring daylie thrie lessonis the space of foure yeires," they should, "with meane diligence, becum perfite theologians;" to which end, however, it was likewise prescribed there should be "daily repetitions; anys in the oulk [week], publict disputationis; everie moneth, declamationis; thrie solemne examinationis in the cours."

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

With reference especially to the class which corresponded to that of Ecclesiastical History of more recent times, I may add, that as, from the deficiency of funds, there never were more than four teachers since this institution became a divinity college, it was necessary to alter the original arrangements in some degree. And, accordingly, it was required by some acts of visitation that the duties which had at first been allotted to the third and fourth professors, should be performed by the third. The original object, therefore, which was meant to be fulfilled by the person holding my office, was to unfold and illustrate the rules to be followed in explaining the historical and prophetic books of the Jewish Scriptures, and particularly in elucidating the obscurities of the Mosaic economy, and the peculiarities of the government, the laws, and the ritual observances of the Hebrew commonwealth.

[28th April
1707.]

It was not till the new erection of this office that it became a part of the prescribed course of sacred literature to study the antiquities of the Christian Church, and the progressive state of religious knowledge and practice in modern as well as in ancient times. The mode in which the teaching was at first carried on, is known with sufficient correctness to enable us to form an estimate of its advantages and defects. The professor read through the books on which it was his business to comment, and after giving a critical analysis, and examining his students on the meaning of the phrases in the original Hebrew, he dictated such notes as he thought might be most useful to direct them in the interpretation of the inspired volume. This method had the effect of compelling the learners to treasure up all that their teacher thought it necessary to communicate. But it was not altogether favourable to

intellectual exertion. The dictates of the professor were generally so copious as to render it superfluous for the students to think for themselves. They occasioned much unnecessary repetition, and they produced a sameness in the manner of going about the exposition of Scripture which did not offer the best pledge for the advancement of biblical knowledge. But the chief disadvantage was that it precluded systematic arrangement, and instead of disposing the knowledge to be acquired under distinct heads, it loaded and encumbered the mind with a vast mass of materials, the value of which could not always be apprehended by those who were required to store them up. Much time was also wasted unnecessarily in dictating and writing, and indeed the whole process was rather mechanical than intellectual. The same thing happened, however, in teaching every other branch. Nobody taught without a text-book; and all that the professor did was either to expand or to illustrate the doctrines contained in the author whom he was required to select as his guide. The choice of the text-book was not left to himself, any more than the doctrines which he was to found upon it. In those days freedom of discussion was never permitted, be the subject what it would.

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

The General Assembly which met at Edinburgh in October 1581, was occupied with some serious matters of which you will find a full account in Calderwood and Petrie, particularly the latter. The King's commissioners inquired if the Church condemn the office of bishops, whereto is annexed a temporal jurisdiction and the right of voting in Parliament, and assisting in his Majesty's Councils, how will the Church supply the loss of this estate? After a long conference, it

General
Assembly,
Oct. 1581.
[Calder-
wood, 118.
Petrie, 411,
&c.]

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

was answered that, for voting in Parliament and assisting in Council, commissioners from the General Assembly should supply the place of bishops ; and for exercising civil or criminal jurisdiction the heritable bailies should act.

A complaint was sent from the King against Walter Balcanquel and John Durie, two ministers of Edinburgh, who had given offence to the Duke of Lennox, the King's favourite, the former of them having said in a sermon that Popery had entered not only into the country, but into the Court, under the protection of a great champion called His Grace, and if His Grace will oppose himself to God's Word, he would have little grace. Balcanquel said that he would neither deny his words, nor express any sorrow for them ; but that though he was ready to lay down his life in defence of the truth, he insisted that he should not be judged unless the charge were proved by two or three witnesses. The elders of the church being examined, declared that they had heard nothing scandalous or offensive in the sermon, but good and sound doctrine. The Assembly, without any discussion, pronounced their brother to be cleared of the accusation ; and, of course, the King was not much gratified by their sentence.

The case of Robert Montgomery, minister of Stirling, who, upon a simoniacal agreement with the Duke of Lennox, had recently been preferred to the archbishopric of Glasgow after the death of Boyd, engaged much of the attention of this General Assembly. Montgomery would have been tried by the Assembly for accepting the office of a bishop contrary to their acts ; but the King required them to stay proceedings upon this ground, as he had ratified the

agreement made at Leith (1571), and would not approve any other policy till he was of perfect age. The Assembly therefore resolved to consider certain charges against the life and doctrine of Montgomery as a minister. He seems to have been a giddy, wrong-headed man, and his folly and obstinacy, being encouraged by his superiors, gave the Church an immense deal of trouble. He had agitated some irreverent questions in the church of Stirling on the subject of circumcision. He spoke contemptuously of discipline, saying it was a thing indifferent. He tried to depreciate the original languages of the Scripture, and asked with as little gravity as wit, "In what school were Peter and Paul graduated?" About a dozen of other accusations against him are mentioned in the register, all of them bespeaking a character of such levity as little entitled him to occupy the most ordinary ministerial charge, much less the elevated rank of a bishop claiming jurisdiction over other ministers. It has been said that some of the charges display liberal views of church government; but it would be more correct to say that he attempted to ridicule his Presbyterian brethren, whom he had only lately deserted, and to propagate from the pulpit the libels with which they were assailed by the courtiers. The charges against Montgomery were proved by eight witnesses; but the General Assembly would not proceed against him in his absence, and remitted to the presbytery of Stirling to examine the case more fully, and to report to the next synod of Lothian, which had power to carry on the process. In the mean time he was ordered to remain minister at Stirling, and not to aspire to the archbishopric of Glasgow. The presbytery suspended him, and the

LECT.
XIV.

1581.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 533.]

LECT.
XIV.

1582.

synod were about to depose and excommunicate him, when the King interposed, summoning the members of synod before the Privy Council. The synod appeared, but declared that they declined the jurisdiction of the Council in a case so purely ecclesiastical. The General Assembly, to whom the case was again referred, disregarded a similar attempt to interfere with their spiritual functions; and after some delay, in consequence of overtures of submission from Montgomery, by which he did not abide, they proceeded to excommunication, which was pronounced by Mr John Davidson, in Liberton Church, on the 10th of June. The affair occupied several successive Assemblies, and was one of the great causes of the dissensions between the Court and the Church.

LECTURE XV.

FOUNDATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH—APPOINTMENT OF ROBERT ROLLOCK AS FIRST MASTER—THE METHOD OF TEACHING ADOPTED IN EDINBURGH—RAID OF RUTHVEN—INFLUENCE OF THAT EVENT ON THE CHURCH—ACTS OF THE CURRENT PARLIAMENT OF MAY 1584—PROTESTED AGAINST BY THE CHURCH—PETITION FOR THEIR REPEAL—ARCHBISHOP ADAMSON EXCOMMUNICATED—THE MINISTERS' ALLEGED REFUSAL TO PRAY FOR QUEEN MARY.

IT was at this period that the Scottish metropolis legally obtained the distinction of being the seat of a university.

LECT.
XV.

1582.

[The first movement towards the erecting of a college in Edinburgh was made by a most learned and amiable prelate of the communion of the Church of Rome, who died in the year 1558, a few months before the Protestant faith obtained the ascendancy in Scotland. This was Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney, and for ten years President of the Court of Session, whose literary taste was equalled only by his political sagacity and princely munificence. Both while he was abbot of Kinloss and after his elevation to the see of Orkney, his contributions to the advancement of letters had been so liberal as to excite the admiration of the most eminent of his contemporaries; and his testamentary bequest of 8000 merks for founding a college in Edinburgh, might at that period have

Foundation
of the Uni-
versity of
Edinburgh.

LECT.
XV.

1582.

been sufficient for providing very ample buildings. As Bishop Reid confided the administration of this endowment to the magistrates and council of the city, who in general openly espoused the cause of the Lords of the Congregation, it has been inferred that the bishop himself was not unfriendly to the change in the profession of religion. But whatever might be the fact in this respect, it is certain that little diligence was exercised in securing the amount of the intended benefaction (8000 pounds Scots); for twenty years afterwards, when the sum should have more than doubled, according to the high rate of interest in those days, the patrons consented (in 1580) to accept one half, or 4000 pounds Scots, and this also appears to have been greatly misapplied.

The limits of these Lectures do not admit of any detailed account of the proceedings connected with the foundation of the University of Edinburgh. On the 14th of April 1582, James granted the charter of erection, constituting the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council of the burgh of Edinburgh, with the advice of the ministers, electors of all the professors, with the power of removal as well as of appointment, and prohibiting all persons not admitted by the patrons from professing or teaching any of the sciences within the liberties of the burgh.^a

The King, who was ambitious of being commemorated as the founder and greatest benefactor of this literary establishment, inserted in the charter an im-

^a [The wonder is, that the King did not himself retain the patronage of all the offices; but his disinterestedness in this matter is very questionable, for at that time he asserted and exercised an influence over the muni-

cipal body, which, if it had been permanently secured, would have enabled him to possess unlimited power over the College, as well as every other establishment in the metropolis of his kingdom.]

posing list of lands, rents, buildings, churches, chapels, and other properties, formerly belonging to the Black and Gray Friars, and other religious orders, which had formerly yielded a large revenue, but which, though apparently secured to the community of Edinburgh for the sustentation of the ministers, schools, and hospitals, by a previous charter of Queen Mary, granted in 1566, had been so much dilapidated and alienated by a variety of discreditable transactions, common in that period of national confusion, as to retain little more than a nominal value. The very ground on which the college was allowed to be built (in the extensive space called the Kirk-of-Field, the site of an old provostry) could not be obtained otherwise than by purchase from a menial servant of the King, who had acquired a title to it;^a and in the

LECT.
XV.

1582.

^a [The house of the provost of St Mary's Church in the fields, the scene of Daruley's murder, with the other grounds of that collegiate establishment (called the Kirk-of-Field), are described in the charter as if they had extended over a vast space—*"Vasta et spatiosa loca quæ præposito, præbendariis, sacerdotibus et fratribus tempore præterito pertinuerunt, maximè apta et commoda pro constructione domorum et ædificiorum, ubi Professores bonarum scientiarum et literarum, ac studentes earundem, remanere, et suam diuturnam exercitationem habere poterint—volumus quod licebit—ædificare et reparare sufficientes domos pro receptione, habitatione et tractatione Professorum, scholarum grammaticalium, humanitatis, et linguarum, philosophiæ, theologiæ, medicinæ, et iurium, aut quarumcunque aliarum liberalium scientiarum, quod declaramus nullam fore rapturam prædictæ mortificationis."* "*Licebit*" indeed! "*Concedimus et volumus quod licebit ædi-*

ficare!" The fact is, that, twenty years before (in 1563), the provost of the Kirk-of-Field had conveyed to the Town-Council of Edinburgh the whole building of the Kirk-of-Field, with the churchyard (a considerable space near the Royal Infirmary), in consideration of the payment of 1000 pounds Scots. Some of the prebendaries had also resigned their accommodations, and other appointments, on receiving equivalents. But without any regard to these arrangements, the Government again filled up the office of provost in 1566, by conferring it on a layman, with the power of appointing prebendaries; and it is remarkable that the person nominated to this office, a brother of the most corrupt man of his age, Sir James Balfour, President of the Court of Session, who is now generally understood to have been the original deviser of the murder of Darnley, appears to have been selected for the express purpose of furnishing that insidious accommodation which ended

LECT.
XV.

1582.

same manner other benefactions, which had a semblance of munificence, if they did not prove altogether delusive, dwindled into extreme meanness.

Maitland's
Hist. of
Edinburgh,
p. 235.

It has been thought a strange anomaly that, as appears from a public deed, executed in May 1583, a copy of which is inserted in Maitland's *History of Edinburgh*, thirteen of the thirty-three persons to whom the patronage and government of the University had been committed only twelve months before, were unable to write their names. But the majority of the Council were men of good education, some of them Masters of Arts, and even some of those of the number who could not write were possessed of more than ordinary intelligence. It is a circumstance worthy of notice that, after the Reformation, the trades of Edinburgh gave many proofs of their value for learning. Several of them educated their sons for learned professions. John Preston of Fenton, an eminent lawyer at this period, and afterwards Lord President of the Court of Session, was the son of a baker in Edinburgh. Another man, distinguished for more elegant learning, Sir Adam Newton, tutor and secretary to Henry, prince of Wales, after having held a professorship both here and on the Continent, was also the son of a

so fatally for the unsuspecting victim, and which has loaded the fairest and most accomplished of the queens of the earth with the suspicion of blood-guiltiness. This lay president of a religious house did not omit any opportunity of making gain of his appointment. But about two years before the date of King James's charter to the college, a new grant of the office was recorded in the books of the Privy Seal, his majesty having been pleased to nominate John Gib, one of the menials of his household, to

the dignified place of Provost of the Kirk-of-Field, while the chief people in the community were making every effort to prevail on the King to consent to the erection of a college on the spot which they had purchased long before. It was necessary for them again to purchase from the domestic servant of the King, and another equally mean dependant of the Court, the ground which they considered themselves as having already secured at a high price.]

LECT.
XV.

1582.

baker in Edinburgh—one of the thirteen councillors who could not write. William Cowper, afterwards Bishop of Galloway, one of the most eloquent writers of the age, was also the son of a tradesman, who, though illiterate himself, was one of the first that founded a bursary. The foundation of the library was also formed by a liberal donation of books by Clement Little, a learned citizen, whose brother honourably succeeded the Earl of Arran as Lord Provost in 1586. In reality, almost all the most valuable grants which were made to the college during the first fifty or sixty years of its existence, were spontaneously conferred by persons in very humble condition, and scarcely any were ever obtained from persons of rank.

The deficient resources of the new institution did not prevent the first promoters of the scheme from entering on the difficult enterprise within a year after the charter had been obtained. Some temporary accommodation was found in the town residence which had formerly belonged to the Duke of Chatelherault, and it was considered to be an unspeakable advantage that the patrons were able from the first to secure the services of an eminent individual, then in his 28th year, Mr Robert Rollock, who had for several years been a regent^a in St Salvator's College, St Andrews, and had

Appoint-
ment of
Robert Rol-
lock as First
Master.

^a [It may not be unnecessary here to explain the meaning of the term *regent*. In the older universities, every student, when he attained the dignity of Master of Arts, acquired the faculty of teaching the branches of learning which were known by the title of the Liberal Arts. But though all were understood to be qualified to teach, and, in certain circumstances, might claim the privilege, all could not be selected to take charge of classes. The practice varied in dif-

ferent universities, and it would be a waste of time to enter into the meaning of the distinctions of *magistri regentes* and *non-regentes*, *regentes necessarii* and *regentes ad placitum*. The regents in Edinburgh and other universities in Scotland were the teachers who conducted the academical youth through the entire course of philosophical study which it was necessary to complete before they could become Masters of Arts. In Edinburgh, for instance, there were four regents,

LECT.
XV.

1582.

acquired a high reputation for his proficiency in letters, and his skill and success in teaching all the branches of liberal study. He was a man of strong intellect, indefatigable industry, deep erudition, and a most Christian spirit. Some of the most zealous clergy thought him, in certain instances, too accommodating to the Court ; but though more attached to monarchical government than some of his contemporaries, he was a man of independent mind, and, instead of wasting his high faculties in the bustle and warfare of politics, he wore out his constitution in the assiduous discharge of professional duties, and in the composition of numerous pious and practical writings, which obtained the highest character from the most learned of his contemporaries in foreign countries, and which were often reprinted on the Continent. He died in the beginning of the year 1599, at the age of forty-three, leaving behind him a much larger number of valuable works than the most celebrated of his successors. His commentaries on the Scriptures, and other theological works, some of them of great length, extend to more than twenty volumes ; and as a specimen of the estimation in which they were held by foreign divines, it is sufficient to refer to the recorded opinion of Beza, who characterises some of the earliest of these works, the Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians (printed at Edinburgh in 1590), and to the Romans (printed in 1594), as “a rich treasure

every one of whom had charge of a class from the period of its first enrolment till the termination of the fourth session, and it was his duty to teach in succession the several branches of Logic, Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, and such kindred studies as were most intimately con-

nected with these branches of learning. This system had long been approved, and continued to be followed in one university of Scotland till within the last fifty years. It had its advantages and its disadvantages ; but, on the whole, it was conceived to succeed well.]

sent from God to his people," than which, he declares (disclaiming all flattery), that he had never read any similar works more eloquent and more judicious, so that he could not refrain from rendering thanks to God for bestowing such a blessing on the churches.

LECT.
XV.

1582.

During the first session, Rollock had the sole charge of all who were matriculated or enrolled, and continued to conduct them onward till they were prepared for laureation—that is, being raised to the degree of Master of Arts. The second year an additional regent was required; but the third year (1585) a visitation of the plague prevented the formation of a class. The third class, which was opened in 1586, and the fourth in 1587, had the benefit of instructors amply qualified for the task, and by this time all the essential departments of study were simultaneously conducted by the usual complement of masters, every one of whom continued in charge of the division of the students who had been originally placed under his authority.

The method of tuition pursued at Edinburgh, though keeping in view the model of other universities, was not a servile imitation of any pre-existing practice. During the first year, about six months were spent chiefly in the study of the Greek and Roman classics, accompanied by frequent exercises in translation, verification, and original composition. The remainder of the session was occupied in the study of the dialectics of Ramus, without, however, discontinuing the reading of Greek and Latin authors, and committing to memory and reciting large portions of the ancient poets and orators. In the second year, besides being exercised in Greek themes and versions, the students

The method
of teaching
pursued in
Edinburgh.

LECT.
XV.

1582.

proceeded in the study of logic, rhetoric, and some part of mathematics. The philosophical works of Aristotle were not neglected, and in the later months of the session the practice of oratory was encouraged by public declamations. The third session, carrying forward the philosophical studies and classical learning, introduced the youth to the knowledge of some branches of natural history and philosophy, and gave every one an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the elements of the Hebrew tongue. In the fourth session, ethics, physics, and metaphysics formed the principal object of study ; but great part of the time was occupied in the practice of disputation. The regent prescribed the subject, and every candidate was matched with an antagonist, with whom it was necessary for him to carry on a debate in presence of his teacher. The regents were required to exercise a habitual inspection of their charge, both in the public class and in the hours of recreation in the fields. The principal was bound to maintain a daily superintendence, presiding in the public devotions, and keeping a watchful eye over all the regents, students, and officers of the establishment. Every Lord's Day was partly employed in the religious instruction of the students in their private classes, and chiefly in the public solemnities of divine worship.

The stinted finances of the college, or rather the entire want of any certain endowment, prevented the fulfilment of one part of the original design, which was that all the masters and students, without exception, should here, as in other colleges at that period, live day and night within the walls, and that the pupils were never to go beyond the precincts for rural recreation, or any other purpose, without being accompanied

by one of the regents, appointed in weekly succession to take this charge. Means were taken at first, on a limited scale, to provide rooms for the students, and it was regulated that the rent of a chamber to a stranger was to be four pounds Scots in the year (6s. 8d. sterling), for which sum every room was to be furnished with a table, a bed, shelves for books and other purposes, and sufficient seating. The sons of burgesses were to pay no rent, but they were to furnish the rooms at their own expense, and this could scarcely be done on a more economical scale. This part of the plan may seem strange to us, and I must confess that I was at one time impressed with what appeared to be an intuitive perception of its inutility. But many wise men, possessing the advantage of long experience, have deliberately entertained an opposite opinion. If, first of all, it is considered how limited, in those times, was the accommodation of almost every family below the rank of the nobility, and how perpetual was the noise and bustle in the humbler habitations of industrious burgesses, who rarely could afford more than two, or, at the utmost, three apartments for domestic purposes, as well as for business, very few indeed being able to surrender a separate chamber, of the smallest dimensions, for the quiet prosecution of study and the preparation of literary tasks, especially in the evening, the only period of absence from the college,—and if, with these and other obvious disadvantages familiar to those who now have access to observe the internal economy of the dwellings of many of the working classes, especially in times of sickness, and when struggling with difficulties, we contrast the situation of those youths who, under the eye, and having the benefit of the counsel, of an intelligent, faithful, and

LECT.
XV.

1582.

kind-hearted regent, ever ready to commend the diligent, to cheer the dejected, and restrain and overawe the disorderly and slothful, we may be struck with many reflections on the probable benefit arising from good discipline and good example in promoting habits of order and assiduous application, and, at least, securing a relief from the vulgarity, the clamour, and the pernicious and provoking interruptions to be encountered in not a few of these houses. One object, it is to be remembered, which was then thought of vast consequence, was to familiarise the use of the Latin tongue, even in ordinary conversation,—an attainment essential to the maintenance of intercourse with the learned in foreign countries, to which many resorted. But, moreover, it appears from the universal and emphatic concurrence of many of our countrymen who, having been educated under this system during the 16th and 17th centuries, have left written memorials of their own lives, that they ascribed the most salutary efficacy to the oversight and care of the regents who superintended their conduct in the college rooms. It is most touching to read those testimonies to the vigilance, assiduity, and tenderness manifested in the daily communications of the teachers with the taught : for instance, the bland and paternal counsels and encouragements addressed to the orphan Andrew Melville by the venerable head of his college, “My poor fatherless and motherless child, who knows for what good and gracious purposes Providence is reserving you?” and the not less moving account which James Melville has preserved of the uniform painfulness, urbanity, and what he calls “lovingness” of that learned gentleman, Mr William Collace, on whose face he never saw a frown, except when his

father pressed on him the acceptance of a valuable acknowledgment for his unwearied and considerate care. Many other testimonies to the same effect have been borne in favour of a system^a which, even after the middle of the last century, such men as Dr Reid not only approved, but insisted on maintaining in its primitive simplicity.^β

Between the date of the royal charter and the opening of the college, an event occurred which was not without important influences on the progress of the Church.]

At this time the King was entirely under the influence of two favourites,—the one, the young Duke of Lennox, a native of France, a man rather frivolous, imprudent, rash, and self-sufficient, than deliberately flagitious or unprincipled; the other James Stewart, created Earl of Arran, an audacious profligate, who committed the vilest immoralities without shame or compunction, and who was not restrained, either by humanity or religion, from trampling on the rights of his country, and outraging the peace of the Church. Through their pernicious counsels, James, who, by an unhappy fatality, was during his whole reign guided

The Raid of
Ruthven.

^a It is a curious circumstance connected with this topic, that, after the Union with England, a number of the most wealthy and influential of the Non-Conformists in England communicated to the authorities in Edinburgh a well-digested proposal, in which they held out the prospect of sending at least 200 students annually to that university, provided they could be allowed to erect a building in the precincts or vicinity of the college, in which the whole of these pupils might have suitable lodging and board, expected to be generally paid for by their parents, but

towards which the Association proposed to secure the payment of at least £2000 a-year, to assist those whose means were not sufficiently ample. This scheme proved abortive, because it was not countenanced so promptly as had been anticipated, and some of the funds, which had been provided to a very considerable amount, were afterwards applied to a destination which has proved not unprofitable to another university. For the details of this plan, see *Life of Dr Daniel Williams*, p. 35-44.

^β [Supplied from the author's separate MSS.—Ed.]

LECT.
XV.

1582.

by unworthy favourites, rendered himself odious to the nation by insulting the feelings of the Presbyterian ministers, and despising the complaints and the wishes of the most virtuous part of his subjects. Ungrateful to those who had raised him to the throne, and lavishing honours and rewards on those who courted him only for their own selfish or sinister purposes, he oppressed the small proprietors of lands, and by extortion and violence rendered his government peculiarly odious to the freemen of the royal burghs, and other citizens of the most humble professions. The grievances of the people, though disregarded by the throne, were known and pitied by the men of rank, who, whatever might be their own conduct to their dependants and inferiors, were indignant at the insolence with which the upstart leaders of the King were impelling their master to the most obnoxious and intolerable measures.

About a year after the Earl of Morton had been sacrificed to the vindictive passions of Lennox and Arran, several noblemen determined to rescue their sovereign from the mischievous management of these worthless minions. This scheme was executed by seizing his person as he returned from a hunting excursion into Perthshire, on the 20th of August 1582. As he was at first confined for some days in the castle of Ruthven, belonging to the Earl of Gowrie, one of the confederates, the enterprise is known in history by the designation of "the Raid of Ruthven." The nobles demanded the expulsion of the two favourites, whom they represented as the authors of all the calamities of the kingdom, and all the injuries suffered by the Church ; and James was reluctantly compelled to sign an order requiring Lennox to retire from Scot-

land. He returned to France, and died soon afterwards, professing an inflexible attachment to the Protestant religion, which he had been suspected of plotting to subvert. Arran was permitted to remain in the country, shut up in one of his rural mansions, where he watched the first favourable opportunity of being reinstated in the good graces of the prince ; and as he had artfully pretended to be a zealous Presbyterian, less danger was apprehended from his intrigues than from those of Lennox, who, with all his faults, bore a much less exceptionable character. After a confinement of more than ten months, James escaped from the relaxed vigilance of his keepers, and, having restored the worthless Arran to his confidence, disregarded all the promises which he had made to the conspirators, ordered the Act of Oblivion to be expunged from the records of Parliament, and, with the consent of the Convention of Estates, declared that all who had been engaged in the Raid of Ruthven were guilty of high treason.

LECT.
XV.

1582.

June 27,
1583.

The ministers did not view these proceedings with indifference. The General Assembly, meeting a few months after the King was detained, expressed their approbation of the proceedings of the associated lords, as having been begun and carried on for the purpose of defending the true religion and guarding the King's person ; and they required all ministers throughout the realm to declare the peril to which the Church as well as the State were exposed, if the cause undertaken by these noblemen were not supported. While his majesty was under restraint, the Assembly proceeded with great alacrity in erecting new presbyteries, empowering them to try bishops and other opposers of the Reformation, and submitting grievances to the

Its influence
on the
Church.

LECT.
XV.

1584.

Convention of Estates for redress. After the King received Arran again to his favour, the vengeance of the Court was directed chiefly against the ministers. John Dury, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, having preached in vindication of the violence used against the King, was summoned before the Council, and was ordered to confine himself in Montrose, where he afterwards became minister. About the same time, Andrew Melville, in a sermon at St Andrews, said that, as Daniel proposed to Belshazzar the example of his grandfather Nebuchadnezzar, it was the duty of ministers to lay before both princes and people the example of their ancestors,—but in our time (he added), if any would speak before the Court what evil happened to James V. by familiarity of flatterers, that so the King might be on his guard against them, they will say that preacher leaves his text, and possibly he shall be accused of treason. For these words he was called before the Council, and he made his appearance accordingly ; but he protested against their jurisdiction, saying that his doctrine as a minister ought to be judged by the presbytery, and that, as a master of a college, his conduct and principles were liable to be judged, in the first instance, by the rector of the university. You will find a long account of this matter in Calderwood. As Melville appealed to the judgment of the Church, and was thought to demean himself irreverently in presence of the King and Council, he was ordered to be shut up in the castle of Blackness within twenty-four hours ; but his friends apprehending that his life would be attempted, he fled to Berwick, where he was under the protection of the Queen of England. Many others of the Presbyterian ministers, who had excited the King's displea-

[Calder-
wood, 144,
&c.]

sure, by having uttered expressions favourable to the late conspiracy, or adverse to his administration, also deemed it prudent to consult their safety by taking refuge in England.

LECT.
XV.
1584.

While the King and his counsellors were irritated by the conduct of the ministers, a Parliament was suddenly called to meet on the 19th of May 1584. As it sat down without previous proclamation, it has been called a *current* Parliament. Those who were apprised of it were all of Arran's party, or persons who durst not oppose any of the measures of the Court. The Lords of the Articles were sworn to secrecy. Five sessions were held in the short space of three days; and, lest the ministers should have access, the doors of the Parliament House were shut against all strangers. Adamson and Montgomery sat in this Parliament, along with three other bishops and eleven abbots, as representatives of the spiritual estate. In a future Parliament, which confirmed and explained some of the Acts, five bishops and thirteen abbots sat and voted in name of the clergy.

Proceedings
of the cur-
rent Par-
liament,
19th May
1584.

The whole of the proceedings had been preconcerted, and it may be easily conceived how far the acts of such a Parliament would be favourable to Episcopacy. An Act was passed confirming the royal authority over all estates, and all causes spiritual as well as temporal, and it was declared that those who declined the King or his Council as judges in any matter, must be held as incurring the crime and pains of treason. This Act, according to Sir George M'Kenzie, was occasioned by Melville's declining the judgment of the King and Council. Another Act declared it to be treason to attempt the diminution of the power of any of the three estates of Parliament, or to procure any innova-

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
292.]

Ibid., 293.

LECT.
XV.

1584.

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
293.]

[Ibid. 294.]

[Ibid. 296.]

[Ibid. 303.]

tion in the constitution of that supreme court. This also was levelled against the Presbyterians, who had declared the episcopal order to be abolished, as unfounded in the Word of God and pernicious to the Church. A third Act discharged all jurisdictions and judicatures, spiritual and temporal, not approved by the King and Parliament. This was intended to prevent synods and presbyteries from holding their meetings, and from going on with such processes as they had latterly instituted against the bishops. The pretence on which this Act was passed, was, that the book of policy had not received the approbation of the King or the Parliament. Another Act, with a plausible title,^a and founded on specious reasons, prohibited ministers to act as judges in any kind of causes. The authors of this enactment were not ashamed of the inconsistency of allowing bishops to be both legislators and judges in temporal matters, as if they were under no obligation to attend to any spiritual function. Another Act was intended to secure the silence of the ministers with regard to all public matters,—ordaining that “none should presume, in sermons, declamations, or familiar conferences, to utter any false or slanderous speeches to the reproach of his Majesty, his Council, and proceedings, or to the dishonour of his Majesty’s parents and progenitors, or to meddle with the affairs of his Highness and estates, under the pains contained in the Acts of Parliament against the makers and reporters of lies.” Another Act gave commission to the

^a [“That ministeris sall not be juggis, nor exerce any uther ordinarie office that may abstract thame fra their office.” This Act was objected to by the Commissioners of the Kirk, particularly because it gave an undue jurisdiction to his Majesty in ecclesiastical

as well as civil matters, and because it took away the liberty of judgment from the Church, and conferred too much power on the bishops. See their *Animadversions* in Calderwood, p. 190.]

Archbishop of St Andrews, and certain commissioners, to judge in all ecclesiastical causes, to receive presentations to benefices, and to give collation upon them.

LECT.
XV.
1584.

An Act, apparently much better than any of the others, and indeed containing several provisions which had been formerly suggested by the General Assembly, was perhaps the most insidious of the whole of them. It is entitled, "An Act establishing the form of judgment anent the deposition and deprivation of ministers and other beneficed persons from their benefices for worthy causes." It ordained that all ministers or readers provided to benefices since the King's coronation, not having vote in Parliament, suspected culpable of heresy, papistry, false doctrine, blasphemy, fornication, drunkenness, non-residence, plurality of benefices, having cure, simony and dilapidation of benefices, being lawfully tried, and judged culpable in any of the vices above written, shall be deprived by the bishop, as well from their function in the ministry as from their benefices. This Act was in many respects most odious. The Church, two years before, had insisted on a law being made to determine the causes of deprivation, applying equally to bishops and to other ministers; and the crimes which they specified were such as could be charged against many of the Episcopal order; but their representation was disregarded, both because they seemed to aim at the bishops, and because they required that the deprivation of bishops should be in the power of the Church. Now, however, it was thought proper to put it in the power of bishops to deprive all ministers, who, being called before them on suspicion, might by them be judged culpable of false doctrine, or any other alleged error or immorality. The bishops were not always

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
293.]

LECT.
XV.

1584.

the best judges of these matters; but the ministers were thus subjected to their capricious will, and it was not to be expected that the bishops would be so forward to summon or to condemn their own particular friends and supporters as those who differed from them in opinion. There was a considerable proportion, too, of privileged persons, who by this Act were exempted from trial on any such accounts. An indemnity was in fact proclaimed to all beneficiaries who had vote in his Highness's Parliament. A bishop might be a blasphemer or a drunkard, he might be guilty of simony and dilapidation of benefices (in fact, these were at this particular time the chief grounds of the preferment of some of them), he might be habitually non-resident (he was necessarily so a great part of the year, when he attended the Court and the Parliament), and he might hold in his own hands twenty or fifty benefices, and yet no man could punish him, unless the King chose to do it; and the King was generally too anxious to be on good terms with the spiritual estate to restrain their enormities. The Church therefore regarded this Act as making exception of persons altogether inconsistent with the laws both of God and man.

Protest by
the Church
against the
acts of the
current
Parliament.

All these Acts indeed, and several others, to the number of nine or ten, were subversive of the liberty and authority of the Church. They were considered by the King and his party as having confirmed the prelacy (as is expressly declared in the large Declaration by Charles I. in the year 1639); and the Church at that time represented them as having been made in what they called the hour of darkness, while the nation was subject to the tyranny of the Earl of Arran. Though great pains had been taken to con-

ceal the Acts from the Church till they were ready for being proposed, the ministers received information of them, and sent David Lindsay, one of their number, to crave a delay, that the Assembly might be allowed to be heard by the Parliament before anything was done to their prejudice. Before he had an opportunity of approaching the King, he was arrested by order of Arran and sent to Blackness, where he was detained nearly twelve months. Robert Pont, minister of the West Church, and Walter Balcanquel, a minister of Edinburgh, attended at the cross while the Acts were proclaimed by the heralds, and in name of the Church protested against them. Pont, for this bold act, lost his office as a Lord of Session, and it was no longer safe for him to remain in Scotland. Lawson and Balcanquel, who had co-operated with him, fled at the same time to England; and as Durie was previously banished to Montrose, Edinburgh was now left without a Presbyterian preacher.

It was now reputed that the King had become a Papist, and that he had made laws to prevent the free progress of the gospel, and to abolish all good order and policy in the Church: he therefore thought it necessary to publish a declaration of his intention in passing the Acts. Among the reasons which were assigned in this declaration, were the approbation of the Raid of Ruthven by the General Assembly, Andrew Melville's declination of the King and Council, the usurping of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction by a number of ministers and gentlemen, the appointing of fasts without his majesty's knowledge, and several others. The declaration in the King's name is known to have been written by Archbishop Adamson, and about seven years afterwards he signed a recantation

LECT.
XV.

1584.

Persecution
of the minis-
ters.

LECT.
XV.

1584.

[Baillie's
Historical
Vindi-
cation of
the Church
of Scotland
(1646), p.
51.]

of it. In the mean time it was answered by various pamphlets ; but the ablest of the ministers were now either out of the country, or removed by death. Principal Baillie says that Thomas Smeaton, Principal of the University of Glasgow, and Alexander Arbuthnot, Principal of the Old College of Aberdeen, died that year, "as it seems of mere grief." They died, however, several months before the passing of these Acts. Arbuthnot, a man of genius and learning, had experienced injury from the King ; and Smeaton could not fail to be affected by the aspect of public affairs. Lawson, the successor of Knox, was, through Adamson's influence, treated with great indignity by the English prelates, and died soon afterwards at London. The ministers who remained in the country were not more secure from oppressive usage. The Parliament sat again on the 20th of August 1584, and passed an Act enjoining all ecclesiastic persons to appear in forty days, and engage to observe the Acts of the last Parliament, and submit to their diocesan, on pain of losing their stipend. Some submitted without reserve. Many submitted with a salvo, it is said ; and others, for refusing, were deprived, and otherwise persecuted. Several fled to England, where they continued to take shelter till the return of the lords exiled on account of the affair of Ruthven.

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
347.]Return of
the banished
lords.

This happened in the autumn of 1585. About mid-summer that year, at a meeting of the wardens of the Borders, an unexpected contest arose, in which Lord Russell, and several other Englishmen of family, were slain by Ker of Fernihurst, one of Arran's friends. Queen Elizabeth, enraged at this outrage, and determining to avenge it, incited the Scottish nobles to return to their own country, promising to give them

assistance in the recovery of their liberty. They gladly seized the occasion, and about the beginning of October found themselves, at the head of 10,000 men, on the banks of the Teviot. Marching with these troops, they advanced towards Stirling, where the King and the Earl of Arran were residing at that time, supported by a small force. Arran and the Archbishop of St Andrews fled, and the King, being unable to resist, affected to receive the banished lords with great kindness. He acknowledged that he had been hitherto misled by deceitful councillors, and pretending to be grateful to Heaven for restoring his faithful friends without violence or bloodshed, he promised to be guided in future by their advice, and to secure them from all injury.

LECT.
XV.

1585.

Episcopacy was now for a short season depressed. A Parliament was summoned to meet, and before it sat down, the General Assembly, which had not had freedom for nearly three years, was called to meet in Dunfermline, as most of the principal towns were at that time visited by the plague. When the ministers attempted to meet at Dunfermline, they found the gates shut against them, and they therefore removed to Linlithgow. They agreed to apply for a repeal of the offensive Acts passed in the Parliament the preceding year; and a deputation was sent to the King, with a representation of the grievances to which these Acts subjected them. Their reception was very ungracious. The King stormed and raged, calling them seditious knaves, and applying to them other epithets as uncourtly as they were opprobrious. The committee next endeavoured to prevail upon their old friends the lords who had newly returned from exile, to make intercession for their interest. But the noblemen had

Petition
from the
Church for
the repeal
of the Acts
of 1584.

LECT.
XV.

1585.

other objects more deeply at heart than the welfare of the Church. They were all trying to establish themselves in their sovereign's favour, and as he had cajoled them with promises, and encouraged them by some preferments, they were afraid to interfere in any matter which was not perfectly agreeable to him. They therefore said that it was not expedient to urge the King at that time; and they declared it to be their opinion, that when they were once firmly re-established in their estates, their recommendation would have greater weight with his majesty. The ministers, however, were not disposed to be diverted from their purpose by any evasions. They continued to importune the King till he required them to lay before him in writing their objections to the Acts. They accordingly presented to him a memorial, entitled "Animadversions of offences conceived upon the Acts of Parliament made in the year 1584, in the month of May, presented by the commissioners of the Kirk to the King's Majesty, at the Parliament holden in Linlithgow in December 1585." You may see it at length in Calderwood, the only author who has preserved it, so far as I recollect.

[Calderwood, Hist.,
p. 188-192.]

The King having received their representation, wrote a Declaration and Interpretation of the Acts, which he said would be as good and sufficient as an Act of Parliament. His declaration was intended to justify and partly to mitigate the Acts. He professed it to be his wish that the Word of God should be preached as sincerely as before; that all processes of excommunication should proceed as heretofore; that the General Assembly should be called only by the King's letters; that the ministers should not proclaim a fast till they made the causes known to the King; that

all bishops nominated by his majesty should be tried and admitted by the General Assembly; that all sects and heresies should be tried by the Church, and that as the Church should decide the King would execute justice. This declaration was not satisfactory to the Church; but the ministers had no opportunity of presenting their reasons against it. They petitioned, however, that, till the next Parliament, they might be allowed to hold their Assemblies with the same freedom as before the Acts were passed.

LECT.
XV.

1585.

The Church determined to assert their privileges to the utmost of their power. The synod of Fife, which had been discontinued by order of the Council for having proceeded against the Archbishop of St Andrews, now revived the process, and having judged him guilty not only of all that had been formerly laid to his charge, but likewise of obstinacy and contempt, they excommunicated him, and required Andrew Hunter, minister of Carnbee, to pronounce the sentence. There was in this part of the proceeding a deviation from the usual form, which has never been very satisfactorily explained; but the moderator, it is said, though he approved of the sentence, did not think it expedient at that time to pass it, and therefore he declined acting as the organ of the presbytery. Adamson published an appeal from the sentence of the synod. This appeal was answered by James Melville at considerable length. The archbishop retaliated upon the synod by excommunicating Andrew and James Melville, and some other of the leading brethren.

Archbishop
Adamson
excommuni-
cated,
April 1586.

Patrick Adamson, one of the most ingenious and learned of the Reformers, was ruined by his ambition and instability. I am disposed to think that,

LECT.
XV.

1586.

though his intriguing spirit lost him the respect of the Church (without ever obtaining any substantial advantages to himself), he was a man of much better principles than his adversaries seemed ever to admit. Indeed, I cannot conceive what else restrained him from acting a much more decided part than he ever took, except it was his regard to rectitude. He was too scrupulous and too timid to be a successful politician ; and he appears to have lost the favour of the King because his nerves were too weak, or his conscience too tender. He was always oppressed with debt, and at last, when the King withdrew his countenance, he found himself reduced to penury, and made the most humble submissions that the sentence of excommunication might be recalled. Before, however, he had ceased to have influence at Court, the King obtained from the General Assembly a conditional absolution from the sentence. Against this deliverance of the General Assembly, Hunter entered his protest ; and as the ministers of the synod of Fife in general adhered to the protest, they continued to consider him as an excommunicated person.

[Booke of
the Univ.
Kirk, p.
662.]

At this Assembly, which met in May 1586, the influence of the Court was successfully exerted upon a great number of the ministers. They consented to hold a conference on the policy of the Church, and agreed to the use of the name of bishops, on condition that the person enjoying it took the charge of a particular flock, and submitted himself to the General Assembly.

[Ibid., p.
652, &c.]

At the same time, the King agreed to certain articles with respect to the jurisdiction of the different Church courts, which formed the basis of an Act of Parliament passed six years afterwards, of which I shall speak in the next Lecture.

[Ibid., p.
664.]

In the course of the following year, the ministers of Edinburgh were committed prisoners to the castle of Blackness, for refusing to pray for Queen Mary's deliverance when she was under sentence of death. It has been falsely said that all the ministers, with the exception of the King's own ministers, and Lindesay at Leith, refused most unchristianly to offer up intercessions for the Queen. I know that some of the ministers, the most adverse to the King's party, complied with the injunction. Those historians who reprobate the conduct of the ministers so strongly for refusing to comply with a royal injunction, dictated by filial affection, and supported equally by the dictates of humanity and the merciful spirit of our religion, are unnecessarily tender to the King's memory on this occasion. They knew that the trial of Mary took place on the 11th of October, and that sentence was pronounced against her fourteen days afterwards, namely, on the 25th of that month. Now, when did James, after his feeble interposition in his mother's behalf, communicate the order to pray for his mother's deliverance from danger? Not for more than three months. The ministers of Edinburgh were required to perform this duty on the 3d of February, and in St Andrews the order was given on the 8th of February; on the morning of which day the barbarous sentence had been executed.^a On this sad occasion, so

LECT.
XV.

1587.

The ministers' alleged refusal to pray for Queen Mary. [Spotswood, 354. Arnot's Hist. of Edin. Heylin's Hist. of Presb., p. 273.]

1586-(7).

^a [‘8 Feb. 1586-(7).—Comperit, Mr Patrik Adamson, bishop of St Andrews, allegiand him to haif verball directioun of ye King's Majestie to desyre ye minister and redar to pray publiclie for his Hienes mother, for her conversion and amendment of lyfe, and y' it be Godis plesor to preserve her from yis pnt danger q'in

sche is now, y' she may hereafter be ane profitabil member in Christes Kirk. The session pntlie assemblit being sufficientlie resolvit heirwt, hes concludit y' ye minister at ilk sermone, and ye redar at ilk tyme quhen he sayes yo prayers, pray publiclie for ye King's G. mother, as is desyrit.”—*Kirk Sess. Records of St Andrews.*]

LECT.
XV.

1587.

insulting to this nation, James did not act either as a son or as a man, much less as the sovereign of an independent kingdom; and there is something pitiful in the attempt to divert the current of indignation from him to those who perceived the hollowness of his professions, and the cold-hearted meanness with which a prince, in his twenty-first year, contented himself with employing supplications and remonstrances to avert his mother's unmerited fate, when, if he had had one drop of honest blood in his body, he would have marched into the heart of England, and either succeeded, or perished in the attempt, to rescue her from her stern oppressors, or at least to revenge her unjust and dishonourable murder. There was but too much reason to say that his lamentation for his mother's death was such as hers had been for his father. In many a bad cause he showed himself to be inflexible; but in this case he was easily soothed by flattery, and withdrawn from almost the only brave design which he ever avowed.

LECTURE XVI.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JUNE 1587—PROCEEDINGS OF THE PARLIAMENT IN THAT YEAR—CORRUPTION OF MANNERS AMONG THE POOR AT THIS PERIOD—COMPLAINT OF THE ASSEMBLY RELATIVE TO THE DISPOSAL OF PATRONAGES—THE KING'S PROFESSIONS OF ATTACHMENT TO PRESBYTERY—ARCHBISHOP ADAMSON—ASSEMBLIES, 1591 AND 1592—MEETING OF PARLIAMENT—ACT ESTABLISHING PRESBYTERIAN GOVERNMENT IN SCOTLAND—IMPORTANCE OF THIS ACT—PROSPERITY OF THE CHURCH FROM 1592 TO 1596—OCTAVIANS—END OF THE SINCERE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

OUR last Lecture was concluded with an account of the alleged refusal of the ministers to pray for the deliverance of the King's mother, the unfortunate Mary, whose sufferings, at least, might have claimed their commiseration, even if the evidence of her guilt had been much more decisive than it was. Of their motives I did not think it was becoming to judge; but the fact I disputed, and I ventured to say that the King's own conduct, upon this melancholy occasion, was dastardly and contemptible. The vindication offered by the ministers of Edinburgh for declining to pray for the Queen was, that as they had sufficient proof that, for the purpose of ruining the Protestant religion, the Papists were plotting the destruction of Queen Elizabeth, and as Mary could not clear herself from a participation in these treasonable schemes, they

LECT.
XVI.

1587.

LECT.
XVI.

1587.

were not warranted to supplicate that the punishment of a criminal should be averted, if by its infliction the Church might be freed from the danger which threatened to overwhelm it; but they said they were willing to pray for the salvation of her soul.^a

General
Assembly,
June 1587.
[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 701.]

That the refusal, on the part of the ministers, was not nearly so general as is commonly represented, appears evident from what occurred in the following General Assembly (in June 1587). The King having

^a [In spite of all the declamation of party writers, and their doleful sympathies with the filial sorrow of King James, as if he had meant anything more than to manifest his natural affection by empty words, instead of defending her life and her honour, as became a son and sovereign, I happen to know for certain, that the story, when fairly told, dwindles almost to nothing. Mr Arnot and others inform us that, with the exception of the King's chaplains and another clergyman, all the ministers refused to offer up intercessions for the King's mother. What would they say if it should turn out that James never issued any proclamation on the subject?—that he gave no general order to pray for his mother?—that the only order which he gave was merely verbal?—that it was given to the ministers of Edinburgh only five days before Mary's execution, though her doom had been pronounced three months before (during which interval her tender-hearted son was not observed to abstain from his usual merriment)?—that in another city [St Andrews: see *supra*, p. 91, note], scarcely a day's journey from Edinburgh, the royal injunction was verbally communicated only on the 8th of February, the very day of the execution? and that so compliant were the ministers with the King's desire, that they continued to pray

for her Majesty several days after she was dead? It was impossible for Spotswood to be ignorant of the precise state of the facts. Calderwood tells us that the ministers "refused to pray in the manner the King would have it to be done—that is, by condemning directly or indirectly the proceedings of the Queen of England and the Estates against her, or as for one innocent of the crime laid to her charge." On Friday the 3d of February, the King caused Mr John Couper, minister, to come down from the pulpit of the High Church, because he would not recite the form of words dictated by his Majesty; but on the Wednesday following, his Majesty stood up in the church, and made an apology to the people "for that which had fallen forth some few days before, touching the discharging of their preacher, protesting he did it of no evil mind, and that he would always favour the ministry and the religion presently professed," &c. &c. "The people were satisfied with this excuse."—*Calderwood's MS. History*, vol. iv. pp. 7, 8. If there be any truth in this part of the account, James must have been conscious that the ministers of Edinburgh who scrupled at the terms of his command, were not so very much to blame as certain historians and commentators seem to believe.—(*Article in Christian Instructor*, 1817.)]

conceived offence against John Couper, a young minister who preoccupied the pulpit in the High Church of Edinburgh, when Adamson, archbishop of St Andrews, was to pray for the Queen on the 3d of February, and also against James Gibson, another minister, whose offence was different, required that they should confess their public offence, and make satisfaction, or otherwise be deprived of all function in the Church. The Assembly expressed their willingness to bring the matter to such a conclusion as might best agree with the honour of the ministry, and might be satisfactory both to the Church and to the consciences of the brethren, with whom his majesty was displeased ; but on being asked by John Couper if they saw any cause why his mouth should be closed, they owned that they saw none, and they referred the business to certain commissioners. It is evident that if all the ministers had refused to comply with the royal mandate, these would not have been the only individuals whom the King would have wished to punish ; and he would never have applied to the Assembly to censure them, if all the members of that court had been equally implicated.^a Another of the King's requisitions at this time was, that Robert Montgomery, bishop of Glasgow, might be restored to the fellowship of the Church without any more ceremony. The Assembly answered that they would dispense with some of the ceremonies commonly used in repentance, if they found his Majesty willing to remit somewhat of the rigour of his satisfaction craved of the two brethren.

At the next meeting of the General Assembly, it

^a Skinner says, " This common office, which, in like circumstances, they absolutely refused to the mother of their Prince" Christian could well deny to a heathen —(as if they had *all* refused).

LECT.
XVI.

1587.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
pp. 711,
712.]

was agreed that John Couper should be removed from Edinburgh to Glasgow, and that James Gibson should be suspended during the pleasure of the Assembly. He had in his public discourses used most imprudent and intemperate expressions concerning the King, saying that he was a persecutor, and, like Jeroboam, guilty of erecting and permitting idolatry, and if he went on, it was to be feared that he would be the last of his race. About this time it was that the city of Edinburgh gained, as was thought, an inestimable accession, in obtaining, as one of its ministers, Mr Robert Bruce, the most popular preacher, perhaps, who ever appeared in Scotland.

[Ibid., p.
686, &c.
Petrie, iii.
457.]See Appen-
dix XV.

The registers of the Church having formerly been taken forcible possession of by the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Assembly presented a petition to the Privy Council that he might be charged to deliver the books within three days, and also to appear personally to answer to other accusations. About ten days afterwards, George Young, the secretary, produced five volumes; but as great part of them was torn, the Assembly begged leave to express to his majesty their deep regret on account of the mutilation of their records, and to request that they might now remain with the Church as its own register. His majesty chose to have the inspection of them as he might have occasion, undertaking that he would presently deliver them back. After this period the Assembly thought it necessary to have a duplicate of their register.^a

As the King was now of age, and the Parliament was to sit the following month, the Assembly thought it expedient that all Acts made for the liberty of the

^a Appendix, No. XV.

true Church, and for repressing idolatry, might be collected and craved to be confirmed; and that all laws made to the derogation of this liberty, or to the prejudice of the gospel, might be collected, in order to be abrogated. They appointed eighteen commissioners to the Parliament, who were instructed to require that nothing should be admitted hurtful to the discipline of the Church, as it was concluded in the General Assemblies preceding the year 1584, but, if possible, they were to procure its ratification as it had stood before that period.

Petrie at this part of his History introduces a long digression concerning Episcopacy, which contains some curious matter, taken chiefly from rare books, and on that account much more valuable than if it had been the offspring of his own judgment. Although Petrie is a mere compiler, often indistinct and always heavy, we have no other book touching on this period of the Church which is nearly so useful. The book in itself does not give a complete view of any transaction, and in many places it is more defective than the printed History of Calderwood, which is a very bad abridgment; but when it is compared with other works, it will be found to supply many of their defects, and particularly to give an enlarged account of the deliberations of the General Assembly.

The commissioners appointed by the Church attended the meeting of the Parliament, and exerted themselves as much as possible to obtain an extension of their privileges. Robert Pont, who had not long before declined the bishopric of Caithness (though some authors erroneously say that he accepted the offer), was the principal speaker upon this occasion. He and his brethren petitioned, in the name of the

LECT.
XVI.

1587.

[Petrie,
459-473.]Proceedings
of the Par-
liament,
1587.[E.g. Sage,
Fundamen-
tal Charter
of Presb.,
p. 110.]

LECT.
XVI.
1587.

Church, that the prelates might be removed from the House, as having no authority from the Assembly, and most of them having no ecclesiastical charge. The Abbot of Kinross, Edward Bruce, made a vehement speech in opposition to this request, and Pont was provoked to a reply, which was thought somewhat acrimonious. The King directed the commissioners to lay this claim, with their other petitions, before the Lords of the Articles, and, as might have been foreseen, it was rejected. All that the commissioners could obtain was the confirmation of all laws made in favour of the liberty of the Church in the time of his minority, and an abrogation of all statutes, canon, civil, and municipal, made in any former time to the prejudice of the true religion. The repeal of the Acts made in the year 1584 was not to be looked for from a Parliament containing so great a proportion of bishops and abbots. Great as the number of prelates had been who sat in the current Parliament in May 1584, the number in this Parliament was nearly double; and the proposal of the commissioners from the Church to exclude them from voting, however reasonable in itself, as they were in no proper sense the representatives of the established ecclesiastical community, was not the most likely method to put them in good temper.

Some Acts were passed in this Parliament, however, which are sometimes understood to have had a favourable effect upon the Presbyterian interests—particularly the Act annexing the temporalities of benefices to the Crown. It no doubt tended to impoverish and to reduce the Episcopal order, but it did not therefore exalt the other party. The only persons who derived advantage from it were such temporal peers as re-

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
431.]

ceived gifts of the temporalities. The King had expected an accession of revenue from this source, and the ministers were privately given to understand that it would also redound to their benefit, as they might be assured of being put in possession of the tithes ; but the hopes of the King and the Church were equally frustrated. This Act was repealed about nineteen years afterwards, when James thought fit to restore the estate of bishops to their ancient honours and privileges.

LECT.
XVI.

1587.

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iii.
p. 451.]

Another Act, supposed to be favourable to liberty, was the admission of the smaller barons to a voice in Parliament with the other Estates. I am not sure that the consequences of this Act were any better than the former. The influence of the nobles continued to be predominant ; and it was only in appearance that the constitution of the legislature had become more popular.

[Ibid., p.
509.]

One of the Acts made in this Parliament was particularly called for by the circumstances of the times. It ratified all laws made against the adversaries of the true religion and those who seduced others to depart from it, and declared that any professed Papist or seminary priest, found more than a month after the act was published, should incur the pains of death and forfeiture. Penalties were likewise ordained against sellers and dispersers of erroneous books. At this period the country was infested with Jesuits, chiefly in the interest of Philip of Spain, all of them aiming at purposes equally treasonable and dangerous to religion.

[Ibid., p.
429.]

The General Assembly which met in February 1587-(8), directed its views to the same subject, and addressed the King, with the advice of the nobles

Proceedings
of the
General
Assembly.

LECT.
XVI.

.1588.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 704.]

and others, entreating his majesty to put in execution the laws against Jesuits and maintainers of idolatry. The noblemen, gentlemen, ministers, and all members of the Assembly, without exception, resolved to go in a body to present their petition to the King. James was offended at what he represented as an attempt to overawe him by numbers ; but he acknowledged their apprehensions to be just, and promised to adopt measures for punishing offenders according to justice. The Church had little confidence in his sincerity or steadfastness. His own danger, however, was as great as theirs, and if he was not in earnest, he was endangering his throne as well the liberties of his people.

Corruption
of manners
among the
poor at this
period.

Another Assembly was held six months afterwards, from the report of whose proceedings it appears that the prospects of the country were exceedingly gloomy. The alarm arising from the reported approach of the Spanish Armada, though far from visionary, was more calmly contemplated by the Church than some of the internal dangers which seemed to threaten the extinction of all good principle and the overthrow of social order. A fast was appointed to be held for a week. The causes of it were the perils of the Church and kingdom from the intended invasion of the Spaniards, and also the decay of religion by the rarity and poverty of ministers. The Church had been established about thirty years, it had been constantly engaged in strenuous efforts to improve the minds and to better the condition of the people ; but penury was still the lot of the ministers, and whoever devoted himself to the sacred profession was well aware that he must struggle with want and hardships. The influence of the Presbyterian ministers at this period is

sometimes spoken of as if it were almost unlimited ; they had not influence enough to keep themselves from starving. It may be supposed that their self-denial was compensated by the delight of scattering blessings around them, and that when they saw the ignorant enlightened, the slaves of vice reformed, the votaries of superstition elevated from the degradation into which they had long been plunged, and enjoying liberty, dignity, and purity of mind, they might gratify themselves with the assurance that, while their benefactions were widely scattered, multitudes would rise up and call them blessed. This lofty and holy gratification was dealt out to them only in a most sparing measure. Their labour was not lost, but the season of reaping its fruits had not yet come. In one of the Acts of this Assembly, such a dismal and horrible picture is drawn of the profligacy, misery, and irreligion of the lower orders, that the mind turns away from it with unutterable repugnance. I shall abridge it. "Because universally throughout this realm there is no religion nor discipline among the poor, but many live in filthy adultery or incest, and their children are not baptised, nor do they resort unto the preaching of the Word,—therefore, ministers shall make intimation to all the poor in their parishes, if they have women and children, that they show testimonial of their marriage, or else shall be refused of alms by all godly persons ; and that they exhort their parishioners to extend their liberality rather to those that are of the household of faith, and judge discreetly in giving alms unto others who have not such evidences."

LECT.
XVI.

1588.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 731.]

It seems probable that by the poor are here meant chiefly mendicants, whose great number—itsself a

Appendix,
No. XVI.

LECT.
XVI.

1588.

melancholy indication of the state of the times—and lawless lives, had frequently before been lamented by the Church. In the preceding Assembly, among “the grievances of the Kirk,” drawn up for presentation to the King, they are described as “vaiging in great troops and companies through the country without either law or religion,” so that no “heart touched with a spark of natural humanity or godly charity can unbleeding behold their miserable state.” But the same corruption prevailed among all classes. About this time we find the Church deploring “the great dissoluteness of life and manners,” and the “ugly heap of all kinds of sin lying in every part of the land ;” “for what part of the land,” they say, “is there that is not with a *spait* (flood) overwhelmed, with abusing the blessed name of God, with swearing, perjury, and lies ; with profaning of the Sabbath-day with mercats, gluttonie, drukness, fighting, playmen, dancing, &c. ; with rebelling against magistrates and the lawes of the country ; with blood touching blood ; with incest, fornication, adulteries, and sacriledge, theft and oppression ; with false witness ; and finallie, with all kinds of impietic and wrong : and albeit there be some good laws for repressing hereof, yet none of them are put in execution, or take any effect.”

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
724.]

Complaint
of the
General
Assembly
relative to
the disposal
of Church
patronages.
[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
733.]

Another complaint made in this Assembly (which is taken notice of by none of our historians who are either avowed Episcopalians or have a leaning to that form of church government) admitted of an easier remedy, if the King and the Three Estates would have applied it. “Since the late Act of Annexation, his Majesty hath transferred the right of patronage of sundry benefices from himself unto lords and others, and hath annexed them to their lands, of whom some

have gotten confirmation in Parliament, others have obtained them since the Parliament, and a third sort have gotten gift of the naked patronage, to the evident hurt of the Church ; wherefore it is thought expedient to entreat his Majesty, by earnest suit, that the said dispositions may be annulled in the next Parliament, and in the mean time that it may please his Majesty to deny the disposing of patronages which remain as yet undisposed ; inhibiting in the mean time all commissioners and presbyteries, that they give not collation nor admission to any person presented by these new patrons till the next General Assembly.”

LECT.
XVI.

1588.

I purposely take notice of all enactments of this kind, because I am anxious that every possible light should be thrown upon a subject which is now generally cast into the shade, but which at different periods has been a ground of violent contentions, and the abuses of which have occasioned the very worst evils which the Church ever suffered : among ministers, avarice, ambition, servility to the great, and the decay of piety ; and among the people, disaffection and lukewarmness, and a want of confidence in their spiritual guides. When I say that such consequences have proceeded from the *abuse* of this institution, I am aware that some of them may be considered as inseparable from its very nature, so long, at least, as men in general continue to be actuated by motives of interest and private partiality, rather than by the elevated desire of consulting in all cases the honour of God and the extensive benefit of mankind.

Appendix,
No. XIV.

I may add one remark. At the time when the Church complained so bitterly of this evil, they gave no definite view of the mode in which they proposed

LECT.
XVI.

1588.

to remedy or to diminish it. They did not mean, surely, that ministers were to be appointed by universal suffrage. It would have been difficult then to find a parish in all Scotland in which it would have been safe to trust to the majority of votes. The nobles were in the habit of making simoniacal bargains with those whom they raised to great preferments; the poor were wallowing in the grossest uncleanness. That class of men which was engaged in husbandry was not more religious than the rest of the community. It was scarcely possible to restrain them from the habitual and open violation of the fourth commandment. Two years after this we find the "manifold profanations" of the Sabbath by going of mills and salt-pans, reaping and leading of corn, and carriage of victual to burgh towns on that day, engaging the anxious attention of the Assembly. In those days, what we now consider as the strength and the pride of the country, the intelligent, industrious, and independent class which occupies the middle station between poverty and greatness, scarcely existed at all. The fact is that the Church wished to have all the appointments to ministerial charges vested in itself; and at that time they could not have been committed to any hands so faithful and so able. It has not, however, been so always; and perhaps one of the greatest sources of the corruptions of the Roman Church was the power which its ministers possessed of nominating one another.

See Appen-
dix, No.
XVII.

While the Assembly was lamenting the impiety and vice which prevailed so extensively throughout the whole country, the friends of Popery were watching an opportunity to regain their consequence, and to take the government into their own hands. An insurrec-

tion both in the south and north under the Earls of Bothwell, Huntly, Crawford, and Errol, was, however, checked without much bloodshed, and the country returned to a state of comparative tranquillity.

In the General Assembly which met in August 1590, the King having recently returned from Denmark after his marriage, attended personally the eighth session as a mark of his regard to the ministers, whose loyalty, prudence, and firmness had been of the utmost service in preserving good order in the kingdom during his absence. He made a speech, most artfully contrived, to cajole his reverend hearers, who had less of the wisdom of the serpent than might have been acquired by their long experience of the craft and deceit of the world. Uncovering his head, and standing up with his eyes and hands raised to heaven, he praised God because he was "King of a country where there is such a Church—the sincerest on earth, that of Geneva not excepted, which keeps Christmas and Easter, for which they have no institution. As for our neighbours in England, their service is an ill-numbled mass in English; they want little of the mass but the liftings. Now I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, that ye all stand to your purity, and exhort the people to do the same, and so long as I have life and crown, I shall maintain the same against all deadly." In the simplicity of their hearts, the ministers in general believed that all this was said in good earnest, and they were so overjoyed at hearing a declaration so unexpected, that for about a quarter of an hour nothing was heard but praising God, and praying for the King. Encouraged by his expressions of attachment to Presbytery, the Assembly craved from the King a ratification of the

LECT.
XVI.

1590.

The King's
professions
of attach-
ment to
Presbytery.
[Calder-
wood, Hist.,
p. 286.
Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 771.]

LECT.
XVI.

1590.

liberties of the Church, the expulsion of priests and Papists from the country, and the provision of every church with a minister, and due maintenance to him. The King gave favourable answers to these requests, and recommended to the Assembly to send commissioners to confer with the Privy Council on the best means of accomplishing their wishes.

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 773.
Spotswood,
Hist., p.
382.]
See Appen-
dix, No.
XVIII.

At a subsequent session, the Assembly passed a resolution requiring all ministers in every presbytery to subscribe the Book of Discipline, under pain of excommunication. It has been remarked that Archbishop Spotswood, in his account of this Assembly (of which he was a member), suppresses the most material parts of the King's speech, and omits all that was determined concerning the discipline of the Church—so anxious was he to keep out of view all the fair promises which the King had broken, as well as the solemn engagements under which he and nine or ten other ministers, who afterwards accepted bishoprics, had come to defend and maintain the Presbyterian church government. Some of these persons were probably sincere at the time; and there are circumstances which favour the supposition that the King himself was not so very unfaithful as his future conduct leads us to suspect. This very year he wrote to Queen Elizabeth in favour of some of the persecuted Puritans, particularly Udal and Cartwright; and it is even believed that he invited Cartwright, the most zealous of all the opponents of Episcopacy, to occupy one of the chairs in the Divinity College of St Andrews.

Death of
Archbishop
Adamson.

At this time the unhappy Patrick Adamson, archbishop of St Andrews, being deeply involved in debt, was so beset by his creditors that the King became quite ashamed of him, and granted the liferent of the

bishopric to the Duke of Lennox. Thus deserted by his sovereign, for whose favour he had abandoned his principles, he fell into extreme bad health, aggravated by distress of mind ; and so destitute was his condition that he was reduced to the mortification of accepting (and even asking) assistance from Andrew Melville, whom he had done all that he could to ruin. He begged in the most piteous manner to be absolved from the excommunication under which he lay. The brethren, on the report of James Melville and Andrew Moncreiff, consented to absolve him, and they obtained from him a recantation of his opinions in favour of Episcopacy, and also a declaration in answer to a book formerly written by him, which had passed under the name of the King's Declaration. Soon afterwards he died in a state of deplorable insensibility. He was the author of several books, a poetical version of Job and the Lamentations, and commentaries on the First Epistle to Timothy and on the Apocalypse.

The General Assembly which met at Edinburgh in July 1591, took many important matters into consideration. One of their resolutions was as follows :—

“ Seeing sacrilege is an universal sin reigning through the country, and is esteemed commonly to be no sin, nor is known unto many, it is thought good that Robert Pont take pains upon that subject, and that others give him their judgment upon it, that the, same being perfected, may be presented again to the Assembly.”

Robert Pont's sermons on sacrilege, written on this occasion, have been highly praised ; and they deserve to be consulted not merely on account of the excellences of the style and matter, but as being a valuable contribution to the history of the Church at that period. Another book—namely, a form of examination

LECT.
XVI.

1590.

General
Assembly,
July 1591.See Appen-
dix, No.
VII.

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

before the Communion—having been written by John Craig, was approved, and ordered to be printed. Commissioners were appointed to present to the King and Council the petitions of the Assembly—viz., that the Acts of Parliament that are made against Jesuits, profaners of sacraments, idolators, pilgrimages, Popish magistrates, sayers and hearers of mass, apostates, public markets on the Lord's day, violent invaders of ministers, profaning of the Lord's day by plays (of Robin Hood), and murderers, which overflow the land, might be put in execution. Also, that the ministers already planted might be provided with sufficient stipends; also, that the Act of Annexation might be dissolved, the new erections and patronages discharged, and the Act of dissolution of prelacies ratified and established.

General
Assembly
of May
1592.

The following Assembly, which met in May 1592, entered on the same subjects, and earnestly petitioned the repeal of the Acts of Parliament made in 1584 against the discipline and liberty of the Church, and the ratification of the new discipline. They again prayed that the patrimony of the Church might be restored; that abbots, priors, and others pretending the title of the Church, may not be admitted to vote in name of the Church, neither in Parliament nor other convention; and that the country may be purged of fearful idolatry and bloodshed. Certain brethren were also sent to the King to represent the daily decay of religion, the disorder and injustice prevailing in the realm, and to admonish him gravely to take measures for the remedy of these evils, and likewise to admonish him, in the name of the Eternal, to have respect in time to the estate of true religion perishing, and to the manifold murders, oppressions, and enormities, daily multiplied through impunity; and that his

majesty might be better informed, they were ordered to declare the particulars.

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

James had no firmness, and the most flagrant transgressors of the laws were allowed often to escape without so much as the form of a trial. The case of the Earl of Huntly, who had lately barbarously murdered the Earl of Murray, and who, notwithstanding, was suffered to go at large, had at this time excited universal indignation. Whether there be any foundation for the suspicions which were entertained, that either the King's jealousy or the resentment of Maitland the Chancellor had secretly prompted this atrocious deed, it is evident that the forbearance to punish the ruffian, who had perpetrated the crime with circumstances of most savage cruelty, was not the most likely means of silencing such conjectures. But even before this shocking instance of unjust lenity to a daring criminal had occurred, the remissness of the King in enforcing the execution of the laws had become intolerable. When the Earl of Bothwell with some accomplices attempted to break open the doors of the palace of Holyrood House, with the intention of seizing the King and Maitland the Chancellor, seven or eight who were apprehended were indeed executed, as the King was seldom slack in avenging any insult or violence offered to his own person. After this outrage, which was one of the most nefarious ever attempted against a sovereign, the most loyal of the Presbyterian ministers thought it necessary to remind their royal master of his offences, and they represented his danger as a warning from Heaven. John Craig, the chaplain to the royal household, preaching before his majesty two days afterwards, said that as the King had slightly regarded the many bloody shirts presented to him by

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

his subjects imploring justice, so God in his providence had made a noise of crying and hammers to come to his own doors. The King called to the people to remain after sermon, "that he might vindicate himself, and said if he had thought his hired servant (meaning the chaplain) would have spoken so, he would not have suffered him so long in his house." Mr John Craig, either not hearing or affecting not to hear what the King said, walked quietly out of the pulpit, quite satisfied that he had delivered a most dutiful and loyal address, though it had not the good fortune to be received in the most gracious manner.

Parliament
of May
1592.

The Parliament which met at Edinburgh immediately after the rising of the General Assembly in May 1592, was more favourable to the wishes of the Presbyterians than any former Parliament had ever been. It is said that they owed this kindness to Maitland the Chancellor, who was most solicitous to propitiate the good-will of the Church, which he had forfeited by instigating Huntly to assassinate the Earl of Murray. Whatever ground there may be for this surmise, the Parliament took into consideration the four petitions of the Assembly, and absolutely refused two of them, which were certainly very material,—the one that the Act of Annexation might be abolished and the patrimony of the Church restored (the granting of this obligation might be thought too expensive), and the other, that abbots and priors should not be admitted to vote in Parliament or in any other convention in name of the Church. With regard to the first petition, that the discipline might be ratified and the Acts of 1584 annulled,—all the former Acts for liberty of the true Church were ratified; the General Assemblies were approved, as also synodal assemblies, presbyteries,

and particular sessions ; the Acts in favour of Popery were abrogated ; and the most offensive of the Acts made in 1584 were annulled, in such a manner that the repeal of the others seemed to be implied.

LECT.
XVI.
1592.

The substance of this Act had been submitted to the King and Parliament six years before. As it is to be regarded as the constitutional charter of the Presbyterian Church government in Scotland, solemnly sanctioned by the legislature, and as it defines the powers of the different church judicatories, I shall make no apology for reading it at length. I read it from Stevenson's Collection of Laws in favour of the Reformation :—

Presby-
terian
government
established
in Scotland.

“ [ACT FOR ABOLISHING OF THE ACTIS CONTRAIR THE TREW RELIGIOUN.

“ *At Edinburgh, Junii. 15, 1592.*

“ OVR Soueraine Lord, and Estaites of this present Parliament, following the lovabil and gude exemple of their predecessoures, hes ratified and appreeved, and be the tenour of this present Act ratifies and apprevis, all liberties, priviledges, immunities, and freedoms quhatsuneuer, given and granted be his Hienesse, his Regentes in his name, or onie of his predecessoures, to the trew and halie Kirk presentlie established within this realme, and declared in the first Acte of his Hienesse Parliament, the 20 day of October, the zeir of God 1579 zeires : And all and quhatsuneuer Actes of Parliament, and Statutes maid of before, be his Hienesse and his Regentes, anent the libertie and freedome of the said Kirk : And speciallie, the first Acte of Parliament, halden at Edinburgh the 24 daie of October, the zeir of God 1581 zeires, with the hail parti-

[Stevenson's
Collection,
(1749), p.
18.
Acta Parl.
Scot., iii.
541.]

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

cular Actes there mentioned: Quhilk sal be als sufficient, as gif the samin were here expressed: And all uther Actes of Parliament made sensine in favour of the trew Kirk: And sik like, ratifies and appreuis the General Assemblies appoynted be the said Kirk: And declaris, that it sal be lauchfull to the Kirk and Ministers, euerie zeir at the least, and oftener *pro re nata*, as occasion and necessitie sal require, to hald and kepe General Assemblies, providing that the Kings Majestie, or his Commissioners, with them to be appointed be his Hienesse, be present at ilk General Assemblie, before the dissolving thereof, nominate and appoynt time and place, quhen and quhair the next General Assemblie sal be halden: And in case naither his Majestie nor his said Commissioners beis present for the time in that toun quhair the said General Assemblie beis halden, then, and in that case, it sal be lesum to the said General Assemblie be themselues to nominate and appoynt time and place quhair the nixt General Assemblie of the Kirk sal be keiped and halden, as they haue bene in vse to do thir times by-past. And als ratifies and appreuis the Synodall and Prouinciall Assemblies, to be halden be the said Kirk and Ministers twise ilk zeir, as the haue bene, and are presentlie in vse to do, within everie province of this realme: And ratifies and appreevis the presbyteries, and particular sessiones appointed be the said Kirk, with the hail jurisdiction and discipline of the same Kirk, agried vpon be his Majestie in conference, had, be his Hienesse, with certaine of the ministers, conveened to that effect: Of the quhilks artickles, the tenour follows. Maters to be intreated in provincial assemblies: Thir assemblies are constitute for weichtie matters, necessar to be intreated be mutual consent and assistance of

brethren, within the province, as neede requiris. This assemble has power to handle, ordour and redresse all things omitted or done amisse in the particular assemblies. It has power to depose the office-beareres of that province, for gude and just cause, deserving deprivation: And generallie, thir assemblies hes the hail power of the particular elderschips quhair of they are collected. Maters to be intreated in the presbyteries. The power of the presbyteries is to giue diligent laboures in the boundes committed to their charge; that the kirkes be kept in gude ordour; to inquire diligentlie of naughtie and ungodlie persons; and to travel to bring them in the way again be admonition or threatning of God's judgments, or be correction. It appertaines to the elderschippe to take heede that the word of God be purelie preached within their boundes, the sacramentes richtlie ministred, the discipline interteined, and ecclesiastical gudes vncorruptlie distributed. It belangis to this kind of assemblies to cause the ordinances maid by the assemblies, provincialles, nationalles, and generalles, to be kepted and put in execution, to make constitutions, quhilk concernis τὸ πρέπον in the kirk, for decent ordour, in the particular kirk quhair they governe: providing that they alterna rules maid be the prouinciall or generall assemblies; and that they make the prouinciall assemblies foresaid privie of the rules that they sall make; and to abolish constituciones tending to the hurt of the same. It hes power to excommunicate the obstinate, formal process being led, and dew intervall of times obserued. Anent particular kirks, gif they be lauchfullie ruled be sufficient ministerie and session, they have power and jurisdiction in their owen congregation, in maters ecclesiasticall. And decernis and declaris the saides

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

assemblies, presbyteries and sessiones, jurisdiction and discipline thereof foresaid, to be in all times cumming maist just, gude, and godlie in the self, notwithstanding of quhatsumever statutes, actes, canone, civill or municipall lawes, made in the contrare. To the quhilkis, and everie ane of them, thir presentes sall make expresse derogation. And, because there ar diners actes of Parliament maid in fauour of the papisticall kirk, tending to the prejudice of the libertie of the trew kirk of God, presentlie professed within this realme, jurisdiction and discipline thereof, quhilk stands zit in the buikes of the actes of Parliament, nocht abrogated nor annulled ; therefore his Hieness and Estaites foresaides hes abrogated, cassed, and annulled ; and be the tenour hereof, abrogatis, cassis and annullis all actes of Parliament maid be onie of his Hienesse predecessoures, for maintenance of superstition and idolatrie, with all and quhatsumever actes, lawes, and statutes, maid at onie time, before the daie and dait hereof, against the libertie of the trew kirk, jurisdiction and discipline theiroyf, as the samin is vsed and exercised within this realme.

“ And in special, that part of the Act of Parliament, halden at Striviling the 4 day of Nouember the zeir of God 1443 zeirs, commaunding obedience to be given to Eugenius the Paipe for the time ; the acte maid be King James the Thrid, in his parliament halden at Edinburgh, the 24 day of Februar, the zeir of God 1480 zeires ; and all vtheris actes, quhairby the Paipis authoritie is established. The acte of King James the Thrid, in his parliament halden at Edinburgh the 20 daie of November, the zeir of God 1469 zeires, anent the Satterday, and vther vigiles to be hailie daies, from euen-sang to euen-sang.

“ *Item*, That pairt of the act, maid be the Queene

Regent, in the parliament halden at Edinburgh, the first day of Februar, the zeir of God 1551 zeires, giuing speciall licence for halding of Pasche and Zule. *Item*, the Kingis Majestie and Estaites foresaidis, declaris, that the 129 Acte of the Parliament halden at Edinburgh the 22 day of Maij, the zeir of God 1584 zeirs, sall na wise be prejudiciall, nor derogate onie thing to the priuiledge that God hes giuen to the spiritual office-bearers in the kirk, concerning heads of religion, maters of heresie, excommunication, collation, or deprivation of ministers, or ony siklike essentiall censours, speciallie grounded and hauand warrand of the word of God. *Item*, Our Soveraine Lord, and Estaites of Parliament foresaidis, abrogatis, cassis and annullis, the act of the same parliament halden at Edinburgh, the said zeir 1584 zeires, granting commission to bischopps, and vtheris iudges, constitute in ecclesiastical causes, to receiue his Hienesse presentations to benefices, to giue collation thereupon ; and to put ordour in al causes ecclesiastical, quhilk his Majestie and estaites foresaidis declaris to be expired in the self, and to be null in time cumming, and of nane avall, force nor effect. And therefore ordainis all presentations to benefices, to be direct to the particular presbyteries in all time cumming : with full power to giue collation thereupon ; and to put ordour to all matters and causes ecclesiasticall within their boundes, according to the discipline of the kirk : Providing the foresaid presbyteries be bound and astricted to receive and admit quhatsumeuer qualified minister, presented be his Majestie, or laick patrones.”]

LECT.

XVI.

.1592.

Appendix,
Nos. XIV.
and XIX.

Thus was Presbyterian government established in Scotland. The steps hitherto taken by the court and the nobles had been uniformly at variance with the

Importance
of this Act.

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

wishes of the Church. Twenty years before they had begun to introduce Protestant bishops into every diocese which became vacant by the death of the Popish incumbents, all of whom retained their dignities and the greater part of their revenues as long as they lived; but as the fruits of the benefices were reaped by the nobles, who allowed only a scanty gleanings to the newly appointed dignitaries, the Church was perfectly aware that this expedient was only a veil to cover the sacrilegious rapine which was committed all over the country, although the *presentees* to these lordly titles with beggarly endowments were in general persons whose talents and whose characters commanded so little respect that it might almost have been imagined that the scheme had been devised for the purpose of bringing episcopacy into utter contempt. The great body of the Church always resisted their authority, and took every occasion to humble them. The Assembly again and again declared their office to be inconsistent with the gospel, and in 1580 solemnly pronounced an ordinance for abolishing it finally. But this effort proved abortive, for reasons too obvious to require illustration. The parliament would not gratify the Church, because they knew that if the diocesan offices were declared vacant they could have no longer a pretext for allowing the benefices to be appropriated to other uses than those of the Church; and besides, those persons whom the Assembly wished to be deposed, and in whose names the rents of the bishoprics were drawn, had a voice in every parliament, while the other ministers had none. More than twenty prelates (including abbots) sat in some of these parliaments; and as the sessions were not well attended by all ranks, such a number must

have thrown a great weight into the scale of the court.

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

The Act of 1592 was passed with an ill grace. The unpopularity of the court, occasioned by the murder of Huntly, made it necessary for the King to solicit the support of the Church, which was daily gaining fresh influence from the accessions of talent and learning which were every year coming forth from the theological school of Andrew Melville. Now, for the first time, however, were the liberties and the powers of an ecclesiastical establishment, constructed on the principles of the Books of Discipline, fully recognised. Now, for the first time, did the people feel that an offence against the discipline of the Church was a violation of the laws of the country. One of the advantages thus secured is especially worthy of notice. The established teachers of religion in a great kingdom admitted into all their judicative as well as legislative assemblies, an intermixture of members chosen from among the people, who had thus the same power as themselves, both in making and executing laws. That such a provision should have been legalised was, in the existing state of the country, of incalculable importance. No regulation could have been better devised for securing the confidence and maintaining the submission of those of whom they had the charge. The people knew that their feelings and their interest would be studiously consulted by the elders, chosen with their own approbation. They knew also that these men, solemnly set apart to their function, under a sacred engagement to act with fidelity, would not fail to represent, to the judicatories of the Church, offences against religion or good morals; and thus, while they were kept in awe by the vigilance of the

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

ruling elders, they could not doubt that those whose habits and manner of life were congenial with their own would be anxious to temper justice with tenderness, and to administer reproof and correction in the spirit of meekness. A number of the elders seems to have been selected from every class of the people, that the rights and the duties of all might be equally kept in view; and it was thought desirable to have the co-operation of some men invested with civil power, who thus, while members of the kirk-session and other church courts, might be able by their authority to restrain and overawe the contumacious.^a The ministers, too, having all equal power, now felt the dignity of independence, without being tempted to assume the arrogance of greatness. They displayed no ambition to rise from obscurity to pre-eminence, and, satisfied with a moderate provision, which could scarcely be called a competency, they proved that in their estimation no distinction was so honourable as the disinterested pursuit of the people's best interest, and the ostentatious discharge of a most laborious duty.

It was not to be expected that this state of things, introduced as it was in opposition to the secret wishes of the monarch and the satellites of the court, would be permitted long to remain undisturbed. James bitterly hated the principles and the form, as well as the promoters, of the presbyterian scheme of church government. His temper was arbitrary, and in spite of the

^a [*Supra*, vol. i., p. 259. The following curious extract, in further illustration of the general statements in the text is from the Records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh:—"Oct. 17, 1587.—Anent the greit necessitie that thair is of the baronis and gentlemen quha wer anes nominat and chosin

eldaris to concure with brethren of the ministrie, it is thocht good that the baronis and gentilmen quha wer chosen to be eldaris at the first erecting of the presbyterie, sall be desyrit be the brethren of the ministrie to be present the last of this instant to the effect forsaid."]

instructions of his elegant tutor, the strong-minded and elegant Buchanan, he had acquired from the evil councillors who beset him from his earliest years, an immoderate desire of supremacy. He claimed a divine right to dictate equally to the Church and the State; and as presbyterianism had obtained its establishment in consequence of its persevering efforts to make itself independent of the civil power, he could not regard it with complacency. He was enraged and disgusted at the ascendancy of the ministers over the people, and still more at the just severity with which his own conduct and that of his favourites were stigmatised in public sermons and in resolutions of the Church courts. He disliked the simplicity of worship, which was ill-suited to a taste like his, enamoured of pomp and tinsel magnificence. In opposition to his promises, therefore, James was inwardly resolved to seize the first favourable occasion to establish in Scotland the Episcopalian forms of worship, and to restore the hierarchy, not indeed to all its former powers and emoluments, but to all the consequence which it was capable of enjoying after being retrenched in its revenues and dependent on the temporal head of the government.

After the Act of Parliament was passed in 1592 (accompanied as it was with several other statutes favourable to the same cause), the Church exerted itself to the uttermost to improve its advantages. The provincial Synod of Fife, which met the following year, represented to the King its disapprobation of the favour which he showed to papists, and his negligence in suppressing idolatry and injustice,—concluding with a resolution to yield up their lives rather than suffer this violation of the laws to continue. The

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

Prosperity
of the
Church from
1592 to
1596.

LECT.
XVI.

1592.

synod also excommunicated the papist noblemen, Huntly, Angus, Errol, and others, though they were openly countenanced and favoured by the King. The General Assembly approved these proceedings, and required their commissioners to admonish the King to discharge his office faithfully in punishing the oppressions and murders which were multiplying to an alarming extent through the want of justice. But these exhortations served only to irritate the King, and to excite the enemies of religion to devise plans for overthrowing the new establishment. Some of the ministers spoke too intemperately on these subjects; and the General Assembly thought it necessary to make an Act, ordaining that no ministers within the realm utter from the pulpit any rash or irreverent speech against his Majesty or his council, but that all their public admonitions proceed upon just and necessary causes, and sufficient warrant, in all fear, love, and reverence, under pain of deposition for the offenders. While they thus respected the laws and authority of the State, the ministers of the Church proceeded to exercise discipline among the members of their own body with strict impartiality. The King continued to receive and protect the excommunicated lords; but a convention of ministers, and barons, and commissioners of burghs met, and represented the dangers of the country so strongly and successfully, that the King and parliament were at last reduced to the necessity of pronouncing the forfeiture of the popish lords, as having been guilty of high treason. They now rose in arms against the King's authority, but were defeated with great loss by the King's army, under the command of Archibald, Earl of Argyle, a young man of eighteen years of age. Till the year

1596, the prosperity and influence of the Church continued undiminished. To this period, all true Presbyterians look back as the era of the greatest purity which this National Church ever attained. It is a period of only four years; and whoever wishes to study the true genius of the presbyterian system of discipline, ought to attend particularly to this interval of its ascendancy, from 1592 to 1596.

LECT.
XVI.
1596.

In the beginning of the year 1596 the King and council chose eight commissioners of exchequer, who received the charge and administration of the King's rents, properties, and casualties. From their number, they were named by the people *Octavians*. Their names were Alexander Seton, Lord President of Session, Walter Stewart, prior of Blantyre, John Lindsey of Balcarres, John Skene, clerk register, Peter Young, almoner, Sir David Carnegie, James Elphinstone, a senator of the College of Justice, and Thomas Hamilton, King's advocate. These persons were all members of the privy council, and having the entire management of the treasury, they had likewise the chief direction of all public affairs. Some of them were suspected of popery, and it is not, therefore, to be wondered that the Church viewed their nomination as a measure most disastrous to religion.

A General Assembly, which met in March 1596, resolved to reform all the abuses which could be detected in its own constituent members. It was remarkable for three things—1. For making regulations to correct the corruption of ministers; 2. For a representation to the King of his own sins, and those of his family, his counsellors, and his nobles; 3. For renewing the national covenant. Robert Pont was the modera-

LECT.
XVI.

1596.

tor of this Assembly. The King was present in the fourth session, and was told that two important objects had been under consideration of the Church,—the one, the most efficacious means of resisting the enemies of religion and of the country, both foreign and domestic,—the other, the purification of the Church from enormities. On the first point, the ministers insisted that the rents of the forfeited rebels should be seized and employed for the subsistence of the troops levied for the defence of the country. They recommended several other prudent measures, to which the King paid little attention. They then informed his Majesty that it was their duty faithfully to try and to reprove his offences, as well as those of inferior men. The King said that he was willing to be judged by the Assembly, provided it were done privately; but a private rebuke for open sin was not in their estimation consistent with the Word of God. In the thirteenth session, three ministers, James Melville, Patrick Galloway, and James Nicolson, were sent to confer with the King concerning his own sins, and those of his household. The articles of complaint are as follows: 1. Strangers and good subjects repairing to court are troubled when they see the exercise of reading the Word at table, and reverent saying of grace before and after meat, omitted; 2. On week-days, repairing to hear the sermon is more rare than before, and his Majesty is admonished to forbear to speak with others in time of sermon; 3. Private meditation with God and with conscience is recommended to his Majesty; 4. His Majesty is blotted with swearing, and the courtiers are moved to it by his ill example; 5. His Majesty would be pleased to have good company about

him, to remove murderers, papists, and profane persons ; 6. The Queen's Majesty is to be informed, especially concerning her company, her not repairing to preaching and sacraments, her night waking and balls, and such other things. How these counsels were received at Holyrood house is not expressly told ; but the King was never in good humour with any of the ministers afterwards, though this was not the only ground of quarrel. The corruptions which the Assembly enumerates as being common to all estates, not excepting the judges and the ministers, are of the deepest dye, and, unless they are aggravated far beyond the truth, they prove that the country was sunk into the lowest abyss of depravity.

Calderwood's *History* contains a very full account of all the proceedings of this Assembly. No other book, not even Petrie, is nearly so minute in the details of all the occurrences affecting the interest of the Church at this period. The ministers and other commissioners assembled in the little church of Edinburgh, and, after prayer and exhortation by John Davidson, minister of Prestonpans (at one time a master in this college), all the members, and some other distinguished persons, four hundred in number, holding up their hands, solemnly entered into a new league and covenant with God. The scene is said to have been peculiarly impressive, and the religious service which preceded it was perhaps the longest which had before that time been known in this country. The members convened at nine in the morning, and the prayer, confession, and sermon, lasted till near one in the afternoon. This was a small matter, indeed, compared with what was common in future times. Calderwood,

LECT.
XVI.

1596.

[Calder-
wood, Hist.,
pp. 312-
323.]

LECT. after giving an account of all the proceedings of this
XVI. Assembly, adds — “ Here end the sincere general
1596. assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland.” Before it dis-
solved, it gave directions to all the synods to renew
the covenant in like manner, and many presbyteries
and parishes followed the example.

LECTURE XVII.

CASE OF DAVID BLACK—DECLINATURE BY THE MINISTERS OF THE KING'S JURISDICTION IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL—TUMULT IN EDINBURGH—CONVENTION AT PERTH—GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT DUNDEE, 1597—PROGRESS OF THE KING'S MEASURES FOR ALTERING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH—ARROGANT PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY THE ASSEMBLY—ACT FOR GIVING THE MINISTRY A VOTE IN PARLIAMENT—GOWRIE CONSPIRACY.

I AM not much accustomed to take notice of passing occurrences; but I cannot refuse myself the high satisfaction of adverting to a circumstance on which I am confident none of us can entertain any difference of sentiment. One of our meetings in this place has been recently graced by the presence of an individual,^a educated in this seminary not many years ago, who has attained a degree of distinction unprecedented perhaps in the annals of our Church, and who, to the envied advantages of original genius, and the acknowledged superiority of scientific acquirements, has added the far nobler eminence of Christian zeal and apostolical eloquence,—for what has there ever been which could more impressively bring home to our recollection the lofty energy of truth and principle with which the utterance of Paul was roused, when he who in bodily presence was weak, and in speech contemptible, stood in the Areopagus, publishing in the ears of Epi-

LECT.
XVII.
1596.

[Dr Thomas Chalmers.]

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

cureans and Stoics the doctrines of the cross, and fighting the good fight of faith with the scornful votaries of false philosophy, than the spirit-stirring fervour and vehemence with which our ears have lately heard the words of eternal life proclaimed? It reminds us at least of the earliest and purest times of our Church, when the dangers and difficulties of its friends required from them exertions of courage and nerve, of which it is difficult for us to form an adequate conception, when under the commanding eye of Bruce the gay and the careless were made to tremble at the Word, when the fire of Melville's reproof struck terror into the royal heart, and when the dying strength of Knox was spent in the pulpit of St Andrews. The electrifying effect of the reformer's eloquence may be faintly conceived from the description of it given by James Melville, who, while a student at this university, had an opportunity of being benefited by some of the latest ministrations of that wonderful man. Though the expression is somewhat homely, I may take this opportunity of quoting a short extract from his *Diary*.

[Melville's
Diary, pp.
23, 28.
See M'Crie's
Life of
Knox, p.
330.]

“Of all the benefits I had that year (1571) [the greatest] was the coming of that maist notable prophet and apostle of our nation, John Knox, to St Andrew's. I heard him teach there the prophecies of Daniel that simmer and the winter following. I had my pen and my little book, and took away sic things as I could comprehend. In the opening up of his text he was moderate, the space of an half hour,—but when he entered to application, he made me so to grew (thrill) and tremble that I could not hold a pen to write. He was very weak. I saw him every day of his doctrine go hulie and fear, with a furring of masticks about his neck, a staff in the anc hand, and gud godlie Richart

Ballenden, his servand, haldin up the uther oxtar, from the abbey to the parish kirk, and be the said Richart and another servant, lifted up to the pulpit, whar he behovit to lean at his first entrie ; but ere he had done with his sermon, he was sa active and vigorous that he was lik to ding the pulpit in blads and flie out of it."

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

On the many great qualities which distinguish the deservedly applauded preacher, to whom we have so lately listened, it is superfluous to dwell : and I have introduced the subject chiefly for the sake of telling you how highly gratified he has been by revisiting the scene of his theological education, and by observing that among you the ardour of study has suffered no decline. It is still more incumbent on me to encourage you to bestow your most strenuous efforts to follow an example so peculiarly calculated to rouse and to animate young men,—an example, however, which, let me say, is not to be followed by imitating either the manner or the diction of this extraordinary and truly original speaker,—for all such imitation is unworthy, and is almost sure to be unsuccessful ; but by imbibing the devotion to truth and to benevolent enterprise by which he is so signally characterised,—by emulating the fervour of his spirit and the alacrity of his labours,—by studying every subject with a desire to bring to it all the illustrations which acuteness of intellect, or extent of learning, or the researches of science can supply,—by laying deeply to heart the incalculable worth of immortal souls, and by exercising with discrimination and with earnestness the peculiar capacities which every one possesses in greater or less degree, so as to promote the glory of that kingdom which is not in word, but in power. We now proceed with our usual occupation.

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

While the ministers were proceeding zealously in their endeavours to reform not only their own order, but all other classes of men, the courtiers and others who had a tendency to popery, being aware that if the strict discipline proposed by the General Assembly were carried into effect, their irregularities could no longer be tolerated, resolved that they would not submit to a yoke so grievous, and that they would avail themselves of all the means in their power to subvert that spiritual government which only four years before had been ratified by the parliament. In spite of the remonstrances of the Church, the King received the popish lords again under his protection, and his Majesty's common talk (which though abundantly foolish, was not so unwise as many of his actions) consisted almost entirely in traducing the preachers and ridiculing their doctrines.

Certain brethren were sent to his Majesty to represent that there was a most dangerous jealousy between him and the Church, and to desire him to declare plainly what offended him in the ministry either in general or particular, that he might be satisfied; and on the other hand, to declare that they were grieved at the favour which he showed to the forfeited lords. The King answered that there could be no agreement between him and the ministers till the bounds of their jurisdictions were defined,—and that, in the following points particularly, he claimed redress. 1. That in preaching they should not speak of the affairs of state and council. 2. That the General Assembly should not be convened but by his authority and special command. 3. That nothing done in the Assembly should be established till it was ratified by him or his commissioners. 4. That synods, presbyteries, and particular

sessions intermeddle with no causes to which his laws were applicable, and with none, indeed, except common scandals. As to the grievances, he said that he had granted nothing to the excommunicated earls but what the Council and Estates thought needful for the peace of the realm, and always under condition that they should first satisfy the Church. The ministers, he said, gave him occasion to speak of them, as they never ceased in their sermons to provoke him, and to disgrace him before the people. The ministers replied that the free preaching of the Word and rebuke of sin, without respect of persons, were established after many conferences, upon evident grounds of the Word, by his Majesty's laws and Acts of Parliament, and that the ministers had always spoken reverently of his Majesty, but could not spare the enemies of the truth.

After the King's answer was reported to the Church, it was suspected that the overthrow of the Presbyterian discipline was intended. It was therefore recommended to all the ministers to study the Acts of Council and Parliament passed in favour of the Kirk, and to listen to his Majesty's articles without entering into any reasoning upon them till their commissioners to the Council were fully apprised of all that passed. In a future conference with the King, some of the ministers were instructed to ask what his doubts were respecting the limits of the calling of the ministry, and to state the hardship which they suffered in being vexatiously charged with trifling offences, when the adversaries of the truth were not merely overlooked but taken into favour. To this representation the King returned an unkind answer. Patrick Galloway, his own minister, had said to him privately, that the Church got fair words and promises,

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

and that their enemies got all the good deeds. His Majesty seems, therefore, to have resolved that they should not have so much even as good words any more.

Case of
David
Black.

Further evidence of the designs against the Church was afforded by the course taken with David Black, minister of St Andrews, who, in November of this year, was summoned before the Privy Council, for certain expressions used by him in the pulpit, and particularly for having, as was alleged, in some of his sermons reflected on the religious character of Queen Elizabeth. The ministers of Edinburgh and others, who had been commissioned to act as a council representing the different provinces of the Church, perceived that the case of Black was laid hold of by the King as a preparative for bringing the doctrine of ministers generally under the review and control of the Court; and therefore they resolved to concur with Black in giving in a written declinature of the jurisdiction of the King and Council in spiritual matters. This declinature was signed not only by Black himself, but by all the ministers then in Edinburgh, and two days afterwards a copy of it was sent to all the presbyteries for their approbation. In a very short time it was subscribed by above 300 ministers, and if the commissioners had been allowed to remain longer in Edinburgh,^a a greater number of signatures might

^a [On the 23d November, the Privy Council discharged "convocationis at the desire of the Ministeris," appointing "letters to be direct, charging the persons of the ministers under-written—Mr John Davidson, Mr Adam Johnston, Mr Nicol Dalgleish, Mr Tho. Buchanan, Mr Patrick Simson, Mr John Knox, John Clapperton,

Mr Andro Melville, Mr George Ramsay, Mr James Law, David Ferguson, Mr James Nicolson, Mr Peter Blackburn, Mr Patrick Sharpe, Mr David Lindsay, Mr James Melville—to depart home to their several flocks and congregations within 24 hours next after they be charged thereto, and to await upon the faithful discharge of their

have been obtained. It is said that Spotswood, archbishop of St Andrews, was very active in procuring subscriptions, but that even then he revealed to the King all their counsels and proceedings, either personally or through one of the courtiers. Petrie here takes occasion to say—"He was the only suspected Judas among the ministers at that time. Others were like Hazael, who understood not their own hollow hearts till time discovered them." I shall read an abridgment of this document from Stevenson's History :—

LECT.
XVII.
1596.

[Petrie, p. 521.]

"[Unto your Majesty, and Lords of Secret Council, with all reverence in Christ, humbly meaneth, I, Mr David Black, minister of the Evangel at St Andrews, That where I am charged to answer for certain irreverent, infamous, and indecent speeches, alleged uttered by me in some of my sermons, in the Kirk of St Andrews, in October last : wherein albeit the consciousness of my innocence upholdeth me sufficiently, and that I am ready to give a confession and to stand to the defence of the truth of God, uttered by me in the said sermons, before your Majesty or Council, so far as shall be requisite for clearing and defending of the truth and my ministry, and may be done without prejudice of that liberty which the Lord Jesus hath given to the spiritual office-bearers in his kingdom ; yet, seeing I am brought to stand before his Majesty and Council, as judges of my doctrine,

Declinature by the ministers of the King's jurisdiction in matters spiritual. [Stevenson's History, vol. i. p. 216.]

calling, &c." It is stated in the preamble that they usurped a power over their brethren—"na tìne" being taken in the mean time of their several flocks and congregations committed to their charge.—(*Reg. Sec. Consilii*, Nov. 23, 1596.) It was afterwards explained (*Ibid.* Dec. 9) that only unlawful con-

vocations were discharged, and that it never was his Majesty's intention to "prejuge the lauchful assemblies of the Kirk, established be the laws and Acts of Parliament, but onlie to discharge the unlauchful convocations of barons and other lieges in arms, be desire of the saids ecclesiastical persons."]

LECT.
XVII.

1593.

and lest to the manifest prejudice of the liberties of the Kirk, my answering to the said accusation might import an acknowledgment of your Majesty's jurisdiction in matters merely spiritual, and move your Majesty to attempt further in the government of the house of God, and in end prove either a plain subverting or confounding of the spiritual judicature with the civil, Therefore I am constrained in all humility to use a declinature of this judgment, in *prima instantia*, for the reasons following:—

“ 1. Because the Lord Jesus, the God of order, of whom only I have the grace of my calling, as his ambassador, hath given me his Word, as the only instructions whereby I should regulate my calling in preaching of the Word, &c., I cannot, in the discharge thereof, be subjected to any civil law, but in so far as I shall be found to pass the bounds of my instructions, which, according to the order established by God, must be judged by the prophets, whose lips should preserve knowledge, and to whom He hath subjected the spirits of the prophets.

“ 2. Because the liberty and discipline of the Kirk have been confirmed by divers Acts of Parliament, and peaceably enjoyed by the office-bearers of the Kirk in all points, particularly the judgment upon the preaching of the Word *in prima instantia*.

“ 3. Because there are two jurisdictions established and exercised within this realm—the one spiritual, the other civil; the one respecting the conscience, the other external things; the one directly procuring obedience unto God, the other obedience to civil laws; the one persuading by the Word, the other compelling by the sword; the one spiritually procuring the edification of the Church, the other procuring the peace

and quietness of the commonwealth, which, having ground in the light of nature, proceeds from God as He is the Creator, and so termed by the apostle, *humana creatura* (1 Pet. ii.), varying according to the constitution of men—the other above nature, grounded upon the grace of redemption, proceeding immediately from Jesus Christ, only Head and King over his Church (Eph. i., Col. ii.), which is his spiritual body; from whose Spirit flow all spiritual gifts and graces; by whom are appointed all spiritual offices and functions (1 Cor. xii.); by whom are given to the Church, and effectually called, all office-bearers (Eph. iv.); to whom He hath intrusted the preaching of the gospel (1 Cor. ix.); whom He reproves and punishes, and of whom He craveth an account of reckoning of the transgressions of the people (Ezek. xxxiv., Ex. xxxii.); whom He has planted in their spiritual ministry over kings and kingdoms, to plant and pluck up by the roots, to edify and demolish (Jer. i.); to cast down strongholds, and whatsoever lifteth itself up against the knowledge of God; unto these He hath given spiritual armour for that effect, and to take revenge of all stubborn disobedients (2 Cor. x.); whom He has commanded not only to *preach the Word, and to be instant in season and out of season* (2 Tim. iv.), but also to *divide the Word aright* (Matt. xxiv., 2 Tim. v.); to admonish, rebuke, convince, and threaten (2 Tim. iv.); to deliver unto Satan (1 Cor. v., 1 Tim. i.); to bind the impenitent in their sins, to lock out and debar from the kingdom of heaven (Matt. x., John xx.); to whom He has given the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xvi.), and power to assemble themselves to this effect (Matt. xviii., Acts xv., 1 Cor. xv.), promising his presence and assistance (Mat. xxviii.); and, in short, the spiritual

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

administration as He has put it in their hands, making them judges to try and cognosce in spiritual matters (1 Cor. xiv.); even so He chargeth them, with vehement attestations by the great God and glorious coming of the Prince of Pastors (1 Pet. v.), to do those things without respect of persons, with all attention (1 Tim. v., vi., 2 Tim. iv., 1 Pet. v., Tit. ii.)

“And therefore, in so far as I am one of the spiritual office-bearers, and have discharged my spiritual calling in some measure of sincerity, should not, nor cannot, be lawfully judged for preaching and applying of the Word of God by any civil judge, I being an ambassador of the Lord Jesus (Mal. ii.), having my commission from the King of kings, and all my instruction set down in the Book of God, that cannot be extended, abridged, or altered by any mortal (2 Tim. iii., Deut. iv., Pro. xxx., Rev. xxii.) And seeing I am sent to all sorts of men, to lay open their hid sins, to preach the law and repentance, the evangel and forgiveness of sins, and to be a savour of life unto life to those that are appointed for life, and a savour of death unto death unto those that are appointed for death (2 Cor. ii.), my commission, the form and delivery thereof, cannot be lawfully judged by them to whom I am sent—they being as both judge and party, sheep and not pastors, to be judged by this Word, and not to be judges thereof.”]

Sentence
against
David
Black.

The Council, disregarding this declaration, to which almost all the ministers of the Church were ready to express their adherence, found themselves competent judges of all the particulars charged against Black, with the exception of one which related to the Church of England. The ministers resolved that the doctrine of all the preachers should be directed against the

interlocutor, as a stronghold set up to destroy the freedom of the gospel. The King seemed to be alarmed by the effect of the sermons delivered on this subject, and promised that if the ministers would desist from their public animadversions, he would willingly retract some of his proclamations, and satisfy the presbyteries concerning the interlocutor of the Council. His pacific overture, on the basis of which some articles of agreement were framed, was afterwards withdrawn by the King, who insisted that Black should at least confess an offence committed against the Queen. He had previously offered that if the members of the Church would not adhere to Black's declinature, or would declare that it applied solely to his cause, as being a case of slander, pertaining by right to the Church, he would discharge the summons, and proceed no farther against Black. But the Church would not recede from the ground they had taken, and Black would make no apology, because in so doing, he said, he would approve the proceedings of the Council who had summoned him, and admitted ignorant and partially affected persons, lying under the censure of the Church, to be witnesses, although he had ample testimonies from the provost, magistrates, and council, from the kirk-session, and from the rector, dean of faculty, principals of colleges, regents, and whole members of the university, his daily hearers. He said he was willing to confess the whole truth to the ecclesiastical court, and to undergo censure if found guilty. The Council again met on the 2d of December. Black did not appear when called. The depositions of the witnesses were read, and the whole points contained in the accusation were declared to be proved. The punishment was referred to the King, and the

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

whole process was registered. Various proposals were still made by the King, which seemed to hold out the proposal of an amicable accommodation; but after much waste of time in fruitless conferences, all the hopes of the ministers were frustrated. On the 10th of December, David Black was charged in the King's name to remove within six days to the north of the Tay, there to remain, under pain of being treated as a rebel and an outlaw.^a

Whatever might, in this case, be the merits or demerits of David Black, his labours were most acceptable in St Andrews, in which he had been settled about three and a half years. It was not by complying with their weaknesses and overlooking their faults that he ingratiated himself with the people, for he was one

^a ["18 Nov. 1596.—Maister David Black, . . . tuching certain words and unsenlie speiches utterit be him in divers his sermones maid in St Andrews, . . . Comperand personaliter declarit . . . alleging that nane should be judges to materis deliverit in pulpit, but the preichers and ministeris of the Worde, and therefore desirit to be remittit to his juge ordinar, the presbyterie where the doctrine was teichit, quhair his Majestie suld be a compleiner in the first instance, as a Christian and member of the kirk, and not as a king. . . . Allegit be his Majestie that the matter is altogedder civile, and not spirituall. . . . Being inquirit quedder giff his Majestie nicht be juge in matteris of tresson, as the kirk is juge in matteris of heresie, grantis, yet allegit that the wordis deliverit in pulpit, albeit allegeit to be tressonabil, sould be tryit *in prima instantia* be the kirk, as onlie juge competent: to the contrarie grof the Act of Parliament, maid in the lxxxiiij zeir of God, was allegit; to

the derogatioun of the quhilk Act Mr David producit another Act in the Parliament halden in the lxxxxii zeir of God. . . . Being inquirit quhat warrand thai had out of the Word of God for matteris spoken against a Christian magistrate, allegeit q'ever is spokin to be spiritual, and therefor mon be reulit be the Worde of God, and for this purpose allegeit the first of Timothie. Continewit to the last of November inst." "Ult Nov. 1596. Interloqueter against Mr David Black. (Thirty-two members present with the King.) All in ane voce findis themselves to be juges competent in the hail causes, points, crymes, and accusations specifiet." "Dec. 2, 1596. Decrete against Mr David Black." After deposition of "certain famous witnesses sworne and examinat," he is "ordanit to pas and enter his person in warde in ony part benorth the north water, &c."—*Reg. Sec. Consilii*. See also *ibid.*, Dec. 17, a very long declaration anent the proceedings against Mr David Black.]

of the strictest disciplinarians ever known. Before his time the parish was exceedingly disorderly ; but very soon after his admission, he established such excellent regulations, and carried them so completely into execution, that no person was ever seen to beg or to profane the Sabbath during the remainder of his ministry. He has been spoken of disrespectfully by late authors ; but his congregation and their descendants cherished his memory with the utmost fondness, as that of a man whose prudence was as remarkable as his piety. The most earnest solicitations were sent to the King, and the General Assembly, holden at Dundee, was entreated to intercede with his Majesty for license to their minister to return to his affectionate flock.^a But the King was inexorable.

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

^a [Spotswood says that, in July 1597, at the visitation of St Andrews, mentioned afterwards, "the elders and deacons of the Church upon oath deponed that Blake had spoken all that whereof he was convicted before the Council, . . . and being asked touching the behaviour [of Black and his colleague, Mr R. Wallace] otherwise, they declared that both the one and the other were given to factions, and that they did not carry themselves with that indifferency which became preachers."—(*Hist.*, p. 447.) That the kirk-session gave any such evidence is not very probable. Black's settlement as minister of St Andrews had been most harmonious ; "the maist speciall of the hail parochin alsweill to land as to bru^t. being convenient, after earnest incalling upon ye haly name of God, electit and chusit all w^t ane voce, w^tout discrepance or variance, Mr David Blak, quha was speciallic recommendit to yame be ye general kirk."—(*Session Minutes*, 11 Nov. 1590.) So late as May 2, 1596, at the Privy Censures, the session,

while they made some objection to his colleague, "objectit nathing aganis him, bot all the brethren praises God of him."—(See *supra*, vol. i. p. 168). On the 9th of January 1596-(7), after his conviction by the Privy Council, they sent a deputation of their number to "ye counsall of ye toun, and desyre ane supplication to his Maj. for relief of Mr David Blak, our pastour." On the 19th of March we find them ordering their clerk to write "ane bill and missive in their names to Mr D. Black, y^e minister, to give him thanks for his last letter, and to schaw to the sd Mr David y^t q^t lyes in y^e power to further his hame-cuming they sall do the samyne w^t his awin advyss, &c.;" and on the 8th of May we again find them sending "a supplication to the General Assembly at Dundee, to intercede to his Ma. to grant licens to Mr Dav. Blak to be restorit and admittit to cum hame in yis citie, to use his function of ye ministrie as he wes wont to do."—*Extracts from St Andrews Session Records.*]

LECT.
XVII.1596.
Tumult in
Edinburgh.

On the 17th of December (exactly a week after the King ordered Black to remove to the north) a tumult arose in the town of Edinburgh, which was made the pretext for the alterations in the government of the Church afterwards introduced by the King. How the tumult originated is not known. It seemed to have been excited by some foolish individuals to whom it was a sport to do mischief, or else who intended to bring the ministers into discredit. A report was circulated through the town that the ministers were attacked and slain, and about the same time a cry of uproar was heard, inviting the people to arm. Some called out to seize the Octavians, but the whole affair evaporated in clamour. The people, on being commanded by the magistrates, went quietly to their homes. There was no violence or bloodshed, and the ministers had co-operated with the magistrates in quelling the commotion. The King, however, either was, or pretended to be, mortally offended, and removed next day to Linlithgow. The judges were commanded to be ready to remove whithersoever the King might direct; the magistrates were required to apprehend the authors of the outrage; some of the citizens accused of violations of the peace were committed to prison, and the ministers of Edinburgh were ordered to be shut up in the castle.^a The whole measures

^a [For a time the city was left without ministers:—21 Dec. 1596. "The ministrie of Edinburgh were absent upon occasion of the late trouble that fell upon the 17th inst. Also absent Mr D. Lindsay, Mr R. Pont, and Jo. Brand." 28 Dec. Edinburgh "destitute of pastors."—*Records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh*. "1596, Wed. 22 Dec.—Here we stayed from marriage because of the absence

of our pastouris, quha wer compellit to remove be reasone of the injurie of tyme."—*Register of Marriages, Edinburgh*. In the Records of the Town-Council, vol. 10, ff. 104, &c., are various entries on the steps taken by the magistrates, both to propitiate the King and to provide for "teaching on Sabbath-days," and the "ministration of baptism and marriages, in the minister's absence." See also the *Reg.*

adopted by the Court proceeded upon the assumption that treason had been committed, and that the ministers were the prime movers. By the advice of their friends, therefore, Bruce, Balcanquel, James Balfour, and William Watson, four of the most eminent ministers, retired to England, where Bruce published an apology for their flight. Twenty-four of the citizens, who had signalised themselves by their zeal in defending the ministers, were also compelled to follow them.

This affair was most unjustly ascribed to the sermons preached by the ministers, and the King resolved, it is said, for this reason, to change the discipline of the Church; but it is certain that he had planned the alteration before this time. Among other steps now adopted, one of the most grievous to the Church was the injunction to all the ministers to subscribe a bond acknowledging the King as their judge, not only in all cases of sedition and treason, but in all complaints of their speeches which may import these crimes, though uttered in the pulpit or in any other place. The ministers in general refused to subscribe this bond, because they regarded it as a snare devised to entrap them into a recognition of the King's supremacy in all manner of causes. Immediately afterwards a proclamation was made by authority of the Council, requiring all magistrates and gentlemen to interrupt ministers if they should utter any speeches in reproach, contempt, or disdain of the King, his parents or progenitors, his Council and their proceed-

LECT.
XVII.

1596.

Sec. Consilii, Dec. 21, 1596, &c. One of the Acts of the Privy Council is entitled, "Act anent the minesteris houssis of Edinburgh," and supplies a curious fact as to the arrangements at that period for their residence. Its purpose was to make them live "severally" (or in separate parts of the town), and not, as before, "*togidder be thameselþis and their families, within the circuit of ane clois*," which gave them facilities for "treasonis, convocacionis, and conspiracis."—*Reg. Sec. Consilii*, Jan. 6, 1596-(7).]

LECT.
XVII.

1597.

ings, and to imprison them till further orders were given, or at least to hinder them from preaching within their jurisdiction.

Convention
at Perth,
1596-(7.)

The Court now prepared fifty-five queries concerning church government, to be submitted to a convention of ministers, summoned by the King to meet at Perth on the 28th of February. Great pains had been taken by the Court to secure the attendance of obsequious ministers from the northern counties. They flattered them by saying that the ministers of the north were men of better temper and greater prudence than those of the south, who were represented as being severe, arrogant, and ambitious of power. The ministers of the south, including those of Fife, were, however, in general, men of unimpeachable honesty, and much less covetous of preferment or of gain than their accusers. Two days were spent in debating whether they should hold the Assembly or not. The commissioners of eight presbyteries voted in the negative, and eleven voted in the affirmative. The others protested that this meeting of the ministry, called by the King's letters, should not be considered as a General Assembly. The majority, however, went on boldly with the business proposed by the King; and the questions having been reduced to thirteen, were hastily answered, in such a manner as to gratify the King. An ample commission was also given to the northern brethren, authorising them to proceed to the absolution of the banished lords, upon conditions not very grievous. The chief of the articles agreed to were as follows:—1, That it is lawful for the King, or for the pastors, to move doubts or crave reformation in any points of the external policy that are not essential to salvation, or are not answered either affir-

matively or negatively by any express passage of Scripture. 2, That no minister meddle with matters of State in the pulpit, but if he thinks any laws hurtful to religion, he may complain privately. 3, That pastors shall not name persons in the pulpit, or describe them so as to be equivalent to naming. 4, That in application, every minister shall have respect to the edification of his own flock, without expatiating on subjects not pertinent to the congregation. 5, That every presbytery shall take care that pastors, in their doctrine, keep themselves within the bounds of the Word. 9, That no conventions be among pastors without the King's consent, except their ordinary meetings of sessions, presbyteries, and synods. 10, That in all principal towns, ministers shall not be chosen without consent of his Majesty. 11, That all matters concerning the rest of his Majesty's questions be suspended, unmeddled with, either in pulpit or any other judicatory, till first all the questions be fully decided.

LECT.
XVII.

1597.

The Assembly of the Church which had been appointed by the last regular meeting, to be held at St Andrews on the 27th of April, was attended by a very small number. The moderator of the former Assembly, Robert Pont, constituted the meeting, and after making protestation for the liberty of the Church, referred all business (except the appointment of a fast) to the next General Assembly.

This meeting was disowned by the King, who called another Assembly, to meet at Dundee on the 1st of May. It was regularly opened by Robert Pont, the last moderator regularly chosen. Robt. Rollock, principal of the College of Edinburgh, was chosen to preside, in conformity with his Majesty's wishes. Rol-

General
Assembly
at Dundee,
May 10.
[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
913.]

LECT.
XVII.

1597.

lock, as we have seen, was a man of the most distinguished learning and piety, one of the best preachers in the Church, and certainly the fittest person, for presiding over a great academical institution, who ever filled the principal's chair in that university, which has since become the most important in the kingdom.

[Spotswood,
Hist., 443.
Petrie, 573.]

Archbishop Spotswood, with his usual inaccuracy, says that Rollock was chosen moderator, "though he was not as yet in orders, in so great esteem he was with all good men for his learning, holiness, and moderation." Now, first of all, he was not chosen either for his holiness or his learning, or for any other reason than that the King wished him to be moderator, and the King wished him to be moderator merely because he was an unsuspecting, peaceable man, void of all guile or artifice, and easily led by such of his friends as he confided in,—some of whom were secretly in the King's interest. But as to Rollock not being in orders, Spotswood must only mean that he was not episcopally ordained. He had been not only a professor of divinity, but an officiating minister in Edinburgh for ten years; and at least seven years before, one of his printed works, the *Commentary on the Ephesians*, designed him minister of Edinburgh on the title-page. (Petrie here takes the liberty of saying that the book which Spotswood "callethe the *History of the Church of Scotland*, may rather be called the *Calumnies and Railings against the Church of Scotland*, whereof he was an enemy, and by which he was justly and solemnly excommunicated in the year 1638. What is in that book of the faith, doctrine, or piety of the churches?") But farther, even the readiness of the Assembly to elect Rollock may be

questioned, as no less than three sessions were occupied with the choice of the moderator and the clerks.

At this Assembly the proceedings of the Convention at Perth were confirmed, and answers were given to several of the King's questions, which had been referred. It was ordained that there should be an uniformity in the ordination of ministers throughout all the country, by imposition of hands; that they be admitted to certain flocks; and that "none who is not admitted to the ministry be permitted to teach in public and great places, except, upon very urgent necessity in defect of actual ministers, they be ordained to supply such wants by the general or provincial assemblies, or by the presbyteries, who shall take diligent order that they keep themselves within the bounds of their gift, and especially in application." This statute was made chiefly, or rather entirely, for the purpose of stopping the mouths of professors of theology, particularly Andrew Melville, whose powerful preaching was somewhat too formidable to the King. By the original constitution of the office, a doctor, if not also ordinarily called to the ministry of the Word in a particular congregation, was restricted to the duty of expounding the Scriptures, without making such applications as the ministers use; and this provision was now turned, by the King's suggestion, against the chief leader of the Presbyterian body. For this reason it might be that, when the form of church government was renewed, it was determined that the doctor should in all cases be considered as a minister of the Word. Several of the other constitutions of this Assembly had the same tendency to abridge the power of presbyteries, and to restrain the liberty of preaching. But the most effectual step

LECT.
XVII.

1597.

Progress of
the King's
measures for
altering the
constitution
of the
Church.

LECT.
XVII.

1597.

taken for altering the constitution of the Church was another device of the King. On the ninth session, his Majesty, being present, said, that as the shortness of time hindered many things of moment from being duly discussed, it deserved to be considered whether it were not expedient to grant commission to certain brethren to convene with his Majesty for executing the business which could not now be overtaken. On this hint, fourteen ministers were named (seven to be a quorum) to meet the King to give advice concerning a constant plat or modification of stipends, and generally to give their advice to his Majesty in all affairs concerning the weal of the Church, and entertainment of peace and obedience to his Majesty, with express power to propound to his Majesty the petitions and grievances of the Church in general, and of every member of it.

Arrogant
proceedings
of the gene-
ral commis-
sioners ap-
pointed by
the Assem-
bly.

The commissioners thus appointed were all eminent men, and one or two of them were named from the party adverse to the King's measures. All of them, however, I believe, were gained over except James Melville. They had access to the King when they chose; they sat and consulted with him, preparing matters for the consideration of the Assemblies, and concerting the methods by which their proposals were to be carried. Their appointment, I have already said, is understood to have been a device of the Court for withdrawing the ablest of the ministers from the main body, and thus to pave the way for the introduction of Episcopacy. These men conducted themselves with great arrogance, and treated the presbyteries with contempt. Some ministers deposed for desertion of duty chose to restore; others they removed in opposition to the views of the presbyteries. They

visited the colleges of St Andrews, where they were most anxious to discover blemishes in the conduct of Andrew Melville, then rector, and in the other masters of the New College. Spotswood has given an unfair representation of the state of the colleges before this visitation, and has given the King the credit of those regulations with respect to the mode of teaching which were really the work of George Buchanan and of Andrew Melville himself. Other ordinances made by the commission of visitation were violations of the original laws of the university, and the most important of them were innovations in the law of the Church. Thus, in pursuance of a decision of the late Assembly at Dundee, all doctors, professors, and regents, not being pastors of any congregation, were exempted from attendance on sessions, presbyteries, synods, or General Assemblies, as from all teaching in churches and congregations, exercises excepted; and they were discharged from accepting any commission prejudicial to the said exemption, under the pain of deprivation and rebellion. The commissioners also suspended and removed Robert Wallace, minister of St Andrews, who had been David Black's colleague, and placed in his room one of themselves, George Gladstones, afterwards Archbishop of St Andrews. All these steps were taken to undermine the Presbyterian government, by weakening or supplanting its chief supporters.

The next measure was still more evidently intended for the same purpose. The Commissioners presented to the Parliament which met in December 1597, a petition in name of the Church, that ministers might have a vote in Parliament. The matter had often been under the consideration of Assemblies,

LECT.
XVII.

1597.

Act for
giving the
Ministry
a vote in
Parliament.

LECT.
XVII.

1598.

but they had never resolved to apply for such a privilege. It was not without difficulty that the nobles were brought to agree to the petition; and probably it would not have been granted if the King had not privately used all his influence. He prevailed on them to consent that "such ministers as his Majesty shall at any time please to provide to the office, dignity, and title of bishop, abbot, or other prelate, shall have vote in Parliament." It is believed that the Estates of Parliament were convinced that the ministers would not accept of these prelacies, and that they were thus led to yield to the petition under a condition which they conceived would be rejected.

The Synod of Lothian opposed this scheme as an insidious attempt to introduce the tyranny of bishops, and many of the members of the Synod of Fife were decidedly hostile to it. But their great leader, Melville, was not now permitted to speak or vote in church courts; and though he did attend this meeting, and begin to deliver his opinion, he was rudely interrupted by one of the commissioners, as being no longer a constituent member. Resistance in the inferior courts was vain. The members of the General Assembly were now so obsequious to the King that they were ready to pass any law which he proposed. The members were not duly elected, but nominated through the King's influence, and they readily approved whatever the commissioners had previously done. The Assembly, which met at Dundee in March 1597-(8), concluded that it was "necessary and expedient for the weal of the Church, that the ministry, as the third estate, have vote in Parliament, in name of the Church," and that the number should be the same as in the time of the Popish Church,

[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 946.]

namely, 51, in place of the bishops, abbots, and priors. They were to be elected partly by the King and partly by the Church ; but many of the regulations concerning the form of election, and other circumstances, were referred to the consideration of presbyteries and synods, who were directed to consult with the doctors of the universities, namely, Andrew Melville, John Johnston, Robert Howie, Robert Wilkie, and James Martin of St Andrews ; Robert Rollock, of Edinburgh ; and Patrick Sharp, of Glasgow. John Davidson, minister of Prestonpans, was the only member who had the boldness to protest against the hasty proceedings of this Assembly, which, he said, was not free, and which, in his judgment, was altogether disorderly. This was the man whose saying in the Synod of Fife is well known, when the proposal to give votes in Parliament to the ministers was first made : “ Dress him up as gaily as ye can, bring him in as softly as ye will, we see him well enough, we see the horns of his mitre ; observe, brethren, how slyly the bishop begins to creep in among us, *novus palliatus episcopus*.” A loud horse-laugh from his Majesty and his minions interrupted the old man while he was making some similar observations in the Assembly. Many of the members thought as he did, but, when the question was put, not one had the manliness to adhere to his protestation ; it was therefore not allowed to be inserted in the register. About seventy or eighty members, however, followed him to the south side of the Tay, and added their names ; but when he came to St Andrews, on his way homeward, he did not think it safe to allow them to stand, and he therefore tore away the subscriptions and threw them into the fire.

LECT.
XVII.

1598.

LECT.
XVII.

1600.

Another Assembly met at Aberdeen, in July 1599, which proceeded farther in the business, and in March 1600 the work was completed by the Assembly at Montrose. It was not carried without opposition on the part of the ministers, but the ablest and most faithful of them were excluded. Those who remained in the Assembly could not be brought to vote that the commissioners to the Parliament should be continued for life. Fifty-one voted that the election should be made annually by presbyteries; forty-eight (many of whom were not ministers) voted that the commissioner should every year lay down his commission at the feet of the Assembly, to be either withdrawn or continued, as the Assembly, with the King's consent, should think fit. The King was somewhat disappointed at this conclusion, but he did not despair of succeeding ultimately in his views. The "cautions" which were introduced into the Act to obtain more easy compliance were soon suppressed, and articles favouring bishops were substituted in their place.

Gowrie
Conspiracy.

About this time, the alleged conspiracy of the Earl Gowrie against the King's life (a most mysterious transaction which has never yet been cleared up) gave occasion to some oppressive measures against the Church. Robert Bruce, and other ministers of Edinburgh, were banished, because they would not publicly give thanks for the King's deliverance^a in the precise

^a [The following entry in the Records of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews refers to a curious commemoration of this event, which, by command of the King, was appointed to be observed throughout the country:—

"Aug. 24, 1600.—Mr George Glaidstanes intimat out of ye pulpit to ye

pepill ane ordinance set down be his Ma's Commissioners of the Kirk and Secret Counsell, that in respect of his Ma's late delyver^{ce} fra ye gryt & eminent treason intended agt his Ma. upon ane Tuesday, it was tho' meit, in all tyme cuming, the preiching on the weik dayes suld be upon Tuesday

terms which he conveyed to them. They were ready, they said, to give thanks for his safety, and even to report the whole matter in his own words, abstaining from any observations which might diminish his Majesty's credit and estimation with his people; but they would not require the people to believe as an undoubted truth a matter on which they wished farther light to be thrown. They were discharged to preach in the King's dominions under pain of death. These men were some of the most steady opponents of the form of government which the King was labouring to introduce, and he rejoiced in the opportunity of getting rid of them. Before his purpose was fully accomplished, all the greatest ornaments of our national literature had been sent into exile, and the persons advanced to the chief dignities were all time-serving politicians.

LECT.
XVII.

1600.

and Thursday, and nocht upon Wednesday and Friday, as of befor. . . and als that ye Session is appointit to be halden ilk Tuesday, at twa hours, at ye ringing of ye gryt bell, as wes of befor upon ilk Wednesday.”]

LECTURE XVIII.

SUCCESSION OF JAMES TO THE ENGLISH CROWN—SEVERE MEASURES AGAINST THE PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS IN SCOTLAND—THE MILLENARY PETITION—THE CONFERENCE AT HAMPTON COURT—DR BARLOW'S ACCOUNT OF THE CONFERENCE—BOOK OF CANONS OF 1604—PERSECUTION OF THE ENGLISH PURITANS A PRESAGE OF THE KING'S SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS IN SCOTLAND—ACT OF THE PARLIAMENT OF PERTH REGARDING THE RESTITUTION OF THE ESTATE OF BISHOPS.

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

AT the conclusion of the sixteenth century, James VI. had succeeded in his great aim of bringing over a majority of the ministers who frequented the General Assembly to his own views on the subject of Church government. The great body of the Church was still attached to Presbytery, and would have been happy to see it established permanently; but their voice was not heard, and the persons who appeared as their representatives in the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court were in general selected by the King as being the fittest instruments for his purposes. His principles—if principles they could be called—had a strong tendency to Popery. Perhaps there was some sinister policy in the partiality which he evinced to the Catholics, as it was believed that he was apprehensive of being opposed in his views of succeeding to the crown of England by the Popish faction in that country, and for this reason, it is said, he gave them private

assurances that they might expect from him every indulgence. His letter to the Pope, which was afterwards published, exhibits his character in a still more suspicious light. Lord Balmerino, the Secretary of State, took the blame of it, and said that the King signed it among a number of other papers, without being acquainted with its contents. This story gained scarcely any credit in the country, as the Secretary, though condemned to death for the offence, was immediately pardoned and restored to liberty. The desire of making himself generally acceptable to the English nation, might be one of the chief reasons why James took so much pains to prepare his Scottish subjects to submit to his favourite scheme of establishing uniformity of worship throughout his whole dominions; but no doubt the motive which weighed more with him than any other was the desire of gratifying his own arbitrary disposition.^a

On the last day of March 1603, Sir Robert Cary arrived in Edinburgh with the long-expected accounts of the death of Queen Elizabeth, and in a day or two afterwards James received a letter from the Court and nobility of England, informing him that he had been proclaimed King, with all the requisite solemnities, in the cities of London and Westminster. He immediately prepared to commence his journey to the capital of his newly-acquired kingdom. On the Sunday before his departure he attended divine service in St Giles's Church, where he made a pompous speech to

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

Accession
of James to
the English
crown.

^a In the year 1600, the King thought fit to promote three of the commissioners for managing the affairs of the Church to the dignity of bishops. David Lindsay, minister at Leith, was made Bishop of Ross; Peter Blackburn, minister of Aberdeen, was ap-

pointed to the Bishopric of Aberdeen; and Gladstones, minister of St Andrews, was made Bishop of Caithness. This was done, by a stretch of the royal prerogative, before the Parliament had restored the temporalities of the dioceses.

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

the people, assuring them that he would maintain the same parental regard for their interest as if he were still to reside among them, and that he would take care that justice should be faithfully administered in his absence. Among the companions of his journey he selected seven of the ministers, two of whom were the Bishops of Ross and Dunkeld, and all the others soon reached equal preferment.

Severe
measures
against the
Presby-
terian min-
isters in
Scotland.

The King was at first so much occupied with the affairs of England that he had not leisure to attend to the ecclesiastical proceedings of his native land; and it is probable that this temporary forbearance had the effect of lulling the jealousy of the Presbyterians, and preventing them from taking measures to counteract his aggressions. He had not been two years in England when he began to interfere with the Church's privilege of holding General Assemblies annually, or oftener *pro re nata*. The General Assembly, which was appointed to meet at Aberdeen in July 1604, was adjourned by the royal mandate to July 1605, and at length postponed to an uncertain day.

The effect of this prorogation was most injurious to the due exercise of discipline. Many of those who became subject to church censures, appealed from the decision of presbyteries and synods to the General Assembly, in the expectation that the King would not allow any General Assemblies to sit. The ministers, too, were convinced that the King would be influenced entirely by the views of the Episcopalian faction, and that no Assembly would be permitted to meet till it was previously ascertained that they would be submissive to the dictates of that party. To guard against these consequences, some of the commissioners from

presbyteries met at Aberdeen on the day to which the Assembly had been prorogued,—but the numbers were inconsiderable, and they thought it sufficient to constitute and appoint a subsequent meeting in the month of September. But that meeting was prohibited, and ordered to disperse under pain of rebellion. On this occasion, fourteen ministers, the most learned and most eminent in the country, were imprisoned, some in the castle of Dumbarton, others in Blackness, others in Doune, and three or four in Stirling. Six of them were tried before the Court of Justiciary, for having convened after the King had discharged the diet. They declined the jurisdiction of the Court, but it was not to be expected that such a plea should avail them. They were found guilty of high treason, a crime which exposed them to capital punishment in the most horrible form; but the Government durst not risk the odium of carrying it into execution, and the sentence was commuted into banishment for life. To this punishment they submitted with exemplary fortitude; and, severe as it was, it might almost be said to be merciful in comparison with the infliction to which the other eight were exposed, who were condemned, during the King's pleasure, to the most inhospitable retreats in the northern and western islands. A proclamation was soon afterwards issued, prohibiting all ministers to pray for any of these persecuted brethren, or to speak favourably of them in sermons, or in any other public or private speeches.

While these severities were practised upon the strict Presbyterians in Scotland, the most decisive steps were being taken in England to crush the same principles. As the King passed through England, in his progress to London, the Puritans presented a peti-

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

The Millen-
ary Petition.
[Neal's
Hist. of the
Puritans
(1854), i.
408.]

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

tion said to be subscribed by one thousand ministers, and hence called the Millenary Petition. The preamble represents that, neither as factious men affecting a popular parity in the Church, nor as schismatics aiming at the dissolution of the ecclesiastical estate, but as faithful ministers of Christ, and loyal subjects, they were humbly desirous of obtaining reformation of certain abuses ; and although several of them had subscribed the Service Book, either with some condition or exposition, or upon protestation, yet now more than one thousand ministers were oppressed by the imposition of human ceremonies, from the burden of which they craved to be relieved. They begged, “ 1. That in the church service the sign of the cross in baptism, the interrogatories to infants, baptism by women (allowed in cases of apparent danger), and confirmation, might be taken away ; that the cap and surplice might not be urged ; that examination might precede communion ; that the ring in marriage might be dispensed with ; that the service might be abridged ; that church songs and music might be moderated, so as to be more edifying ; that the Lord’s day might not be profaned, nor the observation of other holy days strictly enjoined ; that ministers might not be required to insist on the people bowing at the name of Jesus ; and that none but canonical Scriptures should be read in the Church. 2. That, in respect to ministers, none might be admitted but men able and apt to teach ; that the unqualified should be removed, or obliged to maintain preachers ; that non-residents might not be permitted ; and that ministers might not be obliged to subscribe, but according to law, to the Articles of Religion, and the King’s supremacy. 3. In reference to church livings, that

bishops leave their *commendams* ; that impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges be given to preachers and incumbents only ; and that lay impropriations be charged with one-sixth or one-seventh part for maintaining a preacher. 4. In the matter of church discipline, that excommunication and church censures be not in the name of lay chancellors, &c. ; that men may not be excommunicated without consent of their pastors ; that Popish canons be reversed ; that the length of suits in ecclesiastical courts may be restrained ; that the oath *ex officio* may be more sparingly used, and licenses for marriages without proclamation of banns more sparingly granted. These things," added they, " we are able to show not to be agreeable with the Word of God, if it shall please your Majesty to hear us, or by writing to be resolved, or by conference among the learned to be resolved."

This was not the only petition which the King received on the same subject ; but against this in particular the heads of the two English universities took offence, because it asked that the impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges might be withdrawn. An answer published by the University of Oxford passes many harsh censures on the ministers for subscribing the articles and then complaining : it describes them as factious men, who wished to limit the prerogatives of the monarchy, and to lead a party in the Church ; it reprobates the conduct of the Scots reformers, and in fact arraigns those very principles which the King had publicly applauded before he left this country ; and after justifying all those particulars of which the Puritans complained as grievances, and commending the Established Church government as the great support of the royal power, it entreats his

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

Majesty not to allow the peace of the State to be disturbed by those who wished to alter the ecclesiastical polity. The arrogance of the conclusion is unparalleled. "In this one kingdom," say the Oxonians, "there are at this day a greater number of learned men than among all the ministers of religion in France, Flanders, Germany, Poland, Denmark, Geneva, or (to speak in a word) in all Europe besides."

The divines of Cambridge thanked their brethren of Oxford for their masterly answer to the puritanical petition, and expressed their determination to overpower their pitiful antagonists by force of numbers, and by a multitude of books, of which there was no end. "Let them answer," said they, "the thousand books (or nearly a thousand) written in defence of the hierarchy before they pretend to dispute before so great a King."

The Confer-
ence at
Hampton
Court.

His Majesty liking the parade of public disputations, in which he had an opportunity of showing his learning, and probably wishing to preserve the appearance of candour and fairness, thought proper to issue a proclamation requiring a meeting or conference, to be holden at Hampton Court on the 24th October 1603, for hearing and determining things pretended to be amiss in the Church. He declared in this proclamation that he was persuaded that the constitution of the Church of England was agreeable to God's Word, and very near the condition of the primitive Church; and he prohibited his subjects either to publish or to petition against it, as he was determined to preserve the ecclesiastical state in such a form as he found it established by law, being willing to reform only such abuses as should be clearly proved to exist.

The English clergy in general were confident of the

victory they were to gain by this conference, and yet the great adversary of the Puritans, Archbishop Whitgift, was not free of apprehension. The disputants were named by the King. On the side of the Episcopalians he named nine bishops, and eight other dignitaries (deans and archdeacons). Only four ministers were named to plead the cause of the Puritans,—Dr Reynolds and Dr Sparks, Mr Chadderton and Mr Knewstubs. All the Episcopalian divines were dressed in the habits peculiar to their respective professions,—“the Puritans in gowns trimmed with fur, like Turkey merchants,” says Neal, “or like the professors in foreign universities.” When the King spoke with the bishops, he put on an air of great softness, courteousness, and respect; but when the Puritan ministers uttered their opinions, he answered them harshly with frowns and threatenings. Dr Barlow, Dean of Chester, one of the speakers, published an account of the conference, and, as Fuller says, “he being a party, set a sharp edge on his own, and a blunt one on his adversaries’ weapons.” Another account was written by Patrick Galloway, who had been minister of Perth, which gives a very different view of the matter.^a As

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

[History of
Puritans,
vol. i. p.
411.][Calder-
wood, Hist.
474.]

[^a It has been said that “Mr Patrick Galloway, minister of Perth, was present at the Conference as representing the Church of Scotland.” Mr Patrick Galloway, however, had ceased to be minister of Perth fourteen years before the time now referred to, having been one of the King’s domestic chaplains from 1589 to 1607; and so effectually did he ingratiate himself that his son was created a peer by the title of Lord Dunkeld. Galloway, instead of representing the Church of Scotland, was one of the instruments employed by the King for the very purpose of subverting the original

ecclesiastical constitution established at the Reformation. It was impossible that he should have had any commission to represent the Church of Scotland in the Conference, as the last General Assembly, which sat in November 1602 (before Queen Elizabeth’s death), could not have foreseen that any conference was to take place. The Assembly had, however, recommended to presbyteries to advertise his Majesty’s ministers (chaplains) of “such as disliked the government, or were inclined to novations;” and it was also “thought expedient, and concludit that his Majesty’s ministers,

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

I happen to have lately obtained Dr Barlow's book (which is very seldom to be met with), I shall read a few passages from it. It shows in a strong light the manner in which the English dignitaries truckled to his Majesty.

[Thus in the first day's conference, from which the Puritan ministers were excluded, "that if anything should be found meet to be redressed, it might be done without any visible alteration," every point excepted against by the King was conceded by the bishops:—not, it must be added, without, at the same time, the exhibition of some disingenuousness on the part of more than one of them in their expositions of the existing principles and practice of the Church of England. Among the "special points" on which James requested information was private baptism, "his highness growing somewhat earnest against the baptising by women and laicks." The following extracts from the discussion on this topic need no comment:—

[Barlow's
Sum and
Substance

"The lord archbishop proceeded to speak of private baptism, showing his Majesty that the administration

and sic utheris of the ministrie as sall have occasion to be in any charge about his Majesty, inform the presbyteries of the state of things so far as it is needful for the weill of the cause." In this way it was that Galloway wrote to the Presbytery of Edinburgh. His account of the Hampton Court Conference is far more worthy of credit than Barlow's; for Galloway's account was corrected by the King's own hand before it was sent to the presbytery. The letter may be seen in the printed *Calderwood*, p. 475, &c., and in the fifth volume of his MS. History, p. 593, &c.

It is said by Calderwood that when the letter of Mr P. Galloway was read in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, "Mr

James Melville was present. All others keeping silent, he craved two things: First, that they would be grieved with sorrow with many godly and learned brethren in our neighbour country, who, having expected reformation, are disappointed and heavily grieved; and that if no other way could be found for help, that they would at least help them by their prayers to God for their comfort and relief. 2. That as the Presbytery of Edinburgh had ever been as the lion and watch-tower of our Kirk, and the ministers thereof the chief watchmen, that they would watch and take heed that no peril come from our neighbour Kirk."—(*Additional Memorial on Printing Bibles.*)

of baptism by women and lay persons was not allowed in the practice of the Church, but inquired of by bishops in their visitation, and censured; neither do the words in the book infer any such meaning.^a Whereunto the King excepted, ‘urging and pressing the words of the book, that they could not but intend a permission and suffering of women and private persons to baptise.’ Here the Bishop of Worcester said, that indeed the words were doubtful, and might be pressed for that meaning, but yet it seemed, by the contrary practice of our Church (censuring women in this case), that the compilers of the book did not so intend them, and yet propounded them ambiguously, because otherwise, perhaps, the book would not have then passed in the Parliament. The Bishop of London replied that those learned and reverend men who framed the Book of Common Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did indeed by those words intend a permission of private persons to baptise in case of necessity, whereof their letters were witnesses; some parts whereof he then read, and withal declared that the same was agreeable to the practice of the ancient Church. . . . The Bishop of Winchester spake very learnedly and earnestly in that point, affirming that the denying of private per-

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

of the Conference held at Hampton Court (Phenix), p. 146.]

^a [“ It had been customary till this time for bishops to license midwives to their office, and to allow their right to baptise in cases of necessity, under the following oath:—‘ I, —, admitted to the office and occupation of a midwife . . . in the ministration of the sacrament of baptism, in the time of necessity, will use the accustomed words of the same sacrament; that is to say, these words following, or the like effect: “ I christen thee in

the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” and none other profane words; and that in baptising any infant born, and pouring water on the head of the said infant, I will use pure and clean water, and not any rose or damask water, or water made of any confection or mixture; and that I will certify the curate of the parish church of every such baptising.”—*Neal's Hist. of the Puritans*, 1, 413.]

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

sons, in cases of necessity, to baptise, were to cross all antiquity, seeing that it had been the ancient and common practice of the Church, when ministers at such times could not be got; and that it was also a rule agreed upon among divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament. . . . The issue was a consideration, whether into the rubrick of private baptism, which leaves it indifferently to all laicks or clergy, the words *curate or lawful minister* might not be inserted, which was not so much stuck at by the bishops."

The adulation, often not free from profanity, which James receives from "the lords" and their reporter, must have been all the more grateful to him from its striking contrast with the plain speaking to which he had hitherto been accustomed. The archbishop did not enter on the debate until "after that, on his knee, he had signified how much this whole land was bound to God for setting over us a King so wise, learned, and judicious." Dr Barlow, in his account of the first day, concludes by saying that "the three hours and more spent were soon gone,—so admirably, both for understanding, speech, and judgment did his Majesty handle all those points, sending us away, not with contentment only, but astonishment; and which is pitiful, you will say, with shame to us all, that a King brought up among Puritans, not the learnedst men in the world, and schooled by them, swaying a kingdom full of business and troubles, naturally given to much exercise and repast, should in points of divinity show himself so expedite and perfect, that the greatest scholars and most industrious students there present might not outstrip him. But this one thing I might not omit that his Majesty should profess, howsoever he

[Barlow's
Sum and
Substance
of the Con-
ference held
at Hampton
Court,
p. 148.]

lived among Puritans, and was kept for the most part as a ward under them, yet since he was of the age of his son, ten years old, he ever disliked their opinions ; as the Saviour of the world said, ‘ though he lived amongst them, he was not of them.’”

LECT.
XVIII.
1603.

The impression produced by the next day’s conference was still more remarkable. “ It raised such an admiration in the lords, in respect of the King’s singular readiness and exact knowledge, that one of them said he was fully persuaded his Majesty spake by the instinct of the Spirit of God. My Lord Cecil acknowledged that very much we are bound to God, who had given us a King of an understanding heart. My Lord Chancellor, passing out of the privy chamber, said unto the Dean of Chester, standing by the door, I have often heard and read, that *Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote* ; but I never saw the truth thereof till this day. Surely whosoever heard his Majesty might justly think that title did more properly fit him which Unapius gave to that famous rhetorician, in saying that he was *βιβλιοθήκη τις ἔμψυχος, και περιπατοῦν μουσεῖον*, a living library and a walking study.”

In the third day’s conference “ his Majesty so soundly described the oath *ex officio* . . . that all the lords, and the rest of the present auditors, stood amazed at it. The Archbishop of Canterbury said that undoubtedly ‘ his Majesty spake by the special assistance of God’s Spirit ;’ the Bishop of London, upon his knee, protested ‘ that his heart melted within him (as so, he doubted not, did the hearts of the whole company) with joy, and made haste to acknowledge unto Almighty God the singular mercy we have received at his hands, in giving us such a King, as, since Christ’s time, the like, he thought, had not been ;’ whereunto

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

the lords with one voice did yield a very affectionate acclamation. The civilians present confessed that they could not, in many hours' warning, have so judicially, plainly, and accurately, and in such a brief, described it."

[Barlow, p.
157.]

The account of the discussion as to a new version of the Scriptures is worth quoting, though not less inaccurate than the rest of the book :—"Dr Reynolds moved his Majesty 'that there might be a new translation of the Bible, because those which were allowed in the reign of King Henry VIII. and Edward VI. were corrupt, and not answerable to the truth of the original.' To which motion there was at the present no gainsaying, the objections being trivial and old, and already in print, often answered ; only my lord of London well added, that if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no end of translating. Whereupon 'his Highness wished that some especial pains should be taken in that behalf for one uniform translation (professing that he could never yet see a Bible well translated into English ; but the worst of all his Majesty thought the Geneva to be), and this to be done by the best learned in both universities ; after them to be reviewed by the bishops, and the chief learned of the Church ; from them to be presented to the Privy Council ; and, lastly, to be ratified by his royal authority ; and so this whole Church to be bound unto it, and none other.' Marry, withal he gave this cavéat (upon a word cast out by my lord of London), that no marginal notes should be added, having found in them which are annexed to the Geneva translation (which he saw in a Bible given him by an English lady) some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and favouring too much of dangerous and

traitorous conceits. As for example, the first chapter of Exodus, and the 19th verse, where the marginal note alloweth disobedience unto kings. And 2 Chron. xv. 16, the note taxeth Asa for deposing his mother only, and not killing her.' And so concludeth this point as all the rest, with a grave and judicious advice."^a

There are several allusions by the King to his Scottish experiences. Mr Knewstubs, referring to the use of the cross in baptism, having said he had conscientious doubts how far such an ordinance of the Church could be made to bind the Puritans without impeaching their Christian liberty, "the King, as it seemed, was much moved, and told him 'he would not argue that point with him, but answer therein, as Kings are wont to speak in Parliament, *Le Roy s'avisera*;' adding withal, that it smelled very rankly

LECT.
XVIII.

1693.

[Barlow, p.
166.]

^a [If there were no other reason for disputing Dr Barlow's accuracy, this single passage contains internal evidence sufficient to throw discredit on his whole narrative. First, it is inconceivable that King James should never have seen a Geneva Bible till he had one given him by an English lady. The only Bible which had ever been printed in Scotland was of the Geneva translation, and contained the offensive notes. Secondly, it is not very probable that the King would speak so disrespectfully of a translation which he had authorised for the instruction of his subjects; and it is incredible that, after this opinion was pronounced, he should have never, during the remaining twenty-two years of his reign, authorised the printing of any other version in Scotland. Thirdly, we cannot believe that his Majesty could be guilty of the inconsistency of complaining of annotations expressed in the very words of a book set forth by his own authority a

few years before his accession to the English throne—namely, in the "Propositions and Principles of Divinitie, printed at Edinburgh by Robert Waldegrave, printer to the King's Majesty, Anno Dom. 1591. Cum privilegio regali." Fourthly, it is almost incredible that King James should not have learned that the Geneva translation was so highly esteemed by many of the most learned divines in the Church of England, as to be used in preference to what has been called the Bishops' Bible. Thus Dr Abbot, Professor of Divinity, and Master of University College, Oxford, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, one of the translators selected by King James in his "Exposition of Jonah," contained in thirty sermons preached in St Mary's Church, Oxford, in 1599, has always used the Geneva version. In the same manner, Dr Gervase Babington, successively Bishop of Landaff, Exeter, and Worcester, one of the members of the Hampton Court con-

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

of Anabaptism; comparing it to the usage of a beardless boy (one Mr John Black), who the last conference had with the ministers of Scotland, in December 1602, told him that he would hold conformity with his Majesty's ordinances for matters of doctrine; but for matters of ceremony, they were to be left in Christian liberty to every man, as he received more and more light from the illumination of God's Spirit: 'Even till they go mad,' quoth the King, 'with their own light. But I will none of that; I will have one doctrine, and one discipline, one religion in substance and in ceremony; and therefore I charge you to speak no more to that point.' The cornered cap having been approved by the Puritan ministers,—'Well then,' said his Majesty, turning himself to the bishops, 'you may now safely wear your caps; but I shall tell you

ference, had been accustomed to use that version in his sermons preached at Court, as well as in his expository works on the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, and in his *Comfortable Notes on the Five Books of Moses*. The same observation applies to Dillingham, one of the translators, and many others, whom it is unnecessary to name. We cannot, however, pass by Bishop Overall, whose *Convocation Book* was first printed in 1689, with the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Sancroft). The acts and canons contained in this book were passed by the convocation, which was summoned by James I. in the year of the Hampton Court conference, and which continued by adjournments and prorogations to 1610. They were read three times in the Lower House of Convocation, and approved by unanimous consent. They were afterwards approved by the Upper House of Convocation, and passed with a few amendments, as appears

from the attestation of Archbishop Bancroft, who presided. In a very few instances the quotations of Scripture are taken from the Bishops' Bible; but in general they are taken from the Geneva version. . . . We find also Dr Richard Montagu (the best Puritanical person of his age, and one of the greatest favourites of King James), who died Bishop of Norwich in 1641, using the Geneva version frequently in his *Acts and Monuments of the Church before Christ*, printed at London by Miles Flesher and Robert Young, in 1642. Lastly, it is truly wonderful that neither his Majesty nor Barlow should have known that the very notes which were so much reprobated, had been adopted into the Bishops' Bible, published in 1568 by Archbishop Parker, whose respect for the Geneva version was very strongly expressed in his letter to Sir William Cecil, 9th March 1565-6, applying for leave to John Bodleigh to print it.—(*Add. Mem.*)

if you should walk in one street in Scotland with such a cap on your head, if I were not with you, you should be stoned to death with your cap.' Again, at a suggestion of Dr Reynolds relative to periodical meetings of the clergy, his Majesty was somewhat stirred, yet, which is admirable in him, without passion or show thereof; thinking that they aimed at a Scotch Presbytery, which, saith he, as 'well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the devil. Then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me and my Council, and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say, It must be thus; then Dick shall reply, and say, Nay, marry, but we must have it thus. And, therefore, here I must once reiterate my former speech, *Le Roy s'avisera*. Stay, I pray you, for one seven years, before you demand that of me, and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipes stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you. For let that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath; then shall we all of us have work enough, both our hands full. But, Dr Reynolds, till you find that I grow lazy, let that alone.'"]

LECT.

XVIII.

1603.

I refer you to Neal for a more complete and accurate narrative of the proceedings. The truth seems to be that the conference at Hampton Court was a piece of theatrical mockery. Everything was previously arranged between the King and the bishops; and the Puritans were confounded by the unexpected part which the King took in the disputes. The whole matter ended in a few slight alterations in the Book of Common Prayer; and though the anti-Episcopalian speakers were induced to acquiesce, their followers refused to be guided by the conclusion of the Con-

[Neal, History of the Puritans, i. p. 410.]

LECT.
XVIII.

1603.

ference.^a The bishops might easily have been gained over by the King, if he had been firmly attached to the cause of reformation; but his arbitrary temper, his instability of purpose, his love of flattery, and the rooted antipathy which he had conceived against the Puritans, prevented him from fulfilling the expectations of his subjects by embracing the opportunity of healing the divisions in the Church.

Soon afterwards James published a proclamation, in which he says that, after hearing the objections of the Nonconformists to the doctrine and discipline established in England, which proved to be very

^a [The four clergymen who nominally represented the Puritans did not by any means possess the entire confidence of their party. It may be necessary to state that they were all members of the Church of England, and of the English universities. Dr Heylin, in his *Quinquarticular History*, mentions Dr Reynolds and Dr Sparks as being of Oxford (the former was president of Corpus Christi College, and the latter, Fellow of Magdalen College, and a professor of divinity), and Mr Knewstubs and Mr Chatterton as of Cambridge. The last mentioned was Master of Emmanuel College. The same author mentions Drs Sparks and Reynolds as having stood firm to the Church of England (*Quinquart. Hist.* c. 21, Sect. 7.) Calderwood says of the conference, (vol. v. pp. 586, 587, MS.): "The good professors of England were put in hopes of good beginning of reformation, and so much was pretended when the conference was appointed. But nothing less meant, yea, rather under colour of conference to procure further confirmation to the abuses and corruptions. What sincerity was there meant, when *for the sincere party were nominate two that were very cor-*

rupt appearandly? They were nominate only to be spies and to prevaricate." The same account of their characters is given by Mr William Scott, in his MS. Account of the Government of the Church. Galloway says that when the King craved to know of them what they desired to be reformed, "it was very loosely and coldly answered." Anthony Wood speaks of both Reynolds and Sparks as having written in favour of conformity. Fuller (in his *Church History*, cent. 17, b. 10, p. 48), says of Reynolds that "his disaffection to the discipline established in England was not so great as some *bishops did suspect*, or as mere *non-conformists did believe*. No doubt he desired the abolishing of some ceremonies for the ease of the conscience of others, to which in his own practice he did willingly submit, constantly wearing hood and surplice, and kneeling at the sacrament." Neal, in his *History of the Puritans* (vol. ii. p. 22), says that "Dr Reynolds fell below himself, and lost some part of his esteem with the Puritans, being overawed by the place and company and his sovereign opponent." — (*Add. Mem.*)]

slender, he had yielded to a few explanations of passages, and now he enjoined all his subjects to conform to it as the only public form established in the realm, and required them to expect no further alterations, for his resolutions were absolutely settled. This proclamation was considered as a stretch of prerogative. The sovereign owned, that by his own act, without consent of Parliament or convocation, he had altered articles in the Liturgy; and as the validity of every royal proclamation terminates with the King's life, it was argued, in the subsequent reign, that the liturgy, in the state in which it then existed, was not what had been established by law, and was not, therefore, binding on the clergy.

LECT.
XVIII.

1604.

The King also published another proclamation against Puritans, requiring them all to conform, or else to suffer the utmost extremity of the law. About the same time a convocation of the Church sat, and prepared a Book of Canons, which was ratified by the King's letters under the Great Seal. I shall read a few of them which related particularly to the Puritans.

Book of
Canons.

[The following are the canons now referred to, as given by Neal :—

[Hist. of the
Puritans,
vol. i. p.
428.]

“Canon III.—Whosoever shall affirm that the Church of England, by law established, is not a true and Apostolical Church, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the archbishop after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked error.

“Canon IV.—Whosoever shall affirm the form of God's worship in the Church of England, established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer

LECT.
XVIII.

1604.

and administration of sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, and unlawful worship, or contains anything repugnant to Scripture, let him be excommunicated. . . .

“Canon V.—Whosoever shall affirm that any of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church, agreed upon in the year 1562, for avoiding diversity of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe to, let him be excommunicated.

“Canon VI.—Whosoever shall affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, by law established, are wicked, antichristian, superstitious, or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, good men may not with a good conscience approve, use, or, as occasion requires, subscribe, let him be excommunicated.

“Canon VII.—Whosoever shall affirm the government of the Church of England by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is antichristian, or repugnant to the Word of God, let him be excommunicated.

“Canon VIII.—Whosoever shall affirm that the form and manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, or deacons, contains anything repugnant to the Word of God, or that persons so made and consecrated are not lawfully made, or need any other calling or ordination to their divine offices, let him be excommunicated.

“Canon IX.—Whosoever shall separate from the communion of the Church of England, as it is approved by the Apostles’ rules, and combine together in a new brotherhood, accounting those who conform to

the doctrines, rites, and ceremonies of the Church, unmeet for their communions, let him be excommunicated.

LECT.
XVIII.

1604.

“ Canon X.—Whosoever shall affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God’s worship in the Church of England, and their adherents, may truly take to themselves the name of another church not established by law, and shall publish that their pretended church has groaned under the burden of certain grievances, imposed on them by the Church of England, let him be excommunicated.

“ Canon XI.—Whosoever shall affirm that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the King’s born subjects than such as are established by law, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated.

“ Canon XII.—Whosoever shall affirm that it is lawful for any sort of ministers or lay persons to make rules, orders, and constitutions in causes ecclesiastical, without the King’s authority, and shall submit to be ruled and governed by them, let him be excommunicated.

“ Canon XCVIII.—We decree and appoint, that after any judge ecclesiastical hath proceeded judiciously against obstinate and factious persons, for not observing the rites and ceremonies of the Church, or for contempt of public prayer, no judge, *ad quem*, shall admit or allow of an appeal, unless he having first seen the original appeal, the party appelland do first personally promise and vow that he will faithfully keep and observe all the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, as also the prescript form of

LECT.
XVIII.

1604.

Persecution
of the Eng-
lish Puri-
tans,

common prayer, and do likewise subscribe the three articles formerly by us specified and declared.”]

After the ratification of these canons, suspension and deprivation from their livings were not thought sufficient punishments for Nonconformists, but all Puritans must be considered as unfit to have a place in the congregation of God’s worshippers. They were declared incapable of suing for lawful debts; unless they made satisfaction to the Church, they might be imprisoned for life; and when they died, they were to be refused Christian burial. The Puritans were now persecuted with such rigour, that many of them left the kingdom and retired to the Low Countries. The greater part of them were extremely unwilling to separate from the Church; and if there had been any sincere desire on the part of the bishops to listen to their complaints, the schism might have been easily healed. But the detestable court of the Star Chamber was not satisfied with merely depriving the ministers who refused to conform implicitly. It declared that “the King, without Parliament, might make orders and constitutions for the government of the clergy, and might deprive them if they obeyed not,” and that framing petitions to the King in a public cause, and obtaining subscriptions, as the Puritans had done, was “an offence finable at discretion, and very near to treason and felony in the punishment, as it tended to the raising sedition, rebellion, and discontent among the people.” By this determination the clergy were excluded from the benefit of the statute law, and his Majesty’s commissioners were authorised to proceed without the forms of law, while it was declared almost to amount to rebellion to lay

a petition for relief at the feet of the monarch ; as if the conscientious scruples of the Puritans had rendered them unworthy of the protection of the laws, and placed them even beyond the pale of common charity. The pretended friends of Government thought fit to brand them with every conceivable injurious imputation, and even to charge them with the guilt of the Gunpowder Treason, though the conspirators who were convicted never attempted to insinuate that any share of the criminality was imputable to them.

LECT.
XVIII.

1604.

The proceedings in England against the Nonconformists were the presages of the storm which was soon to burst on the Presbyterians in Scotland. Eight of the most distinguished ministers were removed from their charges, and ordered to go to London, where they were detained,^a under false pretences, till Episcopacy was established in Scotland. Two of these ministers were Andrew and James Melville, neither of whom was ever suffered to return. Their influence in the Church courts had been found to be too great, and the King was resolved to put an effectual stop to it.

1606.

a pre-
sage of the
King's sub-
sequent pro-
ceedings in
Scotland.

In July the Parliament met at Perth, and acknowledged the King's sovereign authority and royal

[Act. Parl.
Scot., iv.
261.]

^a [In the month of September they were summoned to several conferences with the King. One of the questions proposed to them related to the power of his Majesty to convoke, prorogue, and dissolve ecclesiastical assemblies. This they all refused to acknowledge, notwithstanding the eloquent and learned sermons delivered on the subject in their hearing, by four dignified clergymen of the Church of England, namely, Bishop Barlow, Dr Buckeridge, Dr King, and Bishop Andrews ; the last of whom,

“ teaching upon the Tenth of Numbers, discoursed upon the two trumpets, and proved, as he could, the convening and discharging of councils and assemblies to belong to Christian kings and emperors.”—CALDERWOOD, p. 542. (See M'Crie's *Life of Melville*, vol. ii. ; *Melville's Declining Age* ; *Scott's Historical Narration* ; *Report of the Conference*, 1606, MS., Advocates' Library ; *Heylin's History of Presbyterians*, page 379.)—(*Add. Mem.*)]

LECT.
XVIII.

1606.

prerogative over all estates, persons, and causes. It rescinded all the laws formerly made which had been subversive of the dignity and privileges of bishops. It restored the estate of bishops to their ancient and accustomed honour, dignities, prerogatives, privileges, livings, lands, teinds, rents, thirds and estate, as the same was before the Act of Parliament 1587, annexing the temporalities of benefices to the Crown. Thus the bishops were advanced to all their civil power, and to their votes in Parliament. This was one of the first of a series of steps for securing their tyranny over the Church.

LECTURE XIX.

PROTESTATION AGAINST THE ACT RESTORING THE ESTATE OF BISHOPS
 —THE REASONS OF THE PROTEST — ASSEMBLY AT LINLITHGOW,
 1606 — APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT MODERATORS FOR PRESBY-
 TERIES AND SYNODS — ERECTION OF THE HIGH COMMISSION
 COURT — THE RIGHT OF ORDINATION AND OTHER POWERS CON-
 FERRED ON BISHOPS BY THE ASSEMBLY — THE OATH OF CANONICAL
 OBEDIENCE — CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOPS — VISIT OF THE
 KING TO SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT OF JUNE 1617 — PROTESTATION
 AGAINST FURTHER INNOVATIONS.

AT the conclusion of the last Lecture I was mention-
 ing the proceedings of the Parliament at Perth, in
 which the annexation of benefices to the Crown was
 dissolved, and the power and dignity of the bishops
 restored, with that portion of their revenues which
 had not been alienated. This measure was not suf-
 fered to pass without opposition, and probably could
 not have been carried into effect, if it had not been
 for the artful management of George Hume, Earl of
 Dunbar. Ministers commissioned from different pres-
 byteries used their utmost diligence to prevail on the
 Parliament to oppose the restitution of the bishop-
 ries; and not expecting that all argument would be
 useless, they prepared a protestation, in which they
 undertook to prove that “the office of bishops, as
 proposed to be erected, is against the Word of God,
 the ancient canons and fathers of the Church, the

LECT.
 XIX.

1606.

Protest
 against the
 Act restoring
 the estate of
 Bishops.

LECT.
XIX.

1606.

modern most learned and godly divines, the doctrine and constitution of the Church of Scotland since the first Reformation, the laws of the realm ratifying the government of the Church by General and Provincial Assemblies, Presbyteries, and Sessions; also against the weal and honour of the King's Majesty, the honour and peace of the kingdom, the established estate and weal of the Church, in its doctrine, discipline, and patrimony, the weal and honour of Parliament and all the subjects."

Reasons of
the Protest.
[Calder-
wood, 529.]

I shall not take up any of your time with reading the Protestation itself, which is engrossed in Calderwood's printed *History*; but the reasons which were prepared against the admitting of bishops to a vote in Parliament, having been the composition of James Melville, one of the most eminent ministers of the Church, deserve a little attention. These reasons are distributed into thirteen heads, a few extracts from which I shall read to you from a rare tract entitled *The Course of Conformity*, as a specimen of the manner in which the controversies of those times were conducted. From this period, the internal state of our Church must be gathered rather from the detached treatises concerning ecclesiastical affairs, which were published in quick succession, than from any professed historical book, or even from the manuscripts which have been preserved. In fact, there are very few authentic records of these times. The proceedings of the Church were altogether irregular, and scarcely any of the registers, such as they were, are now in existence.

[Course of
Conformity
(1662), p.
29.]

[The fourth chapter of the paper referred to is entitled, "That such a bishoprie (Episcopacy) is against the doctrine of the Kirk of Scotland preached these

forty-six years;” and contains an appeal to the teaching of some of the early Reformers, whose sentiments have been so differently represented by such writers as Mr Sage :—“ Let the auditors yet living of these notable preachers of the Kirk of Scotland, glorifie God in this matter, and cease not, as they love the honour of Christ and weale of his Kirk, so long as they are able to speak, to give an evident and full testimonie, what they have heard of Mr Knoxe, Mr Craig, Mr Willockes, Mr Goodman, Mr Lawson, Mr Row, Mr Fergusone, Mr Arbuthnot, Mr Rollock, Mr Durie, Mr Daviesone, Mr Pont, and others most godly, sincere, and learned men, who all joined with their continuall powerfull doctrine from pulpit, their travels, yea and sufferings, in dinging (contending) against that Popish corruption of bishops, till it was all utterly purged and expelled forth of the Kirk; and who now, resting from their labours, yea, triumphing in the heavens, have left the true discipline and government of the Kirk and Kingdome of Jesus Christ well and firmly established and settled within our Kirk: the comfortable effect whereof hath been vively and sincerely enjoyed unto these late days.”—“ Praised be the name of our God in Christ,” Melville adds, “ there wants not yet succession, both to their place and doctrine, able both by preaching and hearing, to maintaine, yea, by His grace, not only by imprisonment, povertie, contempt, and traducing of the world, but by their blood, to seal up the truth of the same . . . ; and the very mouths of those now named bishops have been seen and heard preach and profess this veritie.”

The probable influence of the proposed restoration of bishops to their temporal power and dignities on the honour and privileges of the Estates of Parlia-

[Course of
Conformity,
p. 44.]

LECT.
XIX.

1606.

ment, is largely insisted on in the "Reasons:"—"Set me up these bishops once (called long since the Prince's led-horse), things, if they were never so unlawful, unjust, ungodly, and pernicious to kirk and realme, if they shall be borne forth by the countenance, authoritie, care, and endeavour of the King (supposing such a one, as God forbid, come in the roome of our most renowned sovereign, for to the best hath often times succeeded the worst), they shall be carried through by his bishops, set up and entertained by him for that effect; and the rest of the estates not only be ciphers, but also beare the blame thereof to their great evil and dishonour. If one will aske, 'How shall these bishops be more subject to be carried after the appetite of an evil prince than the rest of the states?' the answer and reason is, Because they have their lordship and living, their honour, estimation, profit, and commoditie of the King. The King may set them up and cast them doune, give them and take from them, put them in and out at his pleasure; and, therefore, they must be at his direction to doe what liketh him; and in a word, he may doe with them by (without) law, because they are set up against law. But with other estates hee cannot doe so, they having either heritable standing in their roomes by the fundamentall lawes, or then but a commission from the estate that send them, as from the burgesses or barons. Deprave me once the ecclesiastical estate, which have the gift of knowledge and learning beyond others, and are supposed (because they should bee) of best conscience, the rest will easily be miscarried. And that so much the more, that the officers of estate, lords of session, judges, lawyers, that have their offices of the King, are commonly framed after the Court's

affection. Yea, let chancellor, secretary, treasurer, president, controller, and others that now are, take heed that these new prelates of the Kirk (as covetous and ambitious as ever they were of old), insinuating themselves by flatterie and obsequence into the Prince's favour, attaine not to the bearing of all these offices of estate and croune, and to the exercising thereof, as craftily, avaritiously, proudly, and cruelly, as ever the papisticall prelates did. For as the holiest, best, and wisest angels of light, being depraved, became most wicked, craftie, and cruell divells, so the learnedst and best pastor, perverted and poysoned by that old serpent with avarice and ambition, becomes the falsest, worst, and most cruell man, as experience in all ages hath proved."

LECT.
XIX.

1606.

One other passage may be quoted as an example of the writer's more declamatory style: "Wherein hath stood thy honor and weale, O Scotland, these forty-six yeares and aboute? Was it not in the judgment of all that judgeth rightly, in the sincerity of the gospel and freedom of Jesus Christ's kingdom, established so notably within thee, with so small bloud and trouble? Since that gospel of peace came within thee, thou hast had no forraine wars, and all commotions within thy selfe have been easily setled, God being in the midst of thee, and bringing evident judgments upon all that lifted their head or moued their tongue against his Kirk. And shalt thou become so foolish and bewitched as not to hold fast that verity, having had Christ so cleerly painted forth before thy eyes, as if thou withe the same had seen Him crucified? Shalt thou with those foolish Galatians begin in the spirit and end in the flesh? Wilt thou follow them, of whom the Apostle weeping doth write, that they are enemies to the crosse,

LECT.

XIX.

1606.

whose end is destruction or damnation, whose God is their belly, whose glorie is shame; earthly-minded men, who seeke not the glory of Christ, nor safety of the soules of thy people, but to be thy guiders, and misguid thee, to be thy conductors and seduce thee, to make thee to sinne against God after the manner of the golden calves at Dan and Bethel, that so the Lord may be incensed, and cast thee away from His face? They seek glorie amongst men and one of another, and so neither can beleve and trust in Christ themselves, nor make thee doe it and be safe. Surely for wealth and honour worldly thou was never comparable to other nations, but the evangell so planted in thee was that crown of thy glorie that decored thy head, and set it above all realmes and kingdomes upon the face of the earth. Was not papistrie thy Egypt, O Scotland? And did not the Lord deliver thee out of it, and safeing thee from that tyrannie and thraldome, brought thee unto a pleasant Canaan of His Gospel, to serve Him in spirit and truth, and that in such a manner and forme as the like was never heard or seene? And no less miraculously hath He made thee to dwel therein so long, so safely, so freely; and shalt thou then goe and make to thee other captaines by Moses and Aaron, yea, contemning them thy lawfull priests and Levites, to lead thee back again to Egypt? God forbid; but so it is (deere native country), your seers see, and your watchman giues you a faithfull warning, crying to you, that the Episcopall hierarchie is verie papistrie and spiritual Egypt. Howbeit, by the pollicie of men, otherwise buskit, attired, and dressed to take the foolish and simple withall, it is no other thing in the substance thereof, making the kingdom of Christ to be of this world, turning the spirituall worshipping of God in

outward toys and ceremonies, bringing the people of the world into the simple and humble Kirk : yea, corrupting the fountains of the waters of life, and empoisoning the food of the soule to work dangerous sicknesses and deadly diseases amongst thy sonnes and daughters. The whole pulpits hath sounded unto you so many years, and yet continues to sound where they are not emptied or terrified by their tyrannie. Admitting that bishopricke againe, lost is your honour, wracked is your welfare, and gone is your grace and garland of heavenly and spirituall glorie for ever.”]

After the Act restoring the power, dignity, and revenue of the bishops was passed, it was not difficult to secure their spiritual authority. An Assembly, convened by the King's direction, was held at Linlithgow, consisting of noblemen, statesmen, and such ministers as were ready to barter their votes for gain. Some of the presbyteries did not receive notice of this Assembly, and those who were advertised of it, without being left to their own choice, were required to send commissioners who were named in his Majesty's letter. This Assembly was called for the purpose of making an Act to appoint perpetual moderators in all the presbyteries. It was not understood that anything was fixed with respect to the moderators of synods,—but when the Act was sent from the Court with the King's approbation, it was found to enjoin that wherever a bishop resided, he, or his vicar, should be the constant moderator both of the synod and of the presbytery ; and that every synod and presbytery should receive the constant moderator, under pain of being prosecuted for rebellion.

Nothing moved by this threatened penalty, many synods and presbyteries refused to admit the moder-

LECT.
XIX.

1606.

General
Assembly
at Linlith-
gow, 10th
Dec.
[Booke of
Univ. Kirk,
p. 1022.]
Appoint-
ment of
constant
Moderators
of Presby-
teries and
Synods.

LECT.
XIX.

1606.

[Calder-
wood, p.
569.]

ators attempted to be imposed upon them ; and Calderwood says that the only synod which submitted was that of Angus,—not, however, without a struggle. Some presbyteries yielded through compulsion, and even then they required that the matter should be subject to revision in a lawful General Assembly. Others being obstinate in their refusal, were imprisoned, or banished, or otherwise severely treated. The Synod of Perth behaved with great spirit at their spring meeting in 1607. Lord Scone, coming with a royal commission, threatened them with the pains of law if they refused to acknowledge the perpetual moderator. But Mr Row, the last moderator, holding the roll of the synod in his hand, in spite of his Lordship's attempts to tear it from him, called over the names of all the members, and after hearing their votes, declared that Mr Henry Livingston was duly elected to the moderator's chair. Livingston opened the meeting with prayer, notwithstanding the indecent interruption of the King's commissioner, who threw down the table, and committed other acts of violence. When the members returned to the second session they found the doors of the church locked,—but they concluded their business in the open air, and resolved that every presbytery, at its first meeting after the synod, should, according to the usual custom, choose its own moderator.

Ultimately, however, most of the presbyteries did acquiesce in the new arrangements ; and it is said that the Earl of Dunbar distributed 40,000 merks among the members, to gain them over to a scheme which so many of them disapproved. Though the provincial synods still protested against the innovation, and in general obstinately refused to accede to it, the

bishops considered it as a great point gained, that they had so far established their authority in the presbyteries as to be able to appoint permanent moderators and clerks, all of whom were declared to be official members of every Assembly, and all of whom, having their salaries paid by the bishops, were in a great measure dependent on their will. The provincial synods were suspended by the bishops, because they would not yield to their dictates,—but in the mean time other measures were in progress for effecting the entire subversion of the liberties of the Church. An Assembly, which met at Linlithgow in 1608, was required to take into consideration the divisions of the Church, and it was proposed to send commissioners to reason in the King's presence concerning all the controversies then agitated; and though this conference did not actually take place in the King's presence, a meeting for the same purpose was kept at Falkland on the 4th of May 1609; but the diversity of opinion was such, that the commissioners separated without coming to any conclusion.

A more decisive step was now taken to strengthen the hierarchy. The bishops obtained from the King a jurisdiction over their co-presbyters in a new tribunal, known by the name of the High Commission Court. Two courts of this kind were instituted in February, the one at St Andrews and the other at Glasgow, both invested with power to suspend and depose ministers, and to excommunicate the impenitent,—to outlaw the contumacious, and to imprison, fine, or otherwise punish, all who were judged obnoxious. The archbishop of the see and four other commissioners formed a quorum, and their sentence was not subject to revision or appeal. Schools and colleges

LECT.
XIX.

1609.

Erection of
the High
Commission
Court.

LECT.

XIX.

1610.

were subjected to their visitation, and the clergy who refused to pronounce or to publish their sentences, were liable to the severe punishments of imprisonment or deprivation. The power of the Courts of High Commission in Scotland was as great in spiritual matters as the power of the Privy Council in civil proceedings, and the mode in which it was exercised was as oppressive and arbitrary as the constitution of these courts themselves was inconsistent with the established laws of the kingdom.

When Spotswood, archbishop of Glasgow, was translated to the metropolitan see, the two courts were incorporated into one, which was equally inconsistent with the liberties of the nation and with the privileges of the Church.

General
Assembly,
June 1610,
gives
bishops
the right of
ordination
and other
powers.

The authority of the bishops over the inferior clergy was now absolute and unlimited, as, besides being judges of this inquisitorial court, they were lords of Parliament and members of the Privy Council. Still, however, they were anxious to obtain the concurrence of the General Assembly in their measures. A meeting of that judicatory was summoned to Glasgow in June 1610. The bishops themselves, with the other pensioned moderators and clerks, were all members *ex officio*. Lay-elders were nominated by the King, who also suggested the election of such clerical members of every presbytery as were expected to be most obsequious. The Earl of Dunbar appeared as the King's commissioner, attended by his Majesty's life-guards; and the prelates, armed with the two-edged sword of the high commission, were still more formidable to the ministers than the household troops. Some zealous ministers coming from the west with the intention of protesting, were overawed, and immediately returned

to their homes ; others basely received the wages of corruption. This Assembly formally confirmed the ecclesiastical power of the bishops, declaring them to be the moderators of every diocesan assembly, and of the presbyterial or weekly meetings for the exercise. It declared also that the bishops had the power of ordaining and depriving ministers, of visiting churches, of excommunicating the guilty, and of absolving the penitent. It declared that the summoning of Assemblies was a prerogative of the Crown, and it assigned to the bishop all the powers which had formerly been exercised by presbyteries. It required every minister at his admission to swear obedience to his ordinary, and prohibited every minister to speak or write against any of the acts and decisions of this Assembly. It also ordered that the question of parity or imparity of pastors should never be introduced in the pulpit, under the pain of deprivation.

LECT.
XIX.
1610.

The oath of canonical obedience imposed by this Assembly was in the following terms :—“ I (being nominated to the church of ——) utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that the right excellent, right high, and mighty Prince James the Sixth, by the grace of God, King of Scots, is the only supreme governor of this realm, as well in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical as in the temporal ; and that no foreign prince, prelate, state, nor potentate, have or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical and spiritual, within this realm. And, therefore, I utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and promise that, from this time forth, I shall and will bear faith and true allegiance to his Highness, his heirs, and lawful suc-

The oath of
canonical
obedience.

LECT. cessors, and to my power shall assist and defend all
 XIX. jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences, and authorities,
 1610. granted and belonging to his Highness, his heirs and
 lawful successors, or united and annexed to his royal
 crown. And further, I confess to have and hold the
 said church, and possession of the same, under God,
 only of his Majesty and crown-royal of this realm ;
 and for the said possessions I do homage presently to
 his Highness in your presence, and to his Majesty, his
 heirs, and lawful successors, shall be faithful and true.
 So help me God."

It is said that out of 140 members present in this Assembly at Glasgow, only three expressed any dissent.

The power granted to bishops in this Assembly, though really unlimited, was not considered in that light by the majority of the members. They were led to believe that bishops were not to exercise any jurisdiction independent of the presbyteries, but that they were to act in conjunction with these Assemblies, and, at the utmost, that their control was not to amount to more than a negative. A clause to this effect, however, was afterwards suppressed, and in place of the word presbytery, which was said to be disliked by his Majesty, the expression, "meeting of ministers of the bounds," was introduced ; in consequence of which change of name, the bishops, disregarding the jurisdiction, and dispensing even with the presence of a presbytery, conducted all their important affairs (such as ordination and trial of ministers) in meetings of a few of the neighbouring clergy, whom they selected as being most subservient to their wishes.

[Act. Parl.
 Scot., iv.
 469.

All the powers assumed by the bishops, with the consent of this obsequious General Assembly, were

afterwards (in 1612) confirmed by the Parliament. It is confessed, however, even by such writers as Dr Heylin, that the measures of the Court were not carried into execution without great opposition.

Among the many objections to the change of the government of the Church, it was said that the King, whose authority was merely secular, took upon him to exercise the power of conferring the spiritual office of bishopric; and to silence this objection, as well as to impress the people with deeper reverence for the newly-erected order, the King wrote letters to Spotswood, archbishop of Glasgow, Gavin Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, and Andrew Lamb, bishop of Brechin, requiring them immediately to repair to London, that they might there be consecrated in due form, and that thus they might be qualified, on their return to Scotland, to give consecration to their brethren. The necessity of this ceremony had never occurred to any of those who, after the Reformation, had been allowed to assume the episcopal office. But the King had now formed all his views of Church law upon the model of the English hierarchy. Consecration, or even ordination, was not considered valid, unless it was bestowed by the hands of bishops, pretending to have derived their sacred character in uninterrupted succession from the apostles themselves. The virtues of the rite were not supposed to be the less genuine though they had been transmitted through the contaminated channel of the Roman prelacy, which had been less distinguished for its sanctity than for its vices and its usurpations. The King issued a commission to four English bishops, requiring them to proceed to the consecration of Spotswood, Lamb, and Hamilton. The Bishop of Ely suggested a scruple concerning

LECT.
XIX.

1612.

Heylin's
Hist. of the
Presbyterians, 388.]

Consecra-
tion of the
Scottish
Bishops.

LECT.
XIX.

1614.

their previous qualification. They had not been episcopally ordained either priests or deacons. The archbishop (Dr Bancroft) solved this difficulty by referring to some cases in which the episcopal character had been conferred by a single consecration, which was understood to involve the inferior orders. The Scottish prelates had also a scruple. They were afraid lest, by receiving consecration from the English bishops, they might give occasion to revive the claim of superiority which had in former times been urged by the primates of England. This apprehension was quieted by the King, who assured them that he had taken care to provide against this difficulty by omitting the names of the archbishops of Canterbury and York in his commission, and that as they alone had ever pretended to any superiority over the Scottish bishops, it was not possible that the performance of the solemnity by the bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester, could furnish any ground for the renewal of the claim. After all the difficulties were thus set aside, the ceremony was completed according to the canons and constitutions of the English Church. The three bishops returned to this country, and consecrated George Gladstanes archbishop of St Andrews, a man who is represented by all Presbyterian writers as contemptible for his indolence, his voluptuousness, and his irreligion.^a Soon afterwards, all the other bishops

^a [It is very evident that the memory of Archbishop Gladstanes was not much revered, even by some of those who had been indebted to his patronage. In an oration delivered in 1617 by Dr Robert Howie, who had been brought from Aberdeen to St Andrews, in 1607, as successor to Andrew Melville, all the chancellors of the university are enumerated,

and generally with commendation; but of Gladstanes he gives only this simple notice: "Tandem successit gratia et autoritate regia Georgius Gladstonus, qui anno 1615, 20 Maii, obiit;" and then he proceeds to a most extravagant panegyric of Spotswood, who had been Archbishop of St Andrews and chancellor of the university about a year and a half.]

of Scotland were consecrated, some at St Andrews and others at Leith, without any consultation of presbyteries, or synods, or any other ecclesiastical assemblies.

LECT.
XIX.

1615.

Episcopalian writers say that Archbishop Bancroft, having seen this great work accomplished for the glory of God, the honour of his Majesty, and the good of both kingdoms, besought God to permit him to depart in peace, that with his eyes he might behold that salvation which was ordained to be a light to the Gentiles, and the glory of the people of Israel. The people of Scotland saw this matter with very different eyes. To them it appeared that the glory was departed from the Church.

On the 4th of March 1614, all the ministers in Scotland were required, by a royal proclamation, to prepare the people for the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and to administer it to them on Easter-day, the 24th of April. The people were also charged to communicate at their own parish churches, and they were now so generally subdued to the King's will that most of them obeyed the mandate. The pretence under which this charge was given, was the trial of popish recusants; but it was believed rather to be an experiment made for the purpose of ascertaining how far the subjects would comply with the prescribed innovations.

On the death of Gladstones, archbishop of St Andrews, James Spotswood, archbishop of Glasgow, was promoted to the primacy of all Scotland. Two days after his admission, in August 1615, he held a Court of High Commission. John Malcolm, minister of Perth, a man of great learning and sound judgment, now far advanced in life, was summoned before this

LECT.

XIX.

1615.

tribunal to answer for some expressions in the dedication prefixed to his *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, which expressions were said to have given offence to the King. In one sentence he had entreated his Majesty to recall the banished ministers, as being more faithful subjects than those who had received rich livings from him ; and in another he lamented the corruption introduced into the Church by unlearned and unsanctified men. Malcolm, accompanied by a great number of his parishioners, explained his meaning, which was taken down in writing, and which he was required to sign for the King's satisfaction. There is reason to suspect that the old man was somewhat timid on this occasion. In December following, the two courts of commission were formed into one, which comprehended not only all the bishops and the principal officers of state, but several inferior judges and eleven ministers. Though the whole number of commissioners was above forty, five might be a quorum, provided that the Archbishop either of St Andrews or of Glasgow was included.

In the year 1616, an Assembly was summoned by royal proclamation to meet at Aberdeen in the month of August. The Archbishop of St Andrews took upon him to preside. The Assembly continued five days, during which time eight sermons were delivered in its presence—but it is said that all the other business did not occupy eight hours. All matters were concluded in the privy conference, of which the bishops, privy counsellors, and about fifteen other lords, with twenty ministers, were members. During the first four days nothing was done at all, except preaching, renewing old Acts, and making some new ones against Papists,

as if these had been the chief objects in view. The ministers from the south, whose opposition was in some degree apprehended, being tired of this vain show, began to withdraw; and then in the last session everything was carried as the bishops had intended. Commission was given to frame a new liturgy, a new catechism, and a new book of canons for church discipline, and to revise a new Confession of Faith submitted to this Assembly, the purpose of which was to supersede the former confession to which the King and all the estates in the land had sworn. This confession, which was composed by John Hall, Edinburgh, and John Adamson, minister of Liberton, is inserted at length in Calderwood's printed *History*.

In the month of May 1617, the King, for the first time after his accession, visited Scotland. He had promised to pay a visit to his ancient kingdom every third year, but he had now been absent fourteen years when he thus first accomplished his purpose. In his progress through the country he was received at every town by some of the learned inhabitants, who welcomed his arrival in orations abounding with the most extravagant adulation, or encomiastic poems in Latin or in Greek, some of them as long as one of the books of the *Iliad*. Public disputations were held in the universities, in which the pedantic monarch never failed to take a part. The solemn fooleries enacted upon this occasion have been commemorated in a folio volume, entitled, *The Muse's Welcome to James VI.*^a

LECT.
XIX.

1617.

Visit of
the King to
Scotland.

^a [Its full title is, "Τα των Μουσων Ἐισωδία. The Muse's Welcome to the most High and Mightie Prince James, King of G. B., Fr., and I., &c., at His M. happy returne to his old and na-

tive Kingdom of Scotland, after xiv yeirs absence, in anno 1617. ὁ Βασιλευς ὡς ἡλιος ἀκαμας. Soli sic pervius orbis. Edin. 1618," (folio).

An outline may be given of the cele-

LECT.
XIX.

1617.

The universities of St Andrews and Edinburgh make the most conspicuous figure in this ridiculous work, which is a monument of the bad taste of the age which produced it. James seems to have been particularly delighted with the disputations of the Edinburgh literati; and he made some magnificent promises of great benefactions, "which," says Crawford, "it is hoped his royal grandchild, King Charles II., will in time convenient royally perform." Nearly two hundred years, however, were suffered to elapse before

brations at St Andrews:—"The King came to St Andrews 11 July, where, at his M.'s entrie, this subsequent speach was delivered in name of the Towne by Maister Harie Danskin, schoolmaster thereof——" (six pages Latin prose, subscribed Henricus Danskinus Civ. Andreeanae, orator et juventutis ibidem moderator.) "The preceding speach being delivered, his M. made forward to the great church of the citie, and at the entrie of the porche" another "speach" (three pages Latin prose) "was delivered in name of the university by Dr Bruce, Rector y^e of," (pp. 162, &c.)

Afterwards, "the subsequent poems were presented." (These the author gives at length.) There are three in Latin (p. 172 to 174) by Jacobus Blarius, S.S.T.D.; one in Latin, by Jacobus Wedderburnus, S.S.T.B.; one in Latin (pp. 174, 175, 176), by Guliel. Areskinus Dunons. Pastor." The others are entitled "Regis ἐγκωμιον," (Jacobus Gleggus, philos. prof.); "De Bibliotheca," (Andreas Brusius, philos. prof.); "Ad Jac. reg." (Andreas Sylvius, phil. prof.); "ἐπιχωρτικον," (Gulielmus Martinus, phil. prof.); "In regis adventum," &c. (Joannes Cornvallus); "Coridonis querela," (Godofridus Vanderhaghen, Middelburgo-Zelandus); "Daphnis rediens," (Joannes Lochæus); "Gaudium Coridonis"

(Justinus Arondæus); "Eximii Laudes magniq. Regis," (Joannes Durwardus); "Phœbus et Kinalochus Colloq." (David Kinalochus); "χαριστηρια," &c. (seven Latin poems, Henricus Danskinus, philol. profes); "ἄσπασμος συμπεραντικος" (Ιωαννης Αυλωνσοιτος. (p. 172-203.)

At page 203 we have "Theses Theologiæ de Potestate Principis, quas ad iv. Id. Julii Andreeapoli coram rege illustrissimo, præside Roberto Hovæo, S.S.T.D. propugnavit David Lyndesius, S.S.T.D."—"Ubi Theses explicatæ essent, eas impugnavit Petrus Brusius, Henricus Philippus, Theodorus Hayus, Joannes Strangius. Theologiæ Doctores." "Et Rex . . . ita doctè interfatus est et disertè, ut omnes (qui et plurimi et doctissimi interfuerunt) auditores in summam rapuerit admirationem."

Again, p. 213:—"Problemata philosophica coram rege, in aede sacra Andreeana prid. id. Jul. disputata. Disputationi præsidebat Joannes Wemesius Academicæ procancellarius et juris in foro consistoriano præses.

"Respondēbat, Robertus Baronius, philos. prof. Oppugnabant,

"Andreas Brusius,	} philos. profes- sores."]
"Andreas Sylvius,	
"David Momrous,	
"Patricius Wemesius,	
"Gulielmus Martinus,	

the posterity of James redeemed the pledge which he solemnly gave to the seminary which he called his own university.

LECT.
XIX.

1617.

It was the chief object of James, in this expedition, to introduce the ceremonies of the English Church into the worship of his native Church. He hoped, by the example of Scotland, to bring over the English Puritans to universal conformity; and for this reason, among others, he was anxious that the clergy and people of Scotland should cheerfully comply with his injunctions. He expected that his own example would operate with peculiar efficacy among a people who had been represented to him as submitting without resistance to the restoration of prelacy. He ordered the chapel at Holyrood House to be adorned with pictures, and with the statues of the evangelists and apostles; but as the people expressed dissatisfaction, he was dissuaded from carrying this order into execution. On the day after his arrival in Edinburgh, the English service was first performed in the Chapel-Royal, and at Whitsunday the Lord's Supper was administered in the English form, the partakers being required to kneel. Many of the nobility declined complying, but the ministers of Edinburgh did not venture to express their disapprobation of this new and offensive form.

A parliament met on the 17th of June, while the King remained in Scotland; and here, for the first time, his ecclesiastical schemes encountered opposition from the nobility, who were jealous of the aggrandisement of the prelates. It was proposed to pass an act, declaring that whatever his Majesty should determine in ecclesiastical affairs, with advice of the archbishops, bishops, and a competent number

Parliament
of June
1617.

LECT.
XIX.

1617.

of the ministers, should have the force of a law. A protestation, which I shall read to you, was prepared by above fifty of the ministers, and presented to Parliament, appealing to the King's own declarations that no innovations should be attempted in the form of worship. [It was to the following purpose :—

PROTESTATION GIVEN IN TO THE PARLIAMENT, 1617.

Protestation
to the Par-
liament
against
innovations.
[Course of
Conformitie,
p. 54.]

“Most gracious and dread Sovereigne,—Most honourable Lords and remanent Commissioners of this present Parliament: We, the ministers of Christ his Evangell, being here convened from all parts of this your Majestie's kingdom, doe in all submission and reverence intreat your Majestie and Honour's patient and favourable hearing of this our reasonable and humble supplication. And, first, it will please your Highnes and Honourable Estates presently conveyened be informed, that we are heere a number of the ministers out of all the parts of this kingdome, and that the bishops have protested since our comming, to a great many of us, that nothing should be agreed upon nor consented to by them, in this present Parliament, in matters concerning the holy Kirk, the discipline and order thereof, without our speciall knowledge and advise; affirming also that neither they nor we have power of consent in any innovation or smallest change of the order of our Kirk established, without speciall advice and determination of the General Assemblie, representing the bodie of the Kirk of the kingdom, had thereunto. Whereupon we, resting in security, have received now a suddaine report, to our great astonishment, of an article to passe in conclusion, and to receive the force of a law in this present Par-

liament, decerning and declaring that your Majestie, with advice of the archbishops, bishops, and such a competent number of the ministerie as your Maj., out of your wisdome, shall think expedient, shall in all time comming have full power to advise and conclude in all matters decent for the external policie of the Kirk, not repugnant to the Word of God, and that such conclusion shall have the strength and power of ecclesiastical lawes. Wherein it will please your Majestie and Honourable Estates to hear our just greeves, and consider our reasonable desire ; and not to put us, your Maj. humble and loving subjects, to that poore and simple point of protestation ; which, if remedie be not provided, we must be forced to use for the freedom of our Kirk, and discharge of our conscience.

“ Wee then, first, plead reformation and puritie in our Kirk, in doctrine, in ministrations of the sacraments, in discipline, and all convenient order, with the best reformed kirks in Europe ; which may stand, and have been acknowledged rather as a pattern to be followed of others, than that we should seeke our reformation from any, that never attained to that perfection, which, in the mercie of God, this long time bygone under your Highnes we have enjoyed, and are able by reason to maintain the same.

“ Next, we plead the libertie of our Kirk, which, by the lawes of your Majestie’s kingdom, and divers Acts of Parliament, given forth in favour of the same, is established with power of publick meetings and General Assemblies, and allowance to make such canons and constitutions as may serve for the comelie order and decencie of the same, all which, by this conclusion to be taken, must be utterly overthrown.

LECT.
XIX.

1617.

“Thirdly, we plead for the peace and tranquillitie of our Kirk, that, being neerest the divine and apostolicke institution, hath lived without schisme or rentings in itselfe, and by introduction of any noveltie not orderlie, nor as appertaines, may be miserablie rent, and our peace broken.

“Fourthly, we have been at divers times sufficiently secured from all suspicions of innovation, as by your Maj. letter, the last winter, sent down to this countrie to take away all feare of any alteration which might arise upon your Maj. lovingly intended journey; which letter, by your Maj. speciall will and direction of the specials of your Maj. Councell, is elsewhere intimated in our pulpits. As also, by that proclamation given out the 26th day of September 1605, when rumours of an intended conformitie with the Kirk of England was spread abroad. Wherein your Maj. sufficiently avoided all such suspicion; and the hearts of all honest men settled themselves in a confidence that no such thing should be attempted.

“These and many other reasons have moved us, in all reverence, by this our humble supplication, to intreat your Highnes and Honourable Estates not to suffer the forenamed article, nor any other prejudiciall to our liberties formerly granted, to passe at this time, to the grieffe and prejudice of this poore Kirk; whereby the universal joy of thousands of this land, who rejoiced at your Maj. happy arriving here, shall be turned to mourning. Wherein as we are earnest supplicants to God to inclyne your Maj. hart this way, as the most expedient for the honour of God and the weal of the subjects; so, if we shall be frustrated of this our reasonable desire, then do we

in all humilitie, with that dutifull acknowledgment of our loyaltie to your Majestie, as becomes us, protest for ourselves and all our brethren that shall adhere to our protestation, that as we are free of the same, so must we be forced rather to incur the censure of your Maj. law, than to admit or obtemper an imposition that shall not fall from the Kirk orderly convened, having power of the same.”]

LECT.
XIX.
1617.

The bill was silently withdrawn,—but the ministers who had been most active in preparing the protestation, particularly Calderwood, Simson, and Hewat, were summoned before the High Commission at St Andrews, and convicted of having joined in a seditious remonstrance. This Parliament passed two statutes, one concerning the election of archbishops and bishops, and another concerning the restitution of chapters, both of which sufficiently established the prelacy. This, however, was not thought enough. Simson and Hewat were suspended and imprisoned; Calderwood was not only deprived of his ministerial office, but sentenced to perpetual banishment. This was a most unjust judgment; and it is not without reason that Mr Laing has said, “When a remonstrance to Parliament was punished as seditious by the High Commission, ecclesiastical, or rather regal, tyranny was carried to the extreme.”

[Laing's
Hist. of
Scotland,
(1800) 1,
71.]

When this sentence was pronounced, James, being at St Andrews, proposed to the clergy that the following ceremonies should be received, as practised in the Church of England:—1. That the Eucharist should be received kneeling; 2. That it should be administered in private, in cases of sickness; 3. That baptism should be administered privately, if necessary; 4. That episcopal confirmation should be bestowed on the

LECT.
XIX.

1617.

young ; and, 5. That the nativity, passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Spirit, should be commemorated as sacred festivals in the Church. He said that he would not listen to any disapprobation of these articles, unless the arguments by which they were opposed should be unanswerable. The clergy on their knees entreated that a General Assembly might be called, that the ceremonies might be sanctioned by the supreme ecclesiastical court. The King, not without difficulty, yielded to this request, on being assured that the Assembly would be obedient to his will.

Episcopal
government estab-
lished in
Scotland.

We have now seen that the conformity to Episcopacy was established by six successive steps,—1. By granting the vote in Parliament ; 2. By appointing perpetual moderators ; 3. By the erection of the High Commission ; 4. By giving bishops the sole power of ordaining and depriving ministers, and by requiring the oath of obedience from every minister ; 5. By the consecration of the bishops, and, last of all, by their confirmation in Parliament, on the 28th of June 1617. The Assembly at Perth, however, proceeded farther than the Parliament had done, and complied with all the King's requisitions. As the transactions of this Assembly introduced a new era into the Church, I shall take notice of them particularly in next Lecture.

LECTURE XX.

PERTH ASSEMBLY, 1618—ORDER OF PROCEDURE—INTERFERENCE WITH THE FREEDOM OF DEBATE IN THE ASSEMBLY — THE VOTE—ARTICLES OF PERTH—ACCURACY OF CALDERWOOD'S ACCOUNT OF THE PROCEEDINGS — REFUSAL OF THE PEOPLE, AND MANY MINISTERS, TO CONFORM TO THE NEW CEREMONIES—THE ARTICLES RATIFIED BY PARLIAMENT—SEVERITIES AGAINST NON-CONFORMISTS—DEATH OF JAMES VI.

JAMES VI. had such a passion for enforcing uniformity of worship, and reducing all the churches in his dominions to the English model, that this may almost be said to have been the chief business of his reign. It was evidently the object of his visit to Scotland in the year 1617 ; and he could not restrain his resentment within the bounds of decency, when he perceived that the forms which appeared to him to be so momentous were not merely received with reluctance, but seriously protested against by many able men, on whose opposition he had never calculated. At an Assembly which met at St Andrews about the time of the King's departure to England, Spotswood, the archbishop, exhorted the ministers to prefer the favour of his Majesty to the praise of those factious persons by whom he alleged they were influenced ; and during the two first days it was expected that the majority would quietly accept the five favourite articles. But their acquiescence was only partial, and they earnestly

LECT.
XX.

1618.

LECT.
XX.

1618.

applied for a farther delay, that they might prepare the minds of the people for the change, by explaining to them its reasonableness and expediency. When James learned that his propositions had not been implicitly adopted, he was frantic with rage. He wrote a furious letter to the two archbishops, in which he said: "We will have you know that we are come to that age as we will not be content to be fed with broth, and think this your doing a disgrace no less than the protestation itself. Wherefore it is our pleasure, and we command you, as you will avoid our highest displeasure, that you keep Christmas Day precisely, yourselves preaching, and choosing your texts according to the time; and likewise that ye grant no modification of stipends for this year to any minister whatsoever, such excepted as have testified their affection to our service at this time, by furthering at their power the acceptance of the articles proposed." In conclusion, the King wrote with his own hand, "Since your Scottish Church has so far contemned my clemency, they shall now find what it is to draw the anger of a king upon them." Five days afterwards he wrote another letter, from which it appears that his passion, instead of having subsided, had become more vehement. He expressed himself with intemperate rage and disdainful levity; and to prove that his anger was inexorable, he sent another letter to the Council, prohibiting the payment of stipends to any rebellious ministers ("rebellious knaves" he called them) who refused the articles, till such time as their conformity was testified by the subscription of the primate or the ordinary bishop.

Assembly
at Perth,
1618.

The prelates, however, at length prevailed upon the King to call another Assembly, to meet at Perth on

the 25th of August 1618,—and this was the last and the most remarkable of all the Assemblies convened during his reign. An account of it, published by Calderwood, after shortly describing the proceedings, contains a long and learned statement of the controversy to which the different articles gave rise. In answer to this pamphlet, Dr Lindsay, at that time minister of Dundee, but soon appointed one of the bishops, published a quarto volume, entitled *A True Narration of all the Passages of the Proceedings in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland holden at Perth,—with a Defence of the Articles therein concluded*. This is the *Defence* to which Spotswood refers as having been published in answer to a lying and seditious pamphlet that came forth in print against the conclusions there taken. Spotswood himself, who was a chief actor in the scene, declined saying a single word of the mode in which matters were conducted, and has contented himself with inserting the five articles as they were finally concluded. It was no doubt prudent in him to forbear entering into details, which, if faithfully given, would have exhibited his own character in an aspect far from venerable,—bullying, threatening, and reproaching those who expected impartiality from the moderator, and grave reasoning from the other members of the court. Calderwood's separate pamphlet is at least three times the length of the minute account which he has given in his printed *History*; and from that statement, compared with Lindsay's defence, I shall try to extract a correct narrative of the proceedings of this famous Assembly.

The King's commissioners, with their assessors and various noblemen and barons, to the number of twenty-five, and ten burgesses from the principal towns, with

LECT.
XX.

1618.

[Calderwood's
Perth
Assembly
(1619).]Lindsay's
"True
Narration,
&c.," Lond.,
1621.][Spotswood
Hist. 538.]

LECT.
XX.

1618.

all the bishops of Scotland, except Argyle and the Isles, convened on the 25th of August. The number of ministers is not mentioned, but though many of them were commissioners from presbyteries, it is said that some appeared without any commission. A fast was observed on the first day of the meeting, and two sermons were preached the first day by Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen, on those words in the twenty-third verse of the seventh chapter of Ezra: "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven, for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons?" From which words he enlarged on the proposition, that nothing should be done or determined in the Church by any superior power, but what is according to the commandment of the Almighty King. The second sermon was preached by the Archbishop of St Andrews, on the words (1 Cor. ii. 16), "If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." He discoursed two hours, first on the necessity of ceremonials in general, and then on the propriety of those which were now proposed to be introduced. He solemnly protested that, without his knowledge and against his desire and expectation, the articles were sent to him to be inserted among the canons of the Church,—and that, if it had been in his power, he would have declined receiving them—not that he thought them unlawful or inconvenient, but because he foresaw the strife to which they would lead. He added, that no man was worthy of the name of a Christian, or even of a Scotsman, who would not lay down his life to meet his Majesty's affection, or who would stand against his pleasure in so just demands. In

Lindsay's *Narration* this sermon is inserted at length. LECT.
XX.

After the second sermon ended, the first session of the Assembly was holden. The archbishop placed himself at the head of the table in the moderator's chair, by the side of his Majesty's commissioners; seats were placed on both sides of the table for noblemen, barons, burgesses, bishops, and doctors. (I ought to have mentioned that, about two years before this, for the first time in Scotland, several doctors of divinity were created at St Andrews by his Majesty's direction). "The ministers," says Calderwood, "were left to stand behind them, as if their place had been only to behold;" and he adds, "but this apparently was done of policy, that they might carry some majesty on their part, to dash simple ministers." Upon this remark Bishop Lindesay is pleased to express his opinion, that "the complaint proceeds from too much pride and sauciness; but the man who cannot hear of degrees in the Church must have patience—presbyters must now content to sit and stand behind the bishops, for the time of confusion is expired, and churchmen must now learn to live orderly."

A question was asked by a member, if all the noblemen, barons, and ministers present would be allowed to vote. The archbishop answered that no minister would be allowed to vote who had not a commission; but as for noblemen and barons sent by the King, a voice could not be denied to them. This was a violation of the laws of the Church, which required that barons must have a commission from presbyteries, in order to be entitled to vote. The regulation concerning ministers without commissions is said also to have been broken.

1618.
[True Narration, p. 21.]
The order of procedure.

[Perth Assembly, 2, 3. True Narration, 47.]

[Perth Assembly, p. 4, *supra*, vol. 1. p. 297, *note.*]

LECT.
XX.

1618.

A letter from the King was delivered by Dr Young, Dean of Winchester, and read twice. His Majesty declared that nothing would content him but a simple and direct acceptation of the articles in the very form in which they had been sent some time before,—as he claimed a power of disposing things external in the Church according as he thought them most convenient and profitable for the advancement of true religion. The archbishop then told the ministers that if they did not consent to the articles, some would be banished, others would be deprived of their offices, all would be exposed to the wrath of their sovereign, and the whole order and state of the Church would be overthrown. “When some of you are banished,” he said, “and others deprived, you will call us persecutors—but as we will lay all the burden on the King, if you call him a persecutor, the whole world will stand up against you.”

Being called on by the archbishop as moderator, Dr Young seconded his Majesty’s letter, in a most affected oration, pronounced in a whining tone of voice, and interspersed with many scraps of Latin sentences, all for the purpose of proving that the wisest, most potent, most religious, and most learned of princes, the matchless mirror of all kings, though the meekest man upon the face of the earth, would, by his supreme authority, force much greater hardships upon his subjects, under strict penalties, if they persisted in refusing what was now required. He therefore adjured the ministers to act so as to prevent the miseries and judgments which were to be apprehended, if they did not give due satisfaction to their bountiful and gracious sovereign by rendering unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s.

When this magnificent rhetorician had delivered his harangue, with all the airs and graces of a tragedian uttering a mournful prologue, Spotswood, the principal performer in the drama (for it was nothing else, all the Acts having been previously adjusted and rehearsed), took upon him, before the commissions of the members were presented, to nominate all those who were to be upon the privy conference. All the deliberations were to be carried on in this committee; and the archbishop was careful to make a selection of members who, he knew, would be willing to acquiesce in his dictates,—namely, all the bishops, all the noblemen, the King's three commoners, and their three assessors; all the barons except three; I believe, all the doctors; and such ministers as in general were known to be inclined to yield. A few were included of the opposite party, for the purpose, it was believed, of hearing their arguments in private, that they might be more easily repelled when they were delivered in public.

The privy conference convened at three o'clock that afternoon, and had also two meetings the next day. The moderator was most anxious to persuade the members to proceed to the vote without any reasoning,—but he found it impossible to prevent reasoning altogether, and therefore it was thought best to appoint two disputants on each side of the question. All this was mere parade,—but after there had been much talk, the archbishop insisted that they should come to a vote on the article of kneeling in the sacrament. When it was said by the other party that it was an innovation, a great prejudice to persons and privileges, and a presumptuous usurpation of a few to vote and conclude under the colourable pretence of a conference,

LECT.
XX.

1618.

matters of weight belonging to the whole Church,—
Spotswood answered, that this was the practice of the
Lords of the Articles in preparing bills for Parliament,
and that, if it were a prejudice, he would rather com-
mit twenty such prejudices than that the King should
be offended.

Interference
with the
freedom of
debate in
the Assem-
bly.

On Thursday the 27th of August, the second and
last sederunt of the Assembly, the business of the day
was begun by a sermon preached by William Cowper,
bishop of Galloway, who had long pretended to be a
most zealous Presbyterian, but who had, according to
his own account, obtained a new light. The King's
commissioners and the bishops then insisted that the
business should be concluded ; and they added, "out of
this house you shall not go till his Majesty's desire be
fulfilled." Spotswood told the ministers that he knew
not one of them would choose to lose a year's stipend
for their scruples, and that all resistance was vain,
as the King would accept no answer but submission.
With great unfairness, he told them also that unless
they proposed arguments which had not been dis-
cussed in the conference, they could not be heard,—
though a great number had no access to know what
had passed in the conference. Indeed, even in the
Assembly, the ministers had scarcely any opportunity
either of hearing or of being heard, as they were all
kept standing in the background, as if they had been
an inferior order of beings, who had no part or lot in
the matter. Some of them, finding that their voices
were borne down, gave in objections in writing ; but
though two papers of this kind were read, the others
were suppressed, and all of them were disregarded.

Before the roll was called, the King's letter was
again read, and all the members were given to under-

stand that whoever denied one, must be considered as denying all. The question was put, "Whether will you receive the articles or refuse them, and disobey the King?" Some wished them to be separately considered, but it was demanded that they should be voted *in cumulo*. The archbishop took the roll in his own hand, and before calling it, told the members that the names of all who voted against the articles would be sent to the King. As the roll was being called, he frequently repeated the words, "Remember the King—have the King in your mind."

LECT.
XX.
1618.

The names of the King's commissioners, noblemen, barons, and bishops, were first called, then the doctors and ministers, and last of all the burgesses. Calderwood says that some who had no commission were called and voted in the affirmative; and that several of those who had commissions, but whose hostility was anticipated, were passed over. Bishop David Lyndsay, with his accustomed prelatical decorum, says that this is an impudent lie, and adds that the commissions of all who voted are extant in the rolls; but he omits to say whether they had their commissions from the Church or from the King; and as Calderwood meant only to say that they had not such commissions as were required by the Acts of the General Assembly, it might have been expected that this high-bred churchman would have chosen some more polite phrase to designate the mistake, if indeed there was any mistake in the case.

The Vote.
[Perth
Assembly,
p. 10.
True Nar-
ration, p.
72.]

It is not very material to determine the dispute concerning the commissions which the voters on this occasion held, or whether they held any commission at all; for it is certain that the greater part of those who held commissions were nominated by the

LECT.
XX.

1618.

[Records of
the Synod of
the diocie of
St Andrews,
bernoth
Forth.]

bishops and other slaves of the Court. First of all, the permanent moderators and clerks of presbyteries, all of whom were appointed by the diocésans, were admitted as members *ex officio*. Next, with regard to those who professed to be elected, I shall give you a specimen of the manner in which they were elected from the diocese of St Andrews, including Fife, Kinross, Clackmannan, Angus, Mearns, and part of Perthshire, the district from which the greatest number attended the meeting. The records of the synod contain the following minute: “Anent y^e directing of commissioners to y^e General Assembly, qⁿ it sall please his Ma^{tie} to appoint one, it was tho^t expedient that such men shall be nominate furth of every presbytery as are wise and discreet, and will give his Majesty satisfaction anent these articles proponed by his Highness commissioners in ye laitte General Assembly holden at St Andrews.”

Considering all this management, it is rather wonderful that the measure met with opposition. Yet, undismayed by the menaces and snares of the Episcopalian party, one nobleman, one doctor, and forty-five ministers had the honesty and boldness to vote in the negative, and several voted *non liquet*.

[True Nar-
ration, p.
72.]

According to Lyndsay's account, 86 voted in the affirmative, including all the noblemen, barons, bishops, and burgesses; and he is quite indignant at the supposition that the noblemen, barons, and burgesses swayed the votes. He says that the whole number of laymen who came to the Assembly were 31, of whom he says one had retired, and two voted in the negative, which whole number being laid aside, they were overswayed by the voices of the ecclesiastics to the number of 18 at least. Without retorting on this

learned bishop any of his own elegant epithets, we may be allowed to say, with the humble deference due to so exalted a character, that if his accuracy in his facts and reasonings is to be estimated by his arithmetical correctness, it will not be safe to rely on his authority. If his own statement of the majority and minority be just, the whole number who voted in the Assembly must have been 131; and as only 30 laymen are said to have been included, the number of ecclesiastical persons could be only 101, of whom 12 were bishops. If the bishops and non liquets were excluded, the number of ministers who voted in the negative would be greater than those who voted in the affirmative; but even if these are retained in the list of ministers, the numbers on both sides would be very nearly equal. The fact, however, is that the laymen were more numerous than he says, and the ministers who voted in the minority were also more numerous, so that it is quite certain that the majority was chiefly constituted by the noblemen, barons, burghesses, bishops, and doctors.

The Articles concluded by the Assembly were as follows :—

“1. Seeing we are commanded to kneel before the Lord our Maker, and considering there is no part of worship more spiritual than the receiving of the blessed body and blood of Christ, the most humble and reverent gesture best becometh so divine and sacred an action; therefore, notwithstanding our Church hath used to celebrate the communion to the people sitting, by reason of the great abuse of kneeling used in the idolatrous worship of the sacrament by the Papists, yet seeing all memory of former superstitions is past, in reverence of God and in disregard

LECT.
XX.
1618.

The Articles
of Perth.

LECT.
XX.

1618.

of so divine a mystery, the Assembly thinketh good that the blessed sacrament be celebrated hereafter meekly and reverently upon their knees."

Plausible as was the pretence on which this article was urged, the Scottish reformers had always referred to the primitive institution as the safest and surest rule. "Christ," said they, "sat at supper with his disciples, and therefore sit we." It was conceived by the Presbyterians who lived under the government of James, that if they complied with his requisition, they not only acted in opposition to the precept and example of Christ, but opened a door to the idolatrous adoration of the consecrated host; and therefore they looked upon this as by far the most offensive of all the articles.

"2. If any good Christian, visited with long sickness, and thinking his sickness to be deadly, shall earnestly desire to receive the communion in his house, the minister shall not deny him so great a comfort, lawful warning being given to him the night before, provided there be three or four of good religion and conversation present with the sick person to communicate with him.

"3. The minister shall often admonish the people that they defer not the baptism of infants any longer than the next Lord's Day after the child be born; as also they shall warn them that without great cause they procure not their children to be baptised at home; but when great need shall compel them to baptise in private houses, then baptism shall be administered after the same form as it should have been in the congregation."

The second and third Articles, though to many they may seem unimportant, were objected to chiefly be-

cause they seemed to be founded on the popish doctrines, that infants who had not been baptised, as not being cleansed from original sin, cannot be received into the happiness of heaven, and that the host on deathbed is indispensable to salvation.

“4. Forasmuch as one of the special means for staying the increase of Popery is the careful education of young children, every bishop in his visitation shall censure the minister who shall be found remiss therein; and the said bishops shall cause the children to be presented before him, and bless them with prayer for the increase of their knowledge, and the continuance of God’s heavenly graces with every one of them.”

This was the sacrament of confirmation, though disguised under another name. The Church of Scotland rejected this rite, as being unauthorised, and as arguing a superiority of bishops over other ministers, which it was contrary to the spirit of the Books of Discipline to acknowledge.

“5. As we abhor the superstitious observance of festival days by the Papists, and detest all profane abuse of them, so we think that the inestimable benefits received from God by our Lord Jesus Christ, his birth, passion, resurrection, ascension, and sending down of the Holy Ghost, were commendably remembered at certain days by the whole church of the world, and may also be now, therefore the Assembly admitteth that every minister shall upon these days have the commemoration of those inestimable benefits, and choose pertinent texts of Scripture, and frame their doctrine and exhortation thereto, rebuking all superstitious observation and licentious observation thereof.”

The Presbyterians had innumerable reasons against

LECT.
XX.

this as well as the other Articles, but it would be tedious to detail them.

1618.

Calderwood's treatises concerning Perth Assembly (of which I believe there are three altogether) are well worth consulting. I have never seen more than two of them. On the article of kneeling in the sacrament he has displayed a most intimate acquaintance with Christian antiquity, and the shallow writers who tell us that sitting was no more the gesture of our Lord and his disciples at the first celebration of the solemnity than kneeling was, would do well to look into these learned treatises for a triumphant answer to this objection. On the questions concerning festival days and confirmation, there is also a profuse display of theological learning as well as of acute reasoning.

Accuracy
of Calder-
wood's
Narrative.

Bishop Lyndsay has been somewhat too rash in his impeachment of Calderwood's veracity. Unfortunately for the bishop's accuracy, some of the private correspondence of Lord Binning, the King's commissioner, with his royal master, has been rescued from oblivion by the late Lord Hailes. Lord Binning, secretary of state, and chief commissioner to this Assembly, wrote to his Majesty, on the evening of the day on which the Assembly closed, an account which confirms several of the particulars related by Calderwood, and denied by his Episcopalian antagonist. His Lordship says that so many precise and wilful Puritans came to the Assembly, that he was at first doubtful of the success of his Majesty's religious desires. He says that the Bishop of Aberdeen in his sermon proposed the Articles with great dexterity, expressing his fear that, if his Majesty did not receive satisfaction, his wrath might be so kindled as to make the Church lose his favour and feel the heavy consequences; and, therefore, exhorting them

[Memorials,
&c. relating
to the His-
tory of
Britain in
reign of
James I.,
p. 87-93.]

in humility and Christian love to proceed with all due respect to the monarch. He also gives a favourable account of the archbishop's harangue, and of his ingenious (or, as his lordship says, his *witty*) device to consider all the Articles, except that of kneeling at the communion, as having been agreed to formerly in the Assembly at St Andrews. He ascribes much to the artful management of the archbishop. He says that on account of "the number of vulgar ministers having vote in the public Assembly, there was great doubt of the event," but "for remedy thereof my Lord of St Andrews, who in direction, disputation, and all other circumstances of this action, expressed great wisdom, learning, and authority, well beseeeming his place, delayed the voting the second day that he and his brethren might have time to dispose things to a wished end." Mr John Carmichael, minister of Kilconquhar, one of the Presbyterians, made the most strenuous efforts against the Articles; but the commissioner interfered, and prevented him from concluding his argument. "At last, the archbishop," he says, "cutting short all their pretended shifts, ordained this proposition only to be voted, 'Whether the Assembly would obey his Majesty in admitting the Articles or refuse them?' Some insisted to have them severally voted; but both the Archbishop and the Dean of Winchester declared that his Majesty would receive none, if all were not granted."

Perhaps there never was an ecclesiastical assembly in which the majority was so entirely swayed by the desire of royal favour. The Episcopalian clergy represented the Articles as being matters of indifference, and the only plausible ground on which they pressed their acceptance was, that it was unreasonable and

LECT.
XX.

1618.

LECT.
XX.

1618.

foolish to displease the King for so small a matter, and that in all cases in which the dictates of conscience or revelation were not clear, implicit obedience was due to the supreme power. To the frivolous and prejudiced mind of the sovereign, the Articles must have appeared to be of primary consequence, unless we believe that he was so hypocritical as to pretend to regard as a matter of conscience what was only a matter of policy, or rather perhaps of caprice, and so despotic as to compel his subjects to receive with the same reverence as divine institutions the idols of his vain imagination. That this last supposition is not void of foundation, appears from some strong and well-known facts. Though the King possessed so great a zeal for commemorating the more remarkable facts in the history of Jesus Christ, by the annual observance of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, and other holidays not prescribed in the Scriptures, he had no scruple in dispensing with the religious observation of the Lord's Day, and even in insisting that those of his subjects who considered the indulgence as impious, should relax from the strictness of their obedience to an institution of Heaven. At the very time when he was compelling the Scottish nation to keep sacred the festivals of the Church for which the Word of God has given no warrant, he issued a proclamation giving his authority to all his people to regale themselves, after attendance on divine service on Sunday, with such sports and pastimes as dancing, archery, leaping, and other social-amusements, which ended in noisy conviviality and riotous dissipation. Whoever considers the conduct of James on this occasion, must exceed in charity, if he believes that the pertinacity with which he obtruded

the Article for the keeping of holidays proceeded from any tenderness of conscience, or from religious conviction.

LECT.
XX.
1618.

The intelligent population of Scotland were not so easily gained over to the King's whims concerning ceremonies as were the time-serving bishops and clergy. In spite of the royal proclamations and the episcopal admonitions, the people in general refused to conform. In this resolution they were supported by those ministers who still retained their attachment to the primitive simplicity of Presbyterian worship, and who accordingly persisted in administering the communion to their flocks sitting at a table. The citizens of Edinburgh at Christmas would not desist from their common employments, and at Easter, none except the lawyers and a few other retainers of arbitrary power attended the churches to receive the sacrament, according to the newly-prescribed form. The churches of those who adhered to the ancient mode of worship were crowded, while those of the conformists all over the country were almost completely deserted. In some places all the people went out of the church, leaving the minister alone. In other places, the people, after being seated at the communion-table, and being required to kneel, remonstrated with the minister, and, when he would not satisfy them, rose from the table and went home. In that part of the diocese of St Andrews which now corresponds to the Synod of Fife, one half of the ministers could not be brought to submit to the Articles for several years, in spite of the terrors of deprivation and other penalties. In the presbyteries of Brechin, Arbroath, Dundee, Forfar, Meigle, and Perth, the ministers submitted in general without

Refusal of
the people
to conform
to the
ceremonies. ✓

✓

LECT.

XX.

1618.

hesitation.^a Some of the recusants were summoned before the High Commission, and a few were removed from their ministry and put in close confinement. The severities would probably have been greater, if the King had not fallen into a dangerous sickness soon after Easter (1619). While his health was considered as being in a precarious state, the bishops conducted themselves with great calmness and moderation ; but

^a [See the Records of the Diocesan Synod of St Andrews. Under the date April 6, 1619, in the entry of the "Trial of the Exercises, are given some of the excuses of the 'brethren who have not kept ye order in celebrating the holie communion prescribed by the laitt General Assemblie holden at Perth.'" The following is the substance of the minute as to the exercise of the Presbytery of St Andrews :—" Mr Wm. Erskine has not conformed, not from contempt, but conscience not resolved. Mr Wm. Murray, not fully resolved, has not conformed. Mr Alexander Henderson has not given the communion according to the prescribed order, not from contempt, but is not fully persuaded of the lawfulness thereof. He is exhorted to stryve to obedience and conformity. Mr Jo. Fowet has not celebrated the communion, because in this season he cannot have his people commodiously examined, because the greatest part are traders by sea. Mr James Cunningham is to celebrate the communion next Sabbath according to the order. Dr David Barclay, minister at St Andrews, was gravely rebuked for his non-concurrence in the celebration of the communion, according to his office in the ministry then required. Dr Glaidstones, D. Bruce, Mr Geo. Mairtin, Mr Jo. Rutherford, Mr Simeon Davie, have kept the prescribed order. Mr Dav.

Merino has not celebrated the communion as yet, because he could not have the elements. (It appears that only six in St Andrews presbytery had conformed.) In Cupar presbytery, Mr Andrew Bennet, elder, has not celebrated conform to the prescribed order, because the maist part of his people were not disposed to receive it. Mr Tho. Douglas gave the elements with his awin hand to all the people, but not kneeling, because they were otherwise inclined." At this meeting of the synod, a thanksgiving was appointed for the King's recovery of " a deidlie sicknes." On the 25th April 1620—" Foralsmeikil as Mr Wm. Wishart, minister, Fettercairn; Mr Dav. Mitchell, Garvoch; Mr Jo. Fowat, Newburn; Mr Dav. Anderson, Ballangrie; Mr Jo. Chalmer, Auchterdirray, Mr Ro. Rock, Innerkeithing; Mr Wm. Nairn, Dysart; Mr Rob. Murray, Methven; and Mr Jo. Gillespie, Kirkaldie, have not given obedience to ye Acts of ye Assemblie at Perth, it was ordained that such as do not conform before Whitsunday shall be summarily deprived of their ministerie. Mr Thos. Hog, minister, Dysart, having been summoned before the archbishop and synod, and often called, did not compeir, was therefore deprived of his ministerie for his disobedience to the Acts of the General Assemblie at Perth, and other causes."]

as soon as he recovered, they resumed their former harsh and intolerant proceedings.

LECT.
XX.

It was not thought enough either by the King or the bishops that the Five Articles were sanctioned by a General Assembly of the Church. A Parliament was held at Edinburgh by the Marquess of Hamilton, as the King's commissioner, in the summer of 1621.

1621.
The Articles ✓
ratified by
Parliament.
[Act. Parl.
Scot. iv.
596.]

One of the purposes for which this Parliament was summoned, was to raise a supply for enabling James to support the expense necessary for assisting his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, in recovering the dominions which he had lost by the disastrous battle of Prague; but the chief object of the Parliament evidently was to ratify the Articles of Perth. The account of the proceedings, as it has been preserved in the letters of the Secretary of State (the Earl of Melrose, afterwards Earl of Haddington), more than justifies the allegations of the Presbyterians concerning the secret influence which was used to obtain a majority.

[Hail's
Memorials
(James I.),
p. 122.]

As several ministers had come to Edinburgh for the purpose of protesting, a proclamation was issued, commanding them to leave the town under pain of rebellion. The Archbishop of St Andrews opened the Parliament by preaching an excellent sermon on the honour and obedience due by subjects to princes. "He brought handsomely in the purpose of the Church articles, and among other reasons proponed the acknowledgment contained in the first Confession of Faith made after the Reformation, . . . that church discipline and rites would not be perpetually unchangeable, but were upon good considerations alterable, and so being indifferent; and the Articles now introduced, being lawful and expedient, needed no other warrant but the judgment of our King, so religious, so wise, so learned and just,

[Hail., p.
123.]

LECT.
XX.

1621.

[Hailes'
Memorials,
p. 126.]

as the world had not seen his equal." After him spoke the Marquess of Hamilton, the King's commissioner. After a long discourse on political matters, he recommended the affairs of the Church, and begged that the Parliament would remember the past proofs of his Majesty's "excellent knowledge and great care for promoting religion, and the public testimonies of his admired works." "He *roughly inveighed*" (these are the Secretary's words) "against those who treasonably slandered his Majesty with intention to introduce all English ceremonies, . . . assuring them, that if they would obey and confirm the Acts already made, his Majesty would never intend any future alteration. He enlarged those grounds in so good terms, as all the estates acknowledged how well he had profited under the hand of the best master in the world." "The public speeches were concluded by the Lord Chancellor," who closed with a "pithy exhortation for the contribution and Church affairs." And then the "Lords of the Articles were chosen with such dexterity, that no man was elected (one only excepted) but those who by a private roll were selected as best affected to his Majesty's service." The mode of electing these members was an innovation which, by giving the nomination to the bishops, was in fact transferring it to the sovereign himself. The King, in his letter to the Parliament, promised that he would reward their duties according to their deservings, and the Marquess of Hamilton did not fail to avail himself of this and other expressions. In spite of all his intrigues, however, a most powerful opposition appeared in the Parliament against the Articles—fifteen noblemen, and forty-four commissioners from counties and burghs, voted against them ; and the majority of twenty-seven,

by which they were carried, would not have been obtained if the commissioner had not solemnly assured them that no farther innovations would be proposed by the King. Many protestations and admonitions had been put by the ministers into the hands of the more zealous members, and the effect of these papers was greater at first than could ever have been anticipated. But many of the members were prevailed upon by various stratagems to depart from the town before the Articles were discussed, and it was also contrived that the Articles should be hastily and unexpectedly introduced one day, after much civil business had been transacted. When the Act was passed, several ministers published a protestation against it, but it was dangerous for them to remain within the reach of the ruling party.

LECT.
XX.

1621.

[Hailes' Memorials,
p. 134.]

From this period the Articles were pressed with the utmost violence,—and whenever a case of refusal was reported, the parties were summoned before the High Commission. Even before the Articles had the force of a law, many ministers had been deposed and banished. The rigour of the High Commission now increased—multitudes were compelled to take the oath *ex officio*, by which they were required to bear evidence against themselves. But the ministers were not subdued by persecution. Although many of them were displaced, they would not desist from preaching whenever opportunity offered ; and those of them who found it not to be safe to remain in the country, were welcomed as pastors in the reformed churches of the Continent. The cruelties of the High Commission were not confined to the ministers and preachers. Magistrates who were not willing to conform were displaced, and many respectable citizens were fined

Severities
against
nonconformists.

LECT.
XX.

1625.

and imprisoned for the same offence. The city of Edinburgh, not being sufficiently submissive, was threatened with the loss of its privileges; but so far were the people from being gained over to his Majesty's favourite Articles, that the churches were left almost empty, and private conventicles were multiplied both in the towns and throughout the country. A proclamation was issued against them,—and so numerous were the severities practised against the non-conformists, that the whole nation was in a state of commotion and misery. Even Bishop Burnet confesses that the bishops lost all esteem with the people, and that the few of them who were more learned than the rest, did lean so grossly to Popery that the heat and violence of the Reformation was the chief subject of their discourses.

[History of
his Own
Times, vol.
i. p. 10.]

↓ Death of
James VI.

At last the Church of Scotland obtained a temporary repose in consequence of the death of the King, with whose life the High Commission expired. It was only a temporary calm, and the friends of Presbytery found to their sad experience that the successor to the throne did not profit by his father's example. Of the character of James I shall forbear to say anything. The great Lord Bacon describes him as the wisest, and most learned, and most eloquent of princes. "His erudition," he says—it is to be remembered that the panegyric was addressed to James himself in the dedication of one of the most profound works^a which was ever written—"was scarcely less than miraculous, and like Hermes Trismegistus, he united the power of a King and the illumination of a priest with the science of a philosopher." Bishop Burnet says that his reign was a continued course of mean practices; that he was

[Burnet's
Own Times,
i. 22.]

[^a Bacon's *Novum Organum*.]

despised by all abroad as a pedant without true judgment, courage, or steadiness ; and that no king could die less lamented, or less esteemed. Yet some of the Episcopalian ministers of Edinburgh affirmed in the pulpit that he was a much more faultless character than David, the man according to God's own heart ; and others said that he was the most religious, the most righteous, and peaceable King who ever lived. The Church of Scotland has little cause to revere his memory.

LECT.
XX.

1625.

LECTURE XXI.

CHARACTER OF CHARLES I. — HIS RESOLUTION TO ENFORCE THE ARTICLES OF PERTH—REPRESENTATION FROM THE MINISTERS TO THE KING ON THE DECREASE OF COMMUNICANTS—ARCHBISHOP LAUD—FURTHER INNOVATIONS IN SCOTLAND CONTEMPLATED—SEVERITIES AGAINST NONCONFORMISTS—SUFFERINGS OF DR ALEXANDER LEIGHTON—THE SCOTTISH BISHOPS AT THIS PERIOD—THE KING'S VISIT TO SCOTLAND—INTRODUCTION OF THE ENGLISH LITURGY INTO THE CHAPEL-ROYAL.

LECT.
XXI.

1625.
Character
of Charles
I.

ON the death of James VI., his third and only surviving son, Charles, succeeded to the crown. The folly of the father was inherited by the son: the same notions of royal prerogative and implicit obedience were retained in all their force; and as his passions were somewhat more violent than those of his father, his conduct rather aggravated than lightened the grievances under which his subjects groaned. If he had less vanity, he had more pride; and though the greater openness of his character exempted him from the imputation of cunning and dishonesty, his subsequent conduct proved that he had imbibed the pernicious maxims which prevailed so unfortunately during the former reign. At his accession to the throne, the nation was elated with high hopes, arising from the reputation which he had gained for his virtues; but the gravity of his character was founded partly on his natural temperament, and partly on the superstition

with which his mind had been tinctured in early life. Without the pedantry of James, he certainly possessed a smaller portion of learning ; but whatever might be the comparative value of his abilities or of his acquirements, it was not possible to exceed him in bigotry.

James had at one time warned his son of the danger of forming a matrimonial alliance with a Catholic princess ; but he afterwards lost sight of his own admonitions, and laboured to promote a marriage with the royal family of Spain.^a When the scheme of a matrimonial treaty with Spain proved abortive, Charles espoused Henrietta Maria of France, a lady whose personal charms were enlivened by the gaiety of her disposition, but whose religious sentiments were among the chief causes of the miseries of his reign. It was stipulated in the contract that the queen and her children and domestics should be secured in the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion,—that she should have a bishop, invested with all necessary authority in religious matters, with twenty-eight priests or monks, and a chapel in every place where she should reside. She was also to have the entire charge of educating her children till they reached the age of thirteen years. It was farther secretly agreed in the treaty, that Catholics in England should not hereafter be searched after or molested on account of their religion.

Charles succeeded his father on the 27th March 1625. As the ministers who resisted the introduction of the Five Articles of Perth had received favour-

LECT.
XXI.

1625.

^a Upon that occasion, James stipulated that all his Catholic subjects should enjoy freedom of their religion, and all good usage ; and the same conditions were expressly sanctioned by him afterwards with respect to the next treaty of the kind. This was the man who was so intolerant to the members of the Church in which he was bred.

His resolution to enforce the Articles of Perth.

LECT.
XXI.

1625.

able accounts of the King's piety and moderation, they resolved to petition him for redress of their grievances, and they despatched Mr Robert Scot, minister of Glasgow, as their commissioner, whose reception, however, gave them no ground to hope for relief. The King, far from being favourable to their views, wrote to Spotswood, the Archbishop of St Andrews, to make it universally known throughout the kingdom that it was his will to have the ordinances and injunctions of his father concerning Church matters strictly enforced. This expression of his Majesty's pleasure obtained him the highest character, among all the Episcopalian party, for his wisdom and piety; and from this period, whoever was disposed to receive the royal will as the rule of his conscience, was sure to be a favourite with the order of bishops.

The meetings of General Assemblies were now altogether discontinued; there was not one from the year 1618 till the year 1638, and during this long term of twenty years the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, if it existed at all, was to be found only in secret chambers, or in the wildest recesses of the mountains in the south and in the west. Provincial or diocesan synods continued to sit, and in these all the business was prepared, or rather concluded, in the privy conferences, the members of which were chosen by the bishops, or by the constant moderators.

In the course of the summer a proclamation was published, declaring that, though some persons hostile to the established order of the Church had endeavoured to persuade the lieges that his Majesty intended to alter its government, there was no intention of introducing any change. The bishops had now so much influence as to exclude from every place of

trust all who were not willing to conform to the government of the Church. On the 12th of September the King sent a letter to the Town Council of Edinburgh, ordering them to elect such magistrates only as received the Articles of Perth. A proclamation was at the same time published against Papists and Nonconformists ; but though the law was rigorously used against the Nonconformists, much lenity was exercised towards those of the Romish religion.

About eleven months after the accession of Charles he was solemnly crowned at Westminster. He dissolved his first Parliament because they were dissatisfied with the state of religion, and complained particularly of the encouragement given to Arminian doctrines. He dissolved his second Parliament soon afterwards, because, instead of yielding to his demand for an increase of taxes, they asked a redress of certain grievances. About the same time, while he was extorting money from his subjects by an unconstitutional exertion of the royal power, he was busily employed in strengthening the hands of the Episcopal party in Scotland, as if their talents and influence had been the chief pillars of the throne. He nominated a number of the bishops to the most important offices of the state,—as to seats in the Privy Council and in the Court of Exchequer. He also constituted a High Commission Court, of which four of the bishops were members, and which was empowered to call all persons to its bar for transgressing any of the acts of Parliament. This court, having authority to fine and imprison at its pleasure, proceeded in the most arbitrary manner to levy contributions on every person obnoxious to the government.

One of the circumstances which was most galling

LECT.
XXI.

1627.

to the Presbyterians at this time, was the countenance which was openly given to Popery. In various parts of the country mass was publicly celebrated, and the enormities committed by some of the Popish noblemen were allowed to escape with impunity; while any man suspected of attachment to Presbyterian principles was considered as incapable of holding any public office.

In the year 1627, a meeting of the clergy agreed to supplicate the King for a lawful General Assembly. They also begged that suffering ministers should be restored to their offices, and that none should be troubled for nonconformity. They appointed certain commissioners to represent their case to the King; but as the bishops disapproved of the substance of the petition, they gave secret instructions to the Bishop of Ross, the only commissioner who was suffered to go to Court, and who accordingly forwarded very different measures from those which were contemplated by the meeting in which he had been appointed.

Representa-
tion to the
King on the
decrease of
communi-
cants.

On Easter Sunday this year, when the communion was given in the churches of Edinburgh, not above six or seven persons in the whole city chose to kneel. Some of the ministers themselves refused to conform. In the following year, the general session of the town proposed to the ministers that, for removing of discord, it would be advisable to dispense the sacrament in the manner which was practised before the Assembly at Perth. It was not to be expected that such a motion would pass unanimously. The ministers who were favourable to conformity were willing at least that the people should either sit, or kneel, or stand. But the others said that as they disapproved of kneeling, and would not adopt that form, they could not

consistently allow it to be followed by any of their brethren. The conformists then suggested the propriety of addressing a petition to the sovereign, begging that they might have liberty to celebrate the ordinance according to the mode which had been originally preferred by the Scottish reformers, and which had continued in use for about sixty years. The non-conformists, on the other hand, proposed to proceed according to their consciences, and then, if his Majesty was offended, to deprecate his displeasure. They conceived that a petition addressed to him at that time would but irritate him, as he might be offended by the supposition that he would dispense with those laws which his father had been so peculiarly solicitous to establish. At last, however, all of them subscribed a letter, in which, having stated how mortifying their condition was, in having flocks, amounting to many thousands, who would not communicate with them, and of the few who did communicate scarcely any consenting to kneel,—they prayed his Majesty to dispense with that part of the Act of the Perth Assembly concerning kneeling, that so, by condescending to the weakest of their flock, they might enjoy the comfort of holding fellowship with a people who were so good and peaceable, and in all points, except this, so loyal and submissive to authority. They authorised their commissioners also to represent that the number of communicants was annually decreasing; that both pastors and people were living in a state of mutual disagreement; that impiety was increasing, because many were led, by what they saw going on in this country, to suppose that religion was a matter of indifference, which fluctuated with the will of the sovereign or the variable opinions of the Church;

LECT.
XXI.

1628.

and that Papists were confirmed in their errors by finding the Protestants approach to the rites most characteristic of their own worship.

When this petition and representation reached the King's hands, he was highly offended, and instead of answering it, he wrote a letter to the Archbishop of St Andrews, requiring him to call the ministers before him ; and after ascertaining who were the chief movers of the business, to inflict such exemplary punishment as might deter others, and promote conformity to the order formerly established. The communion was not celebrated in Edinburgh that year ; but it appears that all the ministers submitted to the archbishop, and were reconciled to the King. The people at large were not so easily subdued.

Archbishop
Laud.

At this time Bishop Laud, having been promoted to the diocese of London, became, after the death of the Duke of Buckingham, the chief counsellor and director of the King in all affairs, civil as well as ecclesiastical ; and one of his first steps was premonitory of evil to the Puritans. He procured a declaration from the King, the effect of which was to restrain the clergy from preaching the doctrine of the 17th Article of the Church of England. Laud was a strenuous advocate of Arminianism, a system which had sprung up while he was a young man, and which with great success he endeavoured to engraft on the Calvinistic articles of his native Church. Through his influence, rather than through his arguments, Arminian doctrines were rapidly propagated both in England and in Scotland ; and it was soon discovered that the surest path to preferment in either Church was to espouse his favourite tenets. In the northern universities, the works of Arminius supplanted the *Institutes* of Calvin,

and Dr Forbes of Aberdeen, and Dr Wedderburn of St Andrews, seemed to vie with each other in courting the patronage of the King of Great Britain and the Bishop of London, by supporting with equal zeal the Five Articles of Perth and the five Arminian points. The English House of Commons was not quite so servilely devoted to either the sovereign or his adviser. When they met on the 20th January 1629, they took into their consideration the growth of Arminianism ; and although, as they were deliberating on this grave subject, they were interrupted by a message from Charles, prohibiting them to interfere in any religious matter, they entered into the following engagement: —“ We, the Commons in Parliament assembled, do protest and avow for truth the sense of the articles of religion which were established in the 13th year of our late Queen Elizabeth, which by the public act of the Church, and by the general and current expositions of the writers of our Church, have been delivered unto us, and we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others wherein they differ from us.” About two months afterwards, they resolved by a majority that “ whosoever shall bring in innovation of religion, or by favour or countenance seem to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinion disagreeing with the truth and the orthodox Church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth.”

It may be added, that it was on the same occasion the House of Commons also protested that “ whoever shall counsel or advise the levying of the subsidies of tonnage and poundage, not being granted by Parliament, shall be likewise reputed a capital enemy to the kingdom.” This was the beginning of the troubles

LECT. XXI. which afterwards convulsed the whole nation, and brought the monarch to the scaffold.

1629.

While England was thus in commotion, the Church of Scotland was not suffered to enjoy repose.

Further innovations in Scotland contemplated.

Rumours of farther innovation spread rapidly through the country, and alarmed even many of those who had hitherto conformed. That both Laud and the King were bent on at once introducing the English liturgy is certain. It was discovered, however, that the time was unpropitious for carrying the proposed changes into effect; and though the plan was not abandoned, its accomplishment was postponed. That nothing was then done, arose, according to Dr Cook, from "some causes which have not been recorded, probably from the remonstrances of the most experienced of the Scottish bishops." The fact is, that the bishops did not make any opposition till some of the most intelligent of the conformists had pointed out the danger of the course which they were pursuing. Among the rest, Mr William Struthers, an eminent clergyman in Edinburgh, having heard that Mr John Maxwell, afterwards Bishop of Ross, after residing some time at the English Court, had brought secret instructions to St Andrews, with a view of introducing all the ceremonies of the Church of England, wrote a letter to the Earl of Airth, stating his apprehensions, and assigning various reasons against the imposition of any further innovations on the members of the Church. The innovations which were dreaded at this time were the use of organs, liturgies, and ceremonies, to which the people entertained the strongest possible antipathy; and as Struthers had hitherto been willing to make a sacrifice of opinion for the sake of peace, he thought himself the better entitled to remonstrate on this oc-

Hist. of Church of Scotland, ii. 337.

casion. Struthers represented that King James authorised the Marquess of Hamilton to promise that the Church should not have any more novelties pressed upon it except the Five Articles; and it was upon this assurance that the Parliament ratified them. He likewise suggested that the introduction of these new rites being intended to be made without previously consulting the Church, must necessarily occasion a ferment, especially as it was reported that the ministers had given their approbation, though they had never heard of the measure at all. So great, he apprehended, would be the shock arising from the execution of the scheme in agitation, that the Church would be finally dissolved. He plainly told his lordship that the bishops were already the objects of universal contempt, insomuch that when any brethren were deposed for nonconformity, it was scarcely possible to find expectants to fill the vacant places, because it was well known that the people would not acknowledge their newly-appointed pastors. He farther stated that the former schisms had already produced throughout the country a general disregard to religion, and that as Popery was already greatly upon the increase, it might soon happen that there would be not even the form of religion at all, except where gross superstition had erected its throne. He concluded by saying, "Your lordship knows that I am not one of those who stand out against order, but do suffer for my obedience; and therefore I the more boldly suggest these reasons to your lordship. I dwell in the most eminent part of the land, and so have occasion to see what is the fruit of a schism. I profess an unspeakable grief to see anything done that may trouble the peace of the Church of this kingdom, and divide the hearts of a

LECT.
XXI.

1630.

good and loving people from so good a King. Our fire is so great already, that it hath more need of water to quench it than oil to augment it."

Severities
against
Noncon-
formists in
England.

Persecution, it is true, had not as yet been employed against the Nonconformists in Scotland with the same rigour as in the sister kingdom. At a time when it was complained that the Protestants on the Continent, particularly in France, were exposed to the greatest oppression from their governments, the Puritans in England, and all who preached the Calvinistic doctrines, were treated with hardly less severity by the Privy Council, the High Commission, and the Star-Chamber, three of the most tyrannical courts ever established in any country. There would be no end to the accounts of their sufferings. The following is a well-authenticated instance, being related not only by all the historians, but by Bishop Laud in his own diary :—

Sufferings of
Leighton.

Dr Alexander Leighton, a Scotch divine, father of the Bishop, having written and published a work entitled, *An Appeal to the Parliament, or Zion's Plea against Prelacy*, which contained some strong expressions against the bishops, the canons, and the ceremonies, was tried by the Star-Chamber for "framing a book, so full of most pestilent, devilish, and dangerous assertions, to the scandal of the King, Queen, and peers, especially the bishops." The words which were particularly charged against him, were—"We do not read of greater persecution of God's people than in this our island, especially since the death of Queen Elizabeth." He confessed the words, and said that the thing was too true, by the prelates taking away life and livelihood from many ministers and private men, of whom many were pined to death in prison, and many wan-

dered up and down, their families being left desolate and helpless ; that, besides this, the blood of souls had been endangered by the removal of the faithful shepherds from the flock. The court unanimously decreed that the Doctor should be “ committed to the Fleet Prison for life, and pay a fine of £10,000 to the King’s use ; that the High Commission should degrade him from his ministry ; that he should then be brought to the pillory at Westminster, while the Court was sitting, and be whipped ; that, after his whipping, he should be set on the pillory a convenient time, and have one of his ears cut, one side of his nose slit, and be branded in the face with the letters S. S., signifying Sower of Sedition ; that then he should be carried back to prison, and after a few days be carried to the pillory in Cheapside on a market-day, and be there likewise whipped, and have the other side of his nose slit, and his other ear cut off, and then be shut up in prison for the remainder of his life, unless his Majesty be graciously pleased to enlarge him.” While this unjust and unmerciful sentence was being pronounced, Bishop Laud, throwing himself into a devout attitude, and pulling off his cap, gave thanks to God for his righteous judgments.

No part of the cruel doom was remitted. That it was rigidly executed, we learn indeed from the bishop’s own journal, in which he has inserted a minute and circumstantial account of the whole transaction, as if he had delighted to dwell on the contemplation of a fellow-creature’s sufferings.—“ Tuesday, 9th of November,” he says, “ Leighton was degraded by the High Commission.” (This was done because it would have been indecorous to inflict corporal or ignominious

[Hist. of
Troubles
and Trials
of W. Laud
(1639), p.
47.]

LECT.
XXI.

1630.

punishment on a person in orders.) "That night he broke out of the Fleet, but was taken in Bedfordshire, and brought back within a fortnight. On the 16th of November part of his sentence was executed upon him. 1. He was severely whipped. 2. Being set in the pillory, he had one of his ears cut off. 3. One side of his nose slit. 4. Branded on the one cheek with a red-hot iron with the letters S. S., and afterwards carried back to prison. On that day se'nnight, his sores upon his back, ear, nose, and face, being not cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside, and there had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him,—by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of the nose, and branding the other cheek." Dr Leighton remained in close confinement ten years, when he was released by the Long Parliament, who also remitted his fine. It appears from his petition to the Parliament, that before his trial he was confined in irons fifteen weeks, in a hole full of rats and mice, with no light but what proceeded through a little grate and the openings in the roof, through which the rain and snow beat in upon him; that, during his imprisonment, his wife and child were treated with inexpressible barbarity by the officers of the pursuivant; that, when his sentence was executed, he was in the height of a fever brought on by cruel usage; and that, during the whole period of his confinement, the apartment allotted to him was such as to ruin his health. When he obtained his release, he could scarcely walk, see, or hear. Indeed, the severities to which he was subjected can scarcely be matched except by the records of the Inquisition.

If severities like these were not ventured upon by the

bishops of Scotland—and, indeed, it is almost certain the attempt would have occasioned a rebellion—yet all the faithful Presbyterians were either driven out of the country, or compelled to hide themselves. Some of the most eminent, such as Blair, Welsh, and Livingstone, went to Ireland, where they preached with great success. Those who had succeeded the faithful and able men now referred to, were for the most part little worthy on any account to occupy the chief places in the Church. It is not necessary to enter into any details as to their proceedings. In a convention of the clergy, held in 1631, it was proposed by the bishops to require the Psalms translated by King James to be used in the churches; but it is said that they were so much ashamed of some of the fantastical expressions that they quietly withdrew the motion. This, however, was not the case in all the dioceses. At St Andrews the translation was recommended by the archbishop, and approved without hesitation by the whole synod. I believe scarcely one of them could have read the book when they expressed their satisfaction with it. Of the character of their discourses a single specimen may be given. Maxwell, the Bishop of Ross (a writer of no mean name among his own party), preached a sermon at Edinburgh, in which he said that our Saviour went down to hell to rescue the souls of the virtuous pagans who have been most renowned for their genius, their military talents, their legislative sagacity, and their political prudence; and he had the goodness to communicate to his audience the names of many of these distinguished personages, such as Hercules and Theseus, Homer and Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, Cyrus and Theogenes, Solon and Lycurgus,

LECT.
XXI.

1630.

The Ministry in Scotland at this period.

LECT.
XXI.

1630.

Aristides and Cicero. Probably he passed over Demosthenes, because some of his orations impeached the doctrine of the divine right of kings. "For my own part," he said, "I so love those wights for their virtues' sake" (no doubt the virtues of Hercules were very eminent), "that I had rather admit twenty opinions, such as *limbus patrum*, than damn eternally the soul of one Cicero or one Socrates." Luckily for Socrates and Cicero, they had no very insuperable antipathy to superstitious ceremonies,—the one having been a sacrificer of chickens, and the other a consulter of their entrails; but if either of them had been tinctured with the leaven of nonconformity, he might have remained *in limbo* as long as it lasted for anything that Bishop Maxwell would have done to help him out. Several of the bishops and chief divines not only preached openly in favour of doctrines which the people considered as most antichristian, but also outraged their feelings by habitually profaning the Christian Sabbath. Spotswood was in the habit of generally selecting Sunday as the fittest day for travelling. Some of the clergy thought it fit to hold out an example of liberality, by spending the evenings after divine service in taverns, and others are said to have insisted on their servants performing the usual occupations of husbandry on that day.

Visit of the
King to
Scotland.

In the year 1633, Charles I. made a journey to Scotland, partly for the purpose of being crowned, partly to obtain money from the Parliament, and partly to accomplish the purpose to which he was instigated by Laud, of reducing the Church of Scotland to complete conformity with that of England. He was crowned at Edinburgh on the 18th of June by Spotswood, the Archbishop of St Andrews, with such

rites as were dictated by Laud, who behaved with great arrogance to such of the prelates as scrupled to wear the canonical vestments.

LECT.
XXI.

1633.

When the Parliament met, two days afterwards, Charles proposed two acts, one concerning his royal prerogative and the apparel of kirkmen, judges, and magistrates—the other, entitled the “Ratification of the Acts touching Religion.” When the question was put, the King took a paper from his pocket, and said, “Gentlemen, I have all your names here, and I’ll know who will do me service, and who will not, this day.” The clerk declared that the vote carried in the affirmative. This was denied by some of the members; but the King, who had himself marked all the votes, said that the clerk’s declaration must be received, unless those who accused him could convict him of falsifying the records of Parliament,—in which, if they failed, they must suffer the punishment of death.

The Presbyterians were now secretly gaining ground, particularly in Fife, Lothian, and in the west of Scotland, where they were kept in countenance by the interest of several powerful peers,—the Earls of Rothes, Lothian, Cassilis, Eglinton, and Lords Lindsay, Balmerino, and Loudon. Some of the Presbyterian ministers attempted to present a petition for redress of grievances to the Parliament; but as the clerk-register was hostile to them, they found it impossible to accomplish their object. They found means, however, to lay the petition before the King, who, after reading it, drily observed, that he wished they had chosen another place than his house for presenting their supplication. This paper throws some light on the state of the Church at this time, and deserves to be read.

Representation by the presbyterian ministers of their “Grievances.”

[Stevenson, 11st. i. 91.]

[It is entitled “Grievances and Petitions concern-

LECT.
XXI.

1633.

ing the disordered state of the Reformed Kirk within the realm of Scotland, presented upon the 29 May 1633, by me, Mr Thomas Hog, minister of the gospel, in my own name, and in the name of others of the ministry, likewise grieved." The following are the most important passages :—

“ . . . Notwithstanding the General Assemblies have been holden, from the time of reformation till the year 1603, at least once in the year, and oftener, *pro re nata*, provincial synods twice in the year, weekly meetings for exercises, and Presbyteries every week, for matters to be treated in them *respective*, and their liberties were ratified in Parliament *anno* 1592, and by that, as a most powerful mean, blessed be God, peace and purity of religion were maintained ; . . . nevertheless, the wonted liberty of holding General Assemblies is suppressed, the order of the provincial synods is confounded, presbyteries in a great part disordered and neglected, whereby divisions have entered into the Kirk : ministers are become negligent in their callings, and scandalous in their lives ; the godly are heavily grieved ; the weak are scandalised ; erroneous doctrine is delivered in kirks and schools, without controulment ; the commissioners, voters in Parliament, lie untried and uncensured, and atheism and Popery increase. . . . Pastors and people adhering to their former profession and practice are nicknamed Puritans, and threatened, not only without any good warrant, but beside the tenor of the act of Perth Assembly, which containeth no such injunction, and contrary to the meaning of the voters, and to the proceedings of that Assembly, where it was professed that none should be pressed with obedience to that act. . . . Albeit it be determined by the General

Assembly of this our reformed Kirk what oaths ministers should take at the time of their admission or ordination, yet there is a new form of oath devised and urged by the admitters or ordainers upon entrants to the ministry, together with subscription to certain articles devised by them, without direction or warrant from any Assembly of the Kirk, yea, or act of Parliament, whereby the entry to the ministry is shut upon the best qualified, and others less able are obtruded upon the people, to their great grief and hazard of their souls. . . . Notwithstanding there be constitutions of the Kirk, and laws of the country, for censuring of ministers before the ordinary judicatures ecclesiastical, yet, contrary to that order, ministers are suspended, silenced, and deprived, and that for matters merely ecclesiastical, before other judicatories, which are not established by the authority or order of the country and Kirk." . . .]

King Charles, after remaining a month in Scotland, returned to London, not much satisfied with his reception in his ancient hereditary dominions. Still less were the people satisfied with him. The whole conduct of his counsellor Laud, whom he now promoted to the see of Canterbury, was offensive in the extreme.

Immediately after the King returned to London, articles were sent down, framed by the new archbishop, for the reformation of his chapel-royal, but also intended to serve as a model for all cathedrals, parish churches, and chapels in the kingdom. The articles were: "That prayers should be read twice a-day, according to the English liturgy; that the dean of the chapel should come to church in white, and should preach in this dress; that the copes consecrated to

LECT.
XXI.

1633.

Introduction of the
English
Liturgy into
the Chapel-
Royal.

LECT.
XXI.

1633.

our use be carefully kept and used at the celebration of the sacrament; that all his Majesty's officers and ministers of state be obliged to receive the sacrament at the royal-chapel kneeling, at least once a-year, for an example to the rest of the people."

The consequences of these proceedings will occupy us in our next Lecture. In the mean time, a few extracts from the correspondence on the subject of the introduction of the liturgy into the chapel-royal, printed by Lord Hailes in his *Memorials and Letters relative to the Reign of Charles I.*, may be read [as showing the nature of some of the means resorted to for the accomplishment of that design.

[Hailes' Memorials, (Charles I.), pp. 1-12.

The following letters are all addressed by Laud to the same correspondent, Bellenden, bishop of Dunblane:—

“ . . Concerning your preferment, until any better place falls, I can promise nothing; but I assure you his Majesty hath a very good opinion both of you and your service, and therefore I cannot doubt but that he will take you and your estate into his consideration. At this time you have given his Majesty good content, and he expects that you will continue in that course; and let him still receive a note who they be that conform, and who not; for I see his Majesty is resolved to go constantly on, and therefore you must not fail. . .

“ LAMBETH, *January 14, 1633-4.*”

“I am right sorry for the death of the Bishop of Edinburgh, the loss being very great both to the King and the Church. I acquainted his Majesty how needful it was to fill that place with an able successor; and when mention was made of divers men to succeed, I did, as you desire, show his Majesty what your desires

were, and what necessities lay upon you. After much consideration of the business, his Majesty resolved to give the bishoprick of Edinburgh to my Lord of Brechin; and for yourself, he commanded me to write expressly to you, that he did not take it well, that, contrary to his express commands, you had omitted prayer in his chapel-royal according to the English liturgy, with some other omissions there, which please him not; besides, his Majesty hath heard that there have been lately some differences in Edinburgh about the sufferings of Christ, &c., and that your lordship was some cause of them; or, at least, such an occasion as might have bred much disturbance, if the late Bishop of Edinburgh his care and temper had not moderated it; and this his Majesty is not well pleased with neither: and this hath been the cause, as I conceive, why his Majesty hath passed you over in this remove; and you shall do very well to apply yourself better, both to his Majesty's service and the well ordering of the Church, lest you give just occasion to the King to pass you by when any other remove falls. I am very sorry that I must write this unto you, but the only way of help lies in yourself and your own carriage; and therefore, if you will not be careful of that, I do not see what any friend can be liable to do for you. Therefore, not doubting but you will take these things into serious consideration, for your own good, I leave you to the grace of God, and rest, &c.

“LAMBETH, *May 6, 1634.*”

“My haste at this time forces me to write very briefly. And these are to let you know that I writ nothing in my former letter but as the King was informed, and myself by him commanded. I have now

LECT.
XXI.

1633.

LECT.
XXI.

1633.

read your lordship's letters to his Majesty, which hath in some part satisfied him, but not altogether. . . .

"You have done very well to acquaint the Lords of Council and Session, &c., with his Majesty's resolution concerning the communion in the chapel-royal; and I doubt not, if you continue to do that which his Majesty looks for in the course of your Church, and which is most just and fit to be done, but that you will easily recover his Majesty's favour, and find the good of it. So, in haste, I leave you to the grace of God.

"LAMBETH, *July 1, 1634.*"

"I have a second time moved his Majesty concerning them that obeyed or disobeyed his commands in receiving the communion in the chapel at Holyrood House, and you shall not fail to receive his Majesty's answer by my Lord of Ross; so that I shall not need to be further troublesome to you in that particular.

"CROYDON, *October 4, 1634.*"

"I am very glad to hear your resolutions for the ordering of his Majesty's chapel-royal, and that you are resolved to wear your whites notwithstanding the maliciousness of foolish men. I know his Majesty will take your obedience and care very well; and being fully satisfied both concerning your sermon and all things else committed to your trust, you may, as opportunity serves, expect from his Majesty all reasonable things; and I shall not be wanting to give you all the assistance that I can upon all occasions; of which I heartily pray you not to doubt. . . .

"LAMBETH, *January 12, 1634-35.*"

"The King has been acquainted with your care of

the chapel-royal, and is very well pleased with the conformity which hath been there at the last reception of the blessed sacrament; and, for my part, I am heartily glad to see in what fair way the Church business now is in those parts. I hope, if the bishops be pleased to continue their good example and their care, all things will settle beyond expectation.

“The King hath declared his pleasure concerning your bishoprics now void, and hath given you the bishopric of Aberdeen, as you will learn more at large by my Lord of Ross; but, being an university, and a place of consequence, he will have you reside there, and relies much upon you for your well ordering that place. I am very glad the King hath been so mindful of you, and given you so good a testimony upon this occasion of your remove. So I leave you to the grace of God, &c.

“LAMBETH, *May 9, 1635.*”]

LECT.
XXI.
1633.

LECTURE XXII.

LAUD'S INFLUENCE OVER THE SCOTTISH BISHOPS—INTRODUCTION OF THE BOOK OF CANONS AND THE SCOTTISH LITURGY—TUMULT IN EDINBURGH—THE TABLES—RENEWAL OF THE NATIONAL COVENANT—MISSION OF THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON—GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1638—THE KING HAS RECOURSE TO ARMS.

LECT.
XXII.

1633.
Trial of
Lord Bal-
merino.

I HAVE already mentioned that the acts of the Scottish Parliament in 1633, relating to religion, were rejected by the majority of the house. The fact is notorious, and is acknowledged by every historian entitled to any credit: yet the King and the Clerk-Register falsely declared that the majority of votes had approved the articles, which accordingly were passed into laws. The noblemen and others who had opposed the measure in Parliament were calumniated by the bishops as promoters of sedition and schism, and were reported to the King as enemies to his person and government. In their own vindication, they resolved to present a petition explaining the grounds of their opposition; and they employed William Haig, advocate, his Majesty's solicitor, to prepare the document to which they intended to attach their names. The design of petitioning the King was abandoned; but a copy of the paper remained in the possession of Lord Balmerino, and having been communicated by him to a confidential agent, passed into the hands of the Archbishop of St Andrews. This crafty prelate im-

mediately went to Court, and falsely represented to the King that the petition was industriously circulated for the purpose of confirming the ministers in their opposition to the introduction of the surplice, and that Balmerino had thus been guilty of a capital crime in alienating the affections and encouraging the disobedience of his Majesty's subjects. For this pretended crime Balmerino was tried, and found guilty by a narrow majority of a packed jury. After a wearisome imprisonment, aggravated by ill usage, the prisoner was set at liberty; but as the whole nation was convinced of the injustice of the sentence, the King got no credit for remitting it. The consequences of the trial were ruinous to his Majesty's interest. The nobility, as well as the people of inferior station, were now universally sensible that, if they incurred the displeasure either of the sovereign or of the bishops, their destruction might easily be accomplished under the colour of law, and that the simple expression of their opinions on the measures of administration might be construed into treason.

About the time of the King's departure from Scotland, an episcopal see was erected at Edinburgh, composed of that part of the bishopric of St Andrews which extended from the southern shore of the Forth to Berwick-upon-Tweed. The first bishop was William Forbes, a man of monastic habits, who survived his appointment little more than two months, and who died suspected of Popery. This bishop, notwithstanding his retired disposition and his taciturnity in company, was the most verbose of all preachers. "He had a strange faculty," says Burnet, "of preaching five or six hours at a time." It is a little curious that when a clergyman who owed

LECT.
XXII.

1633.

Archbishop
Laud.Burnet's
History
of his Own
Time, 131.

LECT.
XXII.

1633.

his preferment in Scotland to Laud, was distinguished so much by the length of his discourses, a minister in the county of Middlesex was suspended by him for preaching a sermon above an hour long on Sunday afternoon. A much surer way of gaining his favour was to recommend the revelry, the dances, and other amusements which the King's declaration authorised, or rather required to be substituted for the devout exercises in which the people of England had been taught since the Reformation to employ themselves on the evening of the Lord's day. Dr Heylin (Archbishop Laud's chaplain), and several other English divines of no inconsiderable name (as Dr Pocklington,^a author of a work entitled *Sunday no Sabbath*, and Dr White, bishop of Ely) wrote large books to prove that there is no moral obligation to keep any part of the Lord's day;^β that its observance

^a [There may be also mentioned the names of Dr John Prideaux, professor of divinity at Oxford, author of a *Defence of the Orthodoxical Doctrine of the Church of England against Sabbatarian Novelty*; and Gilbert Ironside, B.D., author of *Seven Questions of the Sabbath, Disputed after the Manner of the Schools*. Some excellent treatises were written on the other side, which, however, could not be suffered to be printed in this country—particularly one in Latin by Thomas Young, and another by the Rev. George Walker, B.D., entitled *The Doctrine of the Sabbath, delivered in divers Sermons* (printed at Amsterdam in 1638). For this work the writer was prosecuted in the Star-Chamber. He was fined £1000; his living was sequestered; and he was committed to prison, whence, after more than two years' confinement, he was liberated by order of the House of Commons in 1641, and

restored to the possession of his benefice. He became a member of the Assembly of Divines; and though he had suffered most severely under the authority of Charles I., he was one of those London divines who protested solemnly against the execution of that unhappy monarch. Another treatise, on the same side, replete with learning and good sense, is entitled *A Brief Censure to a late Treatise of the Sabbath-day, digested Dialogue-wise between two Divines.*]

^β [In the time of Charles I. the Court divines in general maintained that the whole regulation of the times and places, as well as the substance of public devotion, depended on ecclesiastical authority; but in the practice of the Church of England this might be considered as the same thing with the exercise of royal power. The monarch might command the omission of many of the usages which were most hallowed in the estimation of

depends on the authority of the Church; that it is enough to observe the few hours of public service; and that, in the interval, masks, balls, interludes, plays, as well as rural pastimes, are lawful and expedient. It is believed that the chief reason why Laud pressed the publication of the King's declaration on this subject was, that he might distress the Puritans and root them out of the Church. For seven years all ministers who would not read the *Book of Sports* to their congregations on Sunday were persecuted with great severity. Many hundreds of conscientious and pious men were suspended, excommunicated, deprived of their livings, and compelled to leave the kingdom, for no other reason but because they declined reading the royal declaration on this subject,—though the declaration itself did not require the minister to read it, and gave no authority to the bishops to punish those who refused.

While Archbishop Laud was thus presuming to dispense with the divine ordinance enjoining the religious observation of one day in seven, he was zealously introducing alterations into the forms of

the people, and might introduce others which had hitherto been regarded as profane. *The Book of Sports*, authorised by royal proclamation, not certainly without the approbation of the bishops, abridged the time devoted to the public service of God. This book, which was enjoined by the bishops to be read in churches by the clergy, under the penalty of deprivation for disobedience, prohibited the exercise of preaching oftener than once in the day, and declared it to be lawful and salutary to engage in almost all varieties of amusements and revelry. In the King's palaces, and in the mansions of the nobility, not only was dancing gen-

erally introduced, but masks, operas, and other theatrical performances, were ostentatiously carried on in the most extravagant form, so as to obliterate all serious impressions, and to familiarise the mind to the indulgence of worldly and voluptuous passions which war against the purity and peace of the soul. Scarcely anything can be more disgusting to a well-ordered mind than the unembellished narrative of the evening exercise at Whitehall, on the Sunday after Twelfth Night, 1637-(8), when, at the command of Charles I., a mask was performed entitled "Britannia Triumphans," under the management of Inigo Jones.]

LECT.
XXII.

1633.

worship, altogether unauthorised in the Scriptures, but approaching to the superstitious practices of the Church of Rome. Besides various changes in the Book of Common Prayer, he enforced bowing at the name of Jesus ; he turned the communion-tables into altars ; he required the clergy and people to bow towards the altars ; he furnished the cathedral of Canterbury, and consecrated the furniture, according to the Catholic model.

Laud's influence over the Scottish bishops.

The bishops of Scotland, or at least all the younger ones, were devoted to Laud. If they did not imbibe all his principles, they at least supported them. They spoke favourably of Popery, and inveighed against the Reformers ; they were active and diligent in propagating the doctrines of Arminius ; they recommended sports on the Sunday, and highly applauded the English Liturgy, though they knew that the people considered it to be little better than the mass. As a reward for this obsequiousness to the King and to the primate, they were almost all made privy counsellors : the Archbishop of St Andrews was made Lord Chancellor ; Maxwell, bishop of Ross, had the promise of being Lord High Treasurer ; and several others were enriched with great preferments, which obliged and disgusted many of the most ancient and noble families in the kingdom. The prelates, knowing that they were hated by the nobility as well as by the commons, advised the King to introduce the contemplated innovations rather by his royal authority than by acts of Parliament or of the General Assembly.

These innovations were now at length to be carried into effect. As it was conceived by the King and the Archbishop of Canterbury to be a great defect in the Church of Scotland that it had no liturgy or book of

canons, the new bishops were required to prepare draughts of both, that they might be submitted to the revision of the English prelates. It would have gratified both Charles and Laud if they would have adopted the English Liturgy without any alteration ; but they represented that, as the Scots were jealous of their independence, it would be much easier to reconcile them to a set of forms composed by their own bishops than to the imposition of foreign ceremonies.

The Book of Canons was first completed, and was ratified by his Majesty's letters under the Great Seal,—all the clergy being required to subscribe it. It excommunicated all who denied the prerogative of the King to be as absolute and unlimited as that of the Jewish kings, and all who affirmed the government of the Church by bishops, or the worship contained in the Book of Common Prayer (then in preparation), to be corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful. It thus unreasonably sanctioned the liturgy before that form was published, or even composed. It obliged all the clergy to read divine service according to the form of this liturgy, in all its offices, parts, and rubrics. It suppressed presbyteries and kirk-sessions under the name of irregular conventicles, and it prohibited all assemblies of the clergy which were not called by the King. It enjoined many superstitious observances ; being, indeed, considered by the Presbyterians as a nearer approximation to the popish forms than even the worship of the Church of England. One of the regulations contained in it, prohibiting presbyters to reveal anything which they learned from the confessions of penitents, was regarded as a preliminary to the practice of auricular confession ; and the collation of orders at particular seasons of the year seemed to

LECT.
XXII.

1633.

Introduction of the
Book of
Canons.

LECT.
XXII.

be an acknowledgment that ordination was a sacrament.

1637.
The Scottish
Liturgy.

The Scottish Liturgy, or Service-Book, was not printed till nearly a year after the Book of Canons. It was in a great measure transcribed from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, and is generally represented to have been the work of Archbishop Laud. But though it was framed under his direction, its execution was chiefly intrusted to Maxwell, bishop of Ross; Wedderburn, bishop of Dunblane (formerly a professor of divinity in St Andrews); Sydsers, bishop of Galloway; and Bellenden, bishop of Aberdeen. Wherever it varied from the English service, it was thought to approach to the missal of the Romish Church. Some passages in the communion service, particularly the consecration prayer, were altered so as to favour the real presence of Christ in the elements. When the book was sent down from England with the alterations, the bishops were ordered to retain in the calendar all the Catholic saints which are in the English, and to have particular regard to saints of the blood-royal and renowned bishops, on no account omitting St George and St Patrick; they were required to insert several lessons out of the Apocrypha; the water in the baptismal font was to be consecrated; the sign of the cross was prescribed in the administration of baptism; and in the prayer for the Catholic Church there was a thanksgiving or benediction for departed saints. All its deviations from the English forms, instead of diminishing, were of a nature to increase the dislike of the nation for the new ritual, which was reported to be nothing but a translation of the mass.

The book was introduced into Scotland by a royal

proclamation, requiring all his Majesty's loving subjects to receive it reverently, as the only form which the sovereign thought fit to be used in God's public worship in that kingdom, commanding all churchmen to take care that it be duly observed, and the contraveners condignly censured and punished.^a Every parish was required to procure at least two copies before Easter; but it is said by Principal Baillie that the book was not by that time quite ready for publication. Some of the younger and more violent bishops, however, made use of it at Easter; and being anxious for its immediate adoption, gave a commission to the Earl of Traquair to represent to the Archbishop of Canterbury that no danger was to be apprehended

LECT.
XXII.

1637.

[Baillie's
Letters (Mr
Laing's edi-
tion), i. 4.]

^a [It would have required much more clear and express authority than any that has ever been produced to justify the extreme rigour with which liturgies have often been imposed, not only by a church claiming the character of infallibility, but by churches professing to be reformed from the errors and superstitions of Popery. It is very well known that the first Liturgy of Edward VI., constructed, or at least promulgated, in the year 1548, was formed by comparing the old Romish missals, according to the use of Sarum (or Salisbury), of York, of Bangor, Lincoln, and Hereford. This work coincided with these old superstitious formularies in many objectionable particulars, and it demanded a more rigid uniformity than any of them had found it practicable to attain; for different countries, and different provinces of the same country, had admitted considerable varieties. The cross was used in almost every solemnity. The communion was ordered to be celebrated in both kinds, but in other respects was not altered. Exorcism was practised in

the sacrament of baptism. The sick were anointed with oil, accompanied by the sign of the cross; and in the burial service the soul of the deceased was recommended to the mercy of God, and petitions were offered for the forgiveness of sins committed during life. Uniformity of vestments and ceremonies was required as strictly as exact uniformity of phraseology. Ministers of the gospel, who were not at once sufficiently flexible to yield to the new enactments, were to be punished with the utmost severity. The first failure to observe the new rules in every particular was visited with imprisonment for six months, and the forfeiture of the emoluments of the benefice for a year. The second conviction was punished by forfeiture of all church preferments, and imprisonment for a year; and the penalty imposed for the third offence was imprisonment for life. The severity of these punishments must appear the more intolerable, when it is remembered that those who made the law were far from being unanimous in the changes which were

LECT.
XXII.

1637.

[Guthrie's
Memoirs,
p. 17.]

from the attempt to enforce it. At the suggestion of Traquair (who is said by Bishop Guthrie to have only desired the ruin of the bishops), a warrant was signed by the King, commanding the bishops to proceed, without farther delay, to order the service-book to be used in their dioceses, under the pain of being deprived in case of disobedience.

Opposition was to be expected from the ministers. Even before they knew the contents of the book, they argued against the mode of imposing it. They represented it as a great hardship to have a matter of this importance obtruded without being previously considered and approved by a General Assembly. The bishops, perceiving that many of the clergy were hostile to the measure, obtained an act of the Privy

so hastily made, and none of them could prove that any liturgies had existed in the Church till about the close of the fourth century.

About four years afterwards (in 1552), a new and revised service-book was framed. In a number of parts it was altered, and the moment the changes were agreed upon, it was ordained that it should be observed under the same heavy penalties by which the former liturgy was enforced. In the year 1559, a new revision was ordered by Queen Elizabeth, and though some particulars were amended, the general character of the book continued the same; and so well was the Pope satisfied with it, that he offered to confirm it, if the Queen and her people would return to their allegiance to the papal authority; but Elizabeth was determined to retain her own supremacy. The effect of the strictness with which the liturgy was imposed, was entirely to detach from the Church of England the most pious and zealous of the population.

After various suspensions, depriva-

tions, sequestrations, imprisonments, and other severities, the separation of the Nonconformists, or Puritans, as they were generally called, took place in the year 1566. They did not dispute the lawfulness of set forms of prayer, if the ministers had liberty to use prayers of their own composition before and after sermon; but they disapproved the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer, the frequency of the responses, the reading of the Apocryphal books, the cathedral service, including singing of prayers, the sign of the cross in baptism, the use of godfathers and godmothers, to the exclusion of parents, as sponsors or sureties, kneeling at the communion, bowing at the name of Jesus, several particulars in the office of marriage and of burial, and especially the wearing of the surplice and other vestments in divine service—(this, indeed, was one of the most formidable of the stumbling-blocks, but it was in connection with the use of the liturgy that it was so peculiarly offensive.)]

Council, on the 13th June 1637, authorising them to raise letters of horning against the ministers to provide themselves with copies within a fortnight ; with certification, that all who were disobedient to this order would be proceeded against as rebels.

In the mean time, the nobility and gentry, as well as the ministers and most of the common people, were becoming daily more and more displeased with the substance of the liturgy.^a Even the archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow were supposed to disapprove it ; but though they had long been fearful of the consequences, they were now stimulated by motives of private interest to ingratiate themselves with the King by attempting to compel the Church to receive the liturgy.

The ministers of Edinburgh were ordered to intimate from their pulpits on the 16th of July, that the Book of Common Prayer was to be read next Lord's day. Through the whole intervening week, the town was

LECT.
XXII.

1637.

Tumult in
Edinburgh.

^a [The most able and ample exposition of the principles of the Presbyterians in regard to this matter is to be found in the work of Mr George Gillespie, entitled *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies attempted to be obtruded upon the Church of Scotland*, a small quarto volume, extending to about 360 pages, which produced a most marvellous impression. This tract by Mr Gillespie does not enter so much into the consideration of the liturgy itself, as the general lawfulness of the ceremonies. Another work followed soon afterwards, entitled *A Parallel of the Liturgy with the Mass Book*, by Mr Robert Baillie. In the year 1637 there had also been published a tract, entitled *The Trial of the English Liturgie, or a Copy of a Letter written*

by a Reverend Divine to his Christian Friend, discussing the exceptions and arguments against the imposition and use of the Service-Book in the English churches ; and another pamphlet, consisting only of two leaves, ascribed also to Mr George Gillespie, entitled *Reasons for which the Service Booke, urged upon Scotland, ought to be refused*. This little treatise enters briefly and very decidedly into the consideration of the principle of prescribed forms of prayer, and on this account is deserving of attention, as exhibiting the views which were entertained and avowed at this period by a man who, for more than ten years afterwards, possessed almost the highest influence in his native Church, and for several years also in the Assembly of Divines.]

LECT.
XXII.

1637.

inundated with pamphlets and declamations, all disapproving of conformity, and not a word was heard in its favour. The Bishop of Edinburgh, however, and Hanna the Dean, in the presence and with the countenance of the Archbishop of St Andrews and two other bishops, resolved to read the prayers in the High Church, and the Bishop of Argyle undertook the same service in the Greyfriars. The moment the prayers began in St Giles, a loud clamour arose among the women, chiefly servant-maids, who threw sticks and stones, and other formidable missiles, at the pulpit and the reading-desk, so that it was not without difficulty that the bishop and the dean escaped from their vengeance. Outrages of the same kind took place in other churches. The city was in consequence exposed to an episcopal interdict, at the same time that all the ministers who had not read the service were displaced. The bishops, however, were not less unsuccessful in their attempts to urge the service all over Scotland, except at St Andrews, and in the cathedrals of Ross, Brechin, and Dunblane.

[Guthrie's
Memoirs,
p. 23.]

It is said by Bishop Guthrie that the tumult was instigated by Alexander Henderson, minister of Leuchars, and David Dickson, minister of Irvine ; but the Privy Council acknowledged that, after all inquiry had been made, it could not be discovered that any but the meanest of the rabble had been accessory to it. An express was sent from Edinburgh to London, giving an account of the violence with which the Service-Book had been opposed. Hundreds of petitions meanwhile were sent to the Privy Council against the book. The Council was so far favourable to these representations as to declare that nothing more had been required by the charge to the ministers than that every one of them

should purchase two copies; and they also informed his Majesty that a general and increasing aversion to the liturgy, even among those who had been hitherto reputed the least disaffected, could no longer be concealed.

LECT.
XXII.

1637.

The representations of the Council were treated with contempt, and their lenity to the authors of the commotions was blamed by the King. No answer to any of the petitions came from the Court; and proclamations were issued for the purpose of preventing any further consultation among representatives of different parishes, who had flocked to Edinburgh for the purpose of uniting in these petitions, but who did not separate till they had prepared an accusation against the prelates as being the authors of a liturgy in which the seeds of idolatry and superstition were sown, and as having been the chief causes of the discord between the King and the people. This accusation was subscribed by the nobility and gentry, and by almost every corporation in the kingdom.

There being no redress, the tumults in Edinburgh The Tables. still continued; and now instead of the lowest of the people, the principal inhabitants were the most forward in threatening both the magistrates and the Privy Council. In the month of November, the petitioners from all parts of the country reassembled in Edinburgh, greatly increased in numbers; and as they were told by the Privy Council that it was disorderly and illegal to convene so frequently and in such force, they took occasion to make choice of a few as commissioners for the rest, and the Council approved of the resolution. In pursuance of this arrangement, the Reformers were distributed into four classes, called the Tables, the first including all the nobility who chose

LECT.
XXII.

1637.

to attend; the second, two gentlemen from every county; the third, one minister from every presbytery; and the fourth, one or two representatives from every burgh. The commissioners of each rank sat by themselves and consulted separately; but as it was thought expedient that the whole number should only assemble on extraordinary occasions, they chose four deputies out of every class, to form what was called a General Table, to reside in Edinburgh, and to act in the name of the whole body.

At last an answer from the Court arrived. The King declared that, though he had not yet thought fit to satisfy their demands, his abhorrence of popish superstition was such as to secure him against tolerating or requiring anything, unless conducive to the advancement of the true religion as professed at present. The petitioners, however, would not listen to the representation of Lord Traquair, that as the service was in fact superseded by this declaration, the whole object of their petition was accomplished. They would not desist from their exertions upon this vague assurance. They insisted that the canons should be recalled, that the High Commission Court should be abolished, and that the liturgy should be revoked with the same formalities which had accompanied its introduction. As these requests were not listened to, they increased in their demands, and required that the power of the prelates should be restrained, and that the injuries which they had done should be remedied. The Earl of Traquair, the treasurer, advised his Majesty to recall the liturgy; but his advice was counteracted by the representations of Spotswood and the bigotry of Laud.

The King now published a proclamation approving the prayer-book, reprobating the petitions as deroga-

tory to his authority, and finally prohibiting the petitioners to assemble again under pain of high treason. This document was intended to be kept secret till it was regularly published, but a copy of it was communicated to the Tables through some private channel connected with the Court. When the proclamation was read at the market-cross of Stirling, Lords Home and Lindsay took a protest against it, and affixed a copy of their protest upon the cross by the side of the royal proclamation; and the same formality was repeated in all the towns where the proclamation was made. The protest was to the following purpose:—

1. That the seeds of superstition and idolatry are contained in the Book of Canons, and the liturgy.
2. That they are full of novelties, which could not be admitted without violation of their liberty, laws, and received religion, especially when they are obtruded without any previous judgment of the supreme ecclesiastical assembly.
3. That it is unjust to refuse liberty to accuse the bishops, whom they could prove guilty of many crimes.
4. That the High Commission is a court supported by no foundation in justice, and constituted by no municipal law, serving no purpose but to establish the tyranny of bishops, and being nothing else than a branch of the Spanish Inquisition.
5. That the Tables reject the bishops as unjust judges.
6. That as all their meetings had been intended to defend the purity of worship and the liberty of the Church against the obtrusion of innovations, they could not desist from such meetings, unless they would be esteemed betrayers of the glory of God, the honour of the King, and the liberty both of Church and State.

The principal nobility of Scotland, to the number of thirty, took part in this combination in the defence

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

Renewal of
the National
Covenant.

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

of religious and civil liberty ; and the monarch was ill prepared for contending with a confederacy so powerful. Various stratagems were tried by the courtiers and the prelates to divide the members of the Tables, and to delude them with the fallacious expectation of obtaining all their requests if they would only quietly disperse. To confirm one another in resisting these attempts to dissolve their union, they proposed to renew the National Covenant to which their ancestors had repeatedly sworn. The Tables at Edinburgh summoned the supplicants from all parts of the country to come to a solemn meeting. A fast was kept, and the preachers exhorted the people to concur in the renovation of the Covenant.

Alexander Henderson, now the chief leader of the clergy, and Archibald Johnstone, advocate, afterwards Lord Warriston, were the authors of the composition which bears the name of the Covenant, and which, after copying the Negative Confession, enumerates many statutes adverse to the Romish Church, and subjoins a bond of union, renouncing the liturgy and canons, and resolving to resist all innovations in religion ; to defend each other, and to assist the King in the preservation of religion, liberty, and law.

That you may know exactly what was the object of the Covenant, I shall read a short extract from the conclusion of this celebrated paper.

It concludes in these words :—

“ We, Noblemen, Barons, Gentlemen, Burgesses, Ministers, and Commons underscribing, considering divers times before, and especially at this time, the danger of the true reformed religion, of the King’s honour, and of the publick peace of the kingdom, by the manifold innovations and evils generally contained

and particularly mentioned in our late supplications, complaints, and protestations, do hereby profess, and before God, his angels, and the world, solemnly declare, That with our whole heart we agree and resolve, all the days of our life, constantly to adhere unto and to defend the foresaid true religion, and (forbearing the practice of all novations already introduced in the matters of the worship of God, or approbation of the corruptions of the publick government of the Kirk, or civil places and power of kirkmen, till they be tried and allowed in free Assemblies and in Parliament) to labour, by all means lawful, to recover the purity and liberty of the gospel, as it was established and professed before the aforesaid novations. . . .

And in like manner, with the same heart, we declare before God and men, That we have no intention nor desire to attempt anything that may turn to the dishonour of God, or to the diminution of the King's greatness and authority; but, on the contrary, we promise and swear, That we shall, to the uttermost of our power, with our means and lives, stand to the defence of our dread Sovereign the King's Majesty, his person and authority, in the defence and preservation of the foresaid true religion, liberties, and laws of the kingdom; as also to the mutual defence and assistance every one of us of another, in the same cause of maintaining the true religion, and his Majesty's authority, with our best counsel, our bodies, means, and whole power, against all sorts of persons whatsoever. . . . Neither do we fear the foul aspersions of rebellion, combination, or what else our adversaries, from their craft and malice, would put upon us; seeing what we do is so well warranted, and ariseth from an unfeigned desire to maintain the

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

true worship of God, the majesty of our King, and the peace of the kingdom, for the common happiness of ourselves and our posterity. . . . And because we cannot look for a blessing from God upon our proceedings, except with our profession and subscription we join such a life and conversation as becometh Christians who have renewed their covenant with God ; we therefore faithfully promise ourselves, our followers, and all others under us, both in publick and in our particular families and personal carriage, to endeavour to keep ourselves within the bounds of Christian liberty, and to be good examples to others of all godliness, soberness, and righteousness, and of every duty we owe to God and man : And that this our union and conjunction may be observed without violation, we call the living God, the Searcher of our Hearts, to witness, who knoweth this to be our sincere desire and unfeigned resolution, as we shall answer to Jesus Christ in the great day, and under the pain of God's everlasting wrath, and of infamy and loss of all honour and respect in this world ; most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by His Holy Spirit for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with a happy success, that religion and righteousness may flourish in the land, to the glory of God and the honour of our King, and peace and comfort of us all."]

This Covenant was sworn with uplifted hands^a in Greyfriars' Church, by the noblemen, gentlemen, minis-

^a [Many scruples have existed in this country with regard to the mode of administering oaths. In Scotland, the lifting up of the hand has been regarded as the most Scriptural way of taking an oath ; and it has been con-

sidered a grievance that, in some courts, laying the hand on the Gospels has been required. In the year 1783, a bill was brought into Parliament for the purpose of having it declared that Protestants of the com-

ters, burgesses, and thousands of individuals of every rank. Copies were dispersed all over the country, and in two months it was subscribed almost universally. The only place of any consequence where it was refused was Aberdeen. From this period the kingdom was divided into two parties, the Covenanters, and the Non-covenanters; which latter denomination included only the Papists, the courtiers, the Episcopalians, and a few who questioned the legality of this bond. Many of the most orthodox ministers at first had some scruples on the subject; and none of them would have ventured to enter into such an engagement, if it had not been from the conviction that the King had violated, and, as far as in him lay, subverted their legal church establishment, by assuming the supremacy, by erecting the High Commission, and by imposing on them a Book of Canons and liturgy without consent of Parliament or General Assembly.

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

When Spotswood, archbishop of St Andrews, on his arrival in Edinburgh, heard that the Covenant had been taken, he exclaimed, "Now is all our labour during the last thirty years destroyed at once,"—and he and all the other bishops, except four, fled to England for safety.

The Privy Council informed the King of all that had happened; but for some time nothing was done to

Mission of
the Mar-
quess of
Hamilton.

munion of the Church of Scotland might be sworn in all courts in England according to the usage of their own law, but the Parliament was dissolved after it had passed through both Houses, and before there was time for receiving the royal assent. It was again brought in, and would have passed in all probability, if the Lord Chancellor had not declared that

it was unnecessary, as all judges were entitled and bound to administer oaths according to the form most agreeable to the conscience of the person to whom the oath was administered. This was so far satisfactory; but, in point of fact, it proved afterwards that this privilege was not invariably granted.]

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

soothe the minds of the subjects. At last he sent the Marquess of Hamilton (the son of that Hamilton who had established the Articles of Perth) as his High Commissioner in Scotland, with instructions to suspend the use of the Service-Book, but at the same time to dissolve the Tables, and to require the surrender of the Covenant within six weeks. Meanwhile an attempt was made to send supplies to the castle of Edinburgh, which was frustrated by the Covenanters; but the Marquess was not admitted into the city till the alarm arising from this circumstance had been removed.

[Baillie,
Letters and
Journals,
i. 83.]

Hamilton was received at Leith by the Covenanters in a manner which they are supposed to have contrived as a display of their strength. "Huge multitudes," says Baillie, "as ever was gathered on that field, sett themselves in this way: nobles, gentry of all shyres, women a world, the town of Edinburgh, all at the Watergate; but we (the ministers) were most conspicuous in our black cloakes, above fyve hundred on a braeside in the Links." They appointed one of their number, William Livingstone, "the strongest in voice and austerest in countenance," to make him a short welcome. The Marquess said that harangues in the field were for princes, and above his station; but he would gladly hear in private whatever they had to say; and accordingly Livingstone, after advising with his brethren, went into the commissioner's chamber and delivered word for word the speech which had been previously prepared for him.

It was conceived in the following terms:—"We, the servants of the Son of God, and preachers of the peace which passeth all understanding, being sensible of the fearful wrath of God, which justly pursues the land for our sins, and the sins of the people, where-

through our Kirk is rent by schism and division, which is like to consume all if it be not suddenly quenched, having for remedy of these evils humbled ourselves before God, renewed our covenant with Him, and made our supplications to the King's Majesty, do give your grace a hearty welcome as his Majesty's Commissioner, and the messenger of the God of heaven, by whose blessing your grace may be an happy instrument for doing one of the best works which can be done in the earth for the honour of God, contentment of the King, good of our Kirk, peace of our kingdom, and joy of all the reformed churches, as having power in your hands from his Majesty to quench this fire, cut away the occasions of division, purge the house of God, minister justice, and give satisfaction to grieved souls, according to their supplication, whereby your grace would show a worthy proof of a worthy patriot, a faithful counsellor, a good Christian, and a compassionate member of our mother Church, mourning after manifold miseries, and would reap the fruit of a sweet remembrance in after ages, and of a marvellous peace and strong consolation when it comes to the breaking of the eye-strings, and giving the last gasp (for who lives, and shall not see death?), when all the pleasures and honours of the world will stand in no stead. And this we and our people expect at your grace's hand, and humbly and heartily crave in his name who will judge the quick and the dead."

Hamilton's manner was exceedingly prepossessing, and for some days the ministers expected that he would give them satisfaction; but they soon found that he had no power but to publish a proclamation which demanded concessions from them, instead of

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

promising to remedy their grievances. Indeed, all the aim of Charles, in the mission of Hamilton, was to dissolve the Covenant, and to delude its supporters by plausible pretences till he had collected a force sufficient for their destruction. His temporising policy only bound the Covenanters more strongly together. They called out for a free Parliament and an independent Assembly; and they signified that if the King did not consent to an Assembly, they would hold it by the power inherent in the Church itself. The commissioner was willing to summon an Assembly on certain conditions, which would have destroyed its freedom: as, that the permanent moderators of presbyteries, who were removed by the Tables, should be reinstated, and declared to be constituent members of the Assembly, or at least that the members should be chosen only by the clergy. These conditions were rejected by the Tables.

Their measures were now in some degree disconcerted by the unexpected grant of all their original demands: the Canons, the Liturgy, and the High Commission were recalled; an Assembly and a Parliament were appointed, in which the usurpations of the prelates might be checked. It was, however, too late to satisfy the Covenanters by such concessions. They were determined to restore the Presbyterian government, as the only security for the enjoyment of their religious privileges. They had no confidence in the King's promises; and they knew that if the hierarchy were continued, however much it might be at first restrained in its powers, it had a natural tendency to make encroachments on the liberty of the Church. The King professed to sign the Covenant—that is, the Negative Confession of Faith, and the Bond subscribed

by his father in the year 1581, together with his own concessions ; but the terms of the obligation to which he affixed his name were equivocal and deceitful. He swore to maintain religion as professed at present,—by which expression he understood the Episcopalian worship, while he knew that his subjects understood by it the Presbyterian. The Covenanters were not so short-sighted as to be imposed upon by this snare, and therefore they protested against the King's covenant.

When Charles resolved to call a General Assembly, he was advised by some of his counsellors to hold it at Aberdeen, where the covenanting party was not nearly so strong as the adherents of Episcopacy. But it was ultimately resolved to prefer Glasgow, where the influence of the Marquess of Hamilton was powerful. The Tables were afraid that, if the election of members was left to the ministers, as was proposed by the King, the Assembly might be composed chiefly of men who had not thrown off the yoke of the bishops,—and they therefore directed that an elder from every parish should attend the presbyteries, and have a voice in the election of commissioners. As those who were put in nomination were not suffered to vote, the elders thus outnumbered the ministers, and accordingly, as was expected, the most orthodox and rigid Presbyterian ministers were chosen to represent the presbyteries, in conjunction with Covenanters of approved zeal as elders. The introduction of elders gave the bishops a pretext for declining the jurisdiction of an Assembly in which it was intended to examine the accusations preferred against them for many private and public enormities. Most of them were charged with heresy, profanation of the Sabbath, falsehood, gaming, habitual swearing, drunkenness,

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

General
Assembly
of 1638.

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

adultery, and other infamous offences. Though the trial of the bishops was admitted in the royal declaration to be one of the grounds for calling the Assembly, their declinature, or protestation, was approved by the King and his commissioner as one of the grounds for dissolving it.

Charles directed his commissioner to foment divisions between the clergy and laity concerning the legality of their elections, and by all possible means to discover nullities in their proceedings. When the Assembly was considering the right of sitting in judgment on the prelates, Hamilton hastily dissolved it as a convention irregularly chosen by laymen, and prohibited the members to continue their sessions upon pain of high treason.

The Assembly, however, refused to separate, and next day published a protestation in justification of their conduct. They declared that ruling elders had always sat in their Assemblies before the times of corruption; that his Majesty's presence was not for voting, but merely for countenancing their meetings and preserving external order; that it was unlawful for the King to break up an Assembly of the Church, for if this were admitted, religion and church government would depend on the pleasure of the prince; that there was no precedent or authority in any Act of Parliament for the dissolution of the Assembly without their consent; and that to dissolve the General Assembly before their grievances were redressed, would throw back the whole nation into confusion. They therefore declared that this shall be obeyed by all the subjects as a most lawful and free General Assembly of the kingdom. Their resolution to continue sitting was approved by a great proportion of the Privy Council, and their pro-

ceedings were countenanced by the support of the Earl of Argyle, the most powerful of the Scottish noblemen, whose zeal in the cause is supposed to have been quickened by his discovery of a scheme formed by the Court to partition his great estates as a reward to the Earl of Antrim, who had undertaken to invade the west of Scotland.

The General Assembly continued to sit several weeks, and passed a large number of acts of great importance. They annulled the six preceding Assemblies as corrupt—namely, those which had met in the years 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618. They abolished Episcopacy; they condemned the Articles of Perth, the Service-Book,^a the Book of Canons and Ordination, and the High Commission. They restored presbyteries, provincial synods, and national Assemblies to their constitution, power, and jurisdiction, as contained in the Book of Policy. Of the fourteen Scottish

^a [The Assembly (6th December) unanimously rejected and condemned both the *Book of Canons* and the *Book of Common Prayer*, “not only as illegally introduced, without direction from the Kirk, but also as repugnant to the doctrine, discipline, and order of this reformed Kirk, to the Confession of Faith, constitution of General Assemblies, and Acts of Parliament establishing the true religion,” the book itself containing, “besides the popish frame and form, many popish errors, and the seeds of manifold and gross superstition and idolatry.” For five years after this period, the old liturgy (now generally bearing the name of Knox, but taken chiefly from the form used in the English Church of Geneva) continued to be printed at Edinburgh, though not at full length. Soon after this time, all such works were superseded in Scotland by the proceedings

of the Westminster Assembly, as far as they were approved by the national Church. The Directory for the Public Worship of God was unanimously agreed to by the General Assembly in all its heads, together with the preface set before it; and according to its plain meaning, and the intent of the preface, it was required to be carefully and uniformly observed and practised. In Scotland, in 1661, after Charles II. was seated on the British throne, the government, arbitrary and overbearing as it was in almost every particular, did not venture either to restore the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, or to substitute any other. And half a century afterwards, when an Act of the Parliament of Great Britain was passed, allowing Episcopalians in Scotland to assemble for public worship, the Act authorises only the Liturgy of the Church of England.]

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

bishops, eight were excommunicated, four were deposed, and the other two, though suspended from their functions, were declared to be capable of officiating as ministers, because they submitted to the jurisdiction of the General Assembly, and renounced their Episcopalian orders.

The King
has recourse
to arms.

Charles was rather gratified than disappointed by the conduct of this Assembly. He longed for a pretext to reduce the Scots to submission by force of arms, and the favourable opportunity seemed now to have opened. On the 26th of January he published his resolution to march against them in person at the head of his army. The Archbishop of Canterbury obtained from his clergy a contribution to assist in defraying the expense of the war for supporting Episcopacy. The Queen and her friends undertook to obtain assistance from the Papists for the same purpose. The King, trusting to the exertions of his English subjects, prepared a fleet of sixteen men-of-war, and raised an army of 23,000 cavalry and infantry.

The Scots were not dismayed when they heard of these preparations. From the moment when the report first reached them, their merchants had been employed in purchasing and importing arms from the Continent. General Alexander Lesley and many other officers in the Swedish service were invited to come home. A committee for military affairs was established at Edinburgh. Officers who had served in foreign armies were dispersed in every county to train the people to the use of arms. The castle of Edinburgh was taken by assault, that of Dumbarton was surprised. Leith was fortified so as to protect the metropolis against an attack from the fleet which arrived with the Marquess of Hamilton.

As the King advanced to Berwick, he was met by an army of Scots superior in numbers and discipline, and having the advantage of being led by experienced officers. Charles, afraid of the consequences of a defeat, was glad to enter into terms of pacification, which on his part was insincere, but which was, no doubt, of the greatest service to his adversaries, as they could not long have maintained a defensive position, and as they were not yet prepared for the desperate hazard of offensive war.

I have no intention of entering into the details of their military operations. Enough of these will be found in Burnet's *Memorials of the Hamilton's*, and in his *History of his Own Times*; in Baillie's *Letters*; in Stevenson's *History of the Church*; and in Laing's *History of Scotland*. I may also mention Bishop Guthrie's *Memoirs*, and Spalding's *History of the Troubles in Scotland from 1624 to 1645*, though very inferior books to the others. I consider Baillie's *Letters* and Stevenson's *History* as the most useful works in throwing light upon this period.

LECT.
XXII.

1638.

LECTURE XXIII.

FIRST CAMPAIGN OF THE COVENANTERS—PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1639—PROPOSAL FOR A UNIFORMITY OF WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND—WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—COMMISSIONERS FROM SCOTLAND TO THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY—SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT—SCOTTISH COVENANTERS.

LECT.
XXIII.

1639.

First cam-
paign of the
Covenan-
ters.

THE first short campaign of the Covenanters impressed the English with a high idea of their courage and discipline.

The Scottish army, amounting to at least 23,000 men, presented a spectacle such as had never before been witnessed in any of the wars between Scotland and England. They encamped on Duns Law, a hill about a mile and a half in circumference at the base, and gently sloping upward till it terminates in a flat surface a quarter of a mile in length, and nearly the same in breadth, affording space sufficient for an army 40,000 strong. Forty field-pieces were planted on the summit of this eminence. The common soldiers were almost all selected from the youngest, the most robust, resolute, and active of the peasantry, the husbandmen and shepherds of Fife, Ayrshire, Galloway, and Teviotdale. Many of them were armed with pikes, but the greater part of them with muskets and broadswords, in the use of which weapons they

soon became expert. Their dresses were as variegated as their arms and accoutrements, but they were united in affection to that cause which they accounted sacred. At the door of every captain of 200 men waved a splendid banner with the arms of Scotland emblazoned on it, and this motto inscribed in letters of gold, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant." One Presbyterian minister, at least, was attached to every regiment, armed with a sword, and with a pair of Dutch pistols at his saddle; but though harnessed like the other cavaliers, none of them considered it to be his business to use his weapons otherwise than in self-defence. Yet this part of the complement of the army was not the least useful, or the least employed. Morning and evening the pastors offered up prayers and delivered sermons in the presence of the regiments to which they were attached. To these devout exercises the soldiers were summoned by the drum, and after they retired from the exhortations in which their confidence in Providence, and their conviction of the goodness of their cause, were confirmed, the air resounded with the voice of praise and prayer rising from every tent. "For myself," says Baillie, "I never found my mind in a better temper—I was as a man who had taken leave of the world, and was resolved to die in that service." The commanding officers of the different troops were the most ancient nobility of the land, all of whom, however emulous of distinction, were kept in subjection by the skill and address of Lesley, their general, who is described by Baillie as an old, little, crooked soldier, whose wisdom and authority were such that all from the beginning to the end gave themselves over to be guided by him, as if he had been the great Solyman. Of all this host the most terrible

LECT.
XXIII.

1639.

[Baillie's
Letters, i.
214.]

LECT.
XXIII.

1639.

to the English were the men of Argyle, on whom they looked with a mixture of amazement and horror.

The King was very little disposed to face this army of highland and lowland devotees; and after proposing a negotiation, he concluded a treaty with his subjects, in which, though he would not acknowledge the late General Assembly, he agreed to refer all ecclesiastical affairs to another Assembly, and all civil matters to a Parliament. The pacification was hasty, and not likely to be permanent. The King was insincere in the promises by which he prevailed on the Scots to disperse, and to deliver up the fortifications which they occupied. He never intended to abolish the Liturgy, the Canons, and Episcopacy, or to repeal the articles which were so offensive to the Presbyterians. He determined to revive the order of bishops as soon as an opportunity offered; and he directed a protestation, to be secretly given to his commissioner in name of the bishops, against the legality of the Assembly.

Proceedings
of the Gene-
ral Assem-
bly 1639.

The General Assembly met at Edinburgh on the 12th of August, and was opened by Alexander Henderson, the moderator of the former, whom the Earl of Traquair, the King's commissioner, wished to be continued in office, without seeming to advert to the indirect sanction which this step would have given to the proceedings of that Assembly which the King was so anxious to disown. The proposal seemed to be too nearly allied to the plan of having constant moderators; and David Dickson, minister of Irvine, was elected to the chair by a great majority of voices. In this Assembly it was agreed to hold two sessions every day, as the time was limited to the interval before the sitting down of the Parliament.

The public business of this Assembly, which was

intended to confirm all that had been done by the Assembly at Glasgow, was directed to four principal objects. 1. The condemnation of the corruptions which had prevailed in the Church ; 2. The censures of ministers for errors, immoralities, or contempt of the authority of the Church ; 3. The condemnation of a book entitled *The large Declaration* ; and, 4. The renovation of the National Covenant. The commissioners obtained a private engagement from the leading members, that they should make no mention of the Assembly at Glasgow, to which his Majesty had an insuperable antipathy ; but they gave him to understand that their purpose was to substitute in place of the former acts what would be virtually the same, and they insisted that their conclusions should be ratified by the Parliament.

LECT.
XXIII.
1639.

When the Assembly enumerated the evils under which the Church had long groaned, and proceeded to propose the remedies, the commissioner perceived that Episcopacy was condemned in terms so strong as could not fail to offend the King, and he therefore required them to give the reasons why they believed that Presbytery is the constitution of this Church, and that Episcopacy is a corruption. After the acts of the Assembly relating to this subject, prior to the year 1580, had been read by the clerk, the commissioner declared that as his difficulty applied only to the period preceding that date, he was now completely satisfied. The Assembly then passed an act declaring that the most material causes of the past evils of the Church were—1. The pressing of the Church by prelates with a Service-Book, a Book of Canons, a Book of Consecration, and the High Commission, all without the consent of the Church, all

[Acts of the
General
Assembly
1639, p. 2.]

LECT.
XXIII.

1639.

tending to subvert its constitution, and to maintain error, superstition, and idolatry ; 2. The Articles of Perth contrary to the Confession of Faith ; 3. The change of the government of the Church from General Assemblies of the Church to the persons of some churchmen, usurping priority and power over their brethren, under the name of episcopal government, against the Confession of Faith ; 4. The civil places and powers of churchmen ; 5. The keeping of corrupt Assemblies, contrary to the constitution of the Church ; and, 6. The want of lawful and free Assemblies, “ rightly constitute of pastors, doctors, and elders, yearly, or oftener *pro re nata*, according to the Book of Policy and Act of Parliament 1592.” The act provided that the evils should be remedied by removing the causes.

[Acts of the
General
Assembly
1639, p. 6.]

Committees were formed to inquire into the labours of the commissions named by the last Assembly, to report upon the cases of ministers meriting deposition. The reports were unanimously approved by the Assembly, and about twenty ministers were deposed, some for errors in doctrine, some for declining the Assembly, some for insufficiency, and most of them for gross immoralities, habitual drunkenness, sacrilege, bribery, profanation of the Sabbath, and desertion of their flocks. One of them had been non-resident three years, and had neglected his charge even when he lived in the parish. Those who had merely declined the Assembly, and read the Service-Book, were recommended to the synods to be restored, if they gave evidence of repentance, and promised submission to the constitutions of the Church ; and the Assembly, in proof of its desire to act leniently to-

wards such persons, absolved seven ministers from their censures, and restored them to their functions.

The next subject of debate in the Assembly was the *Large Declaration concerning the late Tumults in Scotland*, a folio volume of 430 pages, published in name of the King, but well known to have been the production of Dr Walter Balcanquel, dean of Durham. The commissioner urged the Assembly to "give evidence," in their decision, "that they regarded his Majesty's honour as the apple of their eye;" and they accordingly resolved that they would think and speak tenderly of whatever the King himself had heard or seen, but that in so far as he was only informed, or rather misinformed, they would clear up all mistakes to the full. A committee was appointed, which, after three days, brought in a long report, condescending on eight articles in the book dishonourable to God, thirteen articles dishonourable to the Church, thirteen dishonourable to the kingdom, twenty-six asseverations which are gross falsehoods, and four instances in which the intentions, words, and actions of the Church had been wrested. The Assembly not only condemned the book, but presented a supplication to the King, praying for an exemplary punishment to be inflicted on the authors, particularly Dr Balcanquel. The commissioner undertook to present the petition; but the King continued to be as partial to the Declaration which bears his name, as before it was denounced; and it is to be regretted that that work has been, and still is, very often quoted as an authority for historical information.

The last important business before the Assembly was the renewal of the National Covenant. The commissioner agreed to this measure more cheerfully

LECT.

XXIII.

1639.

[Acts of the
General
Assembly
1639, p. 9.]

LECT.
XXIII.

1639.

than was expected ; and the Privy Council also passed an act, obliging all the subjects to subscribe the Covenant with “the Assembly’s Declaration.” The commissioner not only himself signed this confession, but promised to obtain its ratification in Parliament along with the other acts of that Assembly.

Renewal of
hostilities.

The Parliament sat down on the 31st of August ; and the members were prepared to confirm the acts of the late Assembly, as well as to repeal every statute favourable to Episcopacy ; but when the commissioner perceived that they were inclined to derogate from the royal prerogative, he protracted the sittings till the middle of November ; and at last, finding that nothing was gained by delay, he prorogued the Parliament to the 2d of June 1640, without having accomplished any of the objects for which it had been called. Commissioners were sent to London to remonstrate against the prorogation, and to vindicate the proceedings, but before their arrival it was determined by the English Council to renew the war.

To provide supplies, the King summoned a Parliament to meet at London, after an interval of twelve years. The Commons of England, however, instead of voting money for the expedition against the Scots, entered upon the consideration of grievances under which they themselves groaned. Finch, the Lord-Keeper, addressed the Parliament in a most elaborate speech, for the purpose of persuading them to cooperate in the patriotic design of furnishing the means for subjugating the Scots. But the audience whom he tried to wield to his purposes did not relish bombast, and many of them stoutly maintained that, in their apprehension, the chief purpose now to be

aimed at was the security of their liberties, and the redress of their wrongs. Charles, incensed at these unpalatable doctrines, suddenly dissolved the Parliament, and ordered several of the members to be arrested. The King also found it necessary to resort to other means of raising money. Lord Strafford, the Lieutenant-General, subscribed £20,000, the Dukes of Lennox and Richmond an equal sum, and many others of the nobility contributed liberally to defray the expense of the armament. Strafford obtained from the Irish Parliament five subsidies, amounting to £240,000, and the Catholics gave so much that the King's troops were called the popish army. The English Convocation granted a subsidy of £20,000 a-year for six years. The principal merchants were compelled to advance considerable sums, and various illegal exactions were continued under the names of ship-money and military charges, against which the whole nation felt the greatest repugnance.

When Charles had burnt the Articles of Pacification, and declared his Scottish subjects to be in a state of rebellion, the Tables betrayed no symptoms of surprise or consternation. They had taken the precaution of keeping the officers in pay, and they knew well where to find both arms and men at the shortest notice. But they resolved to make no open preparations till they obtained the sanction of their national Parliament, which they expected to meet on the day to which it had been prorogued. The members convened, and as the form of farther prorogation was not duly observed, they declared themselves a lawful parliament, and chose Lord Burley for their president, in absence of his Majesty's commissioner. They then proceeded to pass a number of important acts, which

LECT.
XXIII.

1640.

Meeting of
the Parlia-
ment of
Scotland,
11th June
1640.

LECT.
XXIII.1640.
[Act. Parl.
Scot., v.
288, &c.]

had been prepared the former year by the Lords of the Articles. One of these acts declared that all subsequent parliaments were to consist only of nobles, barons, and burgesses, and that bishops and other ecclesiastics were to be excluded. Another ratified the acts of the General Assembly of the former year, and declared that the sole power of jurisdiction in the Church stands in the general, provincial, and presbyterial assemblies and kirk-sessions. Many of the other acts related to the privileges of the Church and the support of religion. Several others were intended to be favourable to civil liberty ; and one of the most important, after stating that the kingdom is threatened by arms, both by sea and land, so that the Estates are forced to put themselves in readiness for a just defence of their religion, laws, lives, liberties, and country, appointed a number of nobles, barons, and burgesses (to the number of forty), as a committee for managing all affairs concerning the army, raising money, and preserving the public peace.

This committee, in whose hands the whole executive power was placed, gave orders to the freeholders of every county, and to the magistrates of burghs, to raise a fourth part of the able-bodied men in every parish, and to collect a tenth of the rents of estates, and a twentieth of the interest of money, as the Parliament had appointed. Meanwhile the ministers were not inactive. They collected voluntary contributions in all their parishes for what was called the good cause.^a They preached strongly in its favour, and they used all their private influence to promote its success.

On the 21st of August, the Scottish forces, to the number of 26,000 (3000 being cavalry), crossed the

river Tweed, and advanced to the banks of the Tyne. They had previously published a vindication of their purpose in a well-known tract, entitled *The Intention of the Army of Scotland, declared to their Brethren in England*. At Newburn, five miles above Newcastle, they passed the river Tyne in the face of the English batteries, and having gained the opposite bank, they attacked their enemies with such impetuosity, that, after sustaining considerable loss, the English horse fled to Durham, and the foot to Newcastle, whence they retreated next day into Yorkshire. This success occurred on the 28th of August, which, by appointment of the last General Assembly, was observed throughout Scotland as a day of solemn humiliation; and this, with several other advantages gained on the same day, were all ascribed to the merciful interposition of Heaven, aiding the cause in which they were engaged.

The Scots took possession of Durham and Newcastle, where they found large supplies of arms and provisions. Though victorious, they sent a petition to the King, praying that he would repair their wrongs, and with the advice of the English Parliament settle a firm and durable peace, that they might cheerfully render their duty to his Majesty as their native sovereign. Many of the English peers and gentlemen at the same time petitioned for a parliament; and the King, apprehending that the whole nation was in a state of discontent, thought it necessary to write a milder answer than it was natural for him to dictate. He professed to be willing to hear and redress his people's grievances, and he informed them that he had summoned a meeting of the English peers, that with their advice he might give an answer to the petition. Commissioners were appointed on both sides, who protracted the negotia-

LECT.
XXIII.

1640.

tions till the meeting of the English Parliament ; and in the mean time the Scots, refusing to disband their men, were supplied with provisions at the expense of England. An armistice was agreed upon, and the treaty which began at Ripon, was, at the request of the English commissioners, transferred to London.

The commissioners from Scotland—the Earls of Rothes, Dunfermline, and several other men of distinction, including Alexander Henderson, minister—were attended by Blair, Baillie, and George Gillespie, three of the leaders of the Presbyterians, as chaplains to the commission. Some of these men, particularly Baillie, had been recently distinguished by their conduct in the Assembly at Aberdeen, and they now became still more widely known by introducing a taste for the presbyterian worship into the metropolis of England. The Scottish commissioners demanded that the acts of their late parliament should be published in the King's name ; that the national fortresses should be kept by natives, with the consent of the Estates ; that their countrymen in England and Ireland should be released from oaths inconsistent with the Covenant ; that the authors of hostilities between the kingdoms should be tried and punished by their respective Parliaments ; that the nation should be indemnified for the loss sustained by the war ; that all opprobrious proclamations should be recalled ; and that the religion and liberty of the nation should be secured by a permanent peace. The articles to which Charles assented with the greatest reluctance were the ratification of the late acts, and the punishment of the authors of hostility between the kingdoms, or, as they were called, the public incendiaries. The commissioners, however,

were inflexible, and would not recede from these demands.

LECT.
XXIII.

In consequence of the King's concession, accusations against the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Earl of Strafford were brought before the English Parliament. The charges against Archbishop Laud were his imposition of numerous alterations upon the Church of Scotland, without order and against law; his obtruding a book of canons and constitutions, devised for the establishment of a tyrannical power of bishops over the consciences, the liberty, and property of the people, and particularly his instrumentality in bringing in the Book of Common Prayer, containing many popish errors and superstitions. On the report of these articles, the Archbishop of Canterbury was impeached by the House of Commons; but his trial did not take place for a considerable time afterwards.

1641.
Impeachment of
Laud and
the
Earl of
Strafford.

The prosecution against the Earl of Strafford, of which a very circumstantial account is to be found in Rushworth's *Collections* and many other works, was conducted with great solemnity. The chief articles of accusation against him were that his government in Ireland had been arbitrary; that he had encouraged the Romish religion; that he had imposed an unlawful oath on the Scots in Ireland; that he had endeavoured to create feuds between England and Scotland; that he had laboured to render the Parliament odious to the King; and that he had advised the King, since the Parliament had refused him supplies, to raise them by such means as he thought fit. His attainder passed the House of Commons on the 19th of April 1641; but it was supposed that it would have been rejected by the Lords, if a plot had not been detected, which

[Rushworth's
Collections, iii.
p. 290, &c.
Baillie's
Letters,
i. 313, &c.]

LECT.
XXIII.

1641.

had been undertaken under the auspices of the King, for the purpose of bringing the army^a to London to overawe the two houses of Parliament, and to defend the royal prerogative. In consequence of this discovery, the Court lost all its character and influence, and the House of Commons was regarded as the only bulwark of the people's freedom. The attainder of Strafford passed the House of Lords, and the King, not venturing to refuse it the royal assent, surrendered his minister to the vengeance of the laws against high treason.

^a [It must be confessed that some of the very men who at this time acted as commissioners from Scotland, when afterwards members of the Assembly of Divines, do not appear to have scrupled at the adoption of [the] very [same] questionable means for obtaining a majority in that Assembly favourable to their views, [which they on this occasion reprobated so severely in the case of the King.] Who would suppose that the spiritually-minded, and truly honest and devout Robert Baillie, would have allowed himself, in his correspondence, to refer, as in many letters he does not hesitate to do, to the great weight which might be expected to be produced by the presence of an army from Scotland, in hastening the consent of the Westminster Assembly to the propositions relating to the Church which he and other Scottish commissioners wished to be adopted? Thus, in a letter written Nov. 17, 1643, to his cousin, Mr William Spang, speaking of the Assembly of Divines having permission "to fall on the question of Church government," he says: "What here they will doe, we cannot say; Mr Henderson's hopes are not great of their conformitie to us, before our armie be in England."—(Letters, ii. 104). But he speaks

much more explicitly and decidedly to the same effect in subsequent letters, e.g. writing three weeks afterwards (Dec. 7) to the same friend, he says: "If God send not in our armie quicklie, and give it not some notable success, this people are likelie to faint. . . . *Till our armie appear in England, little hope of helping their languishing and distracted proceedings: all things are expected from God and the Scotts.*"—(Ibid. ii. 113, 114). In another letter: "If God bring in the army quickly, and be pleased to be with it, all here at once will be well; if otherwise, all here will quickly ruin." Many other passages are to the same effect. In July 1644 he says: "We bless God, who is *beginning to shine on our army*, and make it a fountain of joy and hope to those that love the welfare of religion. *We hope things in the Assembly and Parliament may go more after our mind: Our armie oft signified to us, they conceived their want of success flowed most from God's anger at the Parliament and Assemblie for their neglect of the establishment of religion. We oft told them that we had no hope of any progress till God gave them victories, and then we doubted not all would run both in Parliament and Assembly.*"

The King was now convinced that the strength and spirit of the House of Commons arose chiefly from their connection with the Scots. He therefore attempted to withdraw the Scots from the cause, and he began by practising on the avarice and ambition of some of the commissioners. He gained over the Earl of Rothes to his interest; but it was vain to hope that he would gain the Scottish army otherwise than by acceding to their demands. A treaty was at length hastily concluded, with the approbation of both Houses of Parliament, and on the same day the King set out for Scotland.

LECT.
XXIII.

1641.

Treaty
signed with
the Scottish
army.

At this time the defection of the Marquess of Montrose from the cause of the Covenanters might have proved ruinous to their interests, if his correspondence with the King had not been intercepted.

Charles, on his arrival in Scotland, professed his willingness to accomplish all that he had promised,—and among other proofs of his sincerity, offered to ratify the acts of the former session of Parliament. But the Estates maintained that these acts were already valid, and they declined to accept from their sovereign that confirmation of their proceedings which would have implied that *till then* their authority was incomplete. While the King was in Scotland, he regularly attended public worship, apparently with great satisfaction, and had family worship performed by his Scots chaplains, who were convinced at the time, that if he had not been influenced by evil counsel, he would have been easily persuaded to relinquish his partiality for the English service.

The King's
visit to Scot-
land.

Before his arrival in Scotland, a General Assembly had sat down at St Andrews, and adjourned to Edinburgh. In addition to the public acts, with which all

Proposal for
a uniformity
of worship
and disci-
pline in

LECT.
XXIII.1641.
England
and Scot-
land.
[Acts of
Assembly
1641, pp.
29-33.]

of you have opportunities of becoming acquainted, there was now for the first time proposed a model of Church government which was intended to be applicable to England as well as to Scotland, that so there might be uniformity of discipline and worship all over the island. It was also moved to appoint members to prepare a confession of faith, a catechism, and a directory, for all the parts of public worship, in concurrence with the Presbyterians of England. The Assembly, which met the following year at St Andrews, had a communication from many English ministers on this subject, expressing their strong desire for presbyterian government, and a complete union with the Church of Scotland. Letters from the King and the Parliament were at the same time received, all of them favourable to reformation in the Church; and the Assembly, in their reply, pressed the matter with all that fervour and earnestness which flowed from a firm persuasion of the excellence of the principles to which they were devoted, and from an ardent desire to promote the spiritual advantage of their brethren.

Westmin-
ster Assem-
bly of Di-
vines.

About this time the Commission of the General Assembly, which before that period had never ventured on much business, began to act as a constant judicatory, and to assume very high powers. It was to this court that Lord Maitland, who had formerly been appointed to negotiate with the Parliament of England on the subject, gave in an answer, bearing that the Parliament was willing to grant all the desires of the Scots in abolishing Episcopacy, and requiring some of the ministers to assist at the Assembly, which was to meet at Westminster on the 5th of November.

Many of the ministers were sufficiently anxious to

be employed on this occasion; but the Marquess of Argyle artfully contrived to defeat their desires, by putting them on the committee of nomination. This committee named Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Samuel Rutherford, George Gillespie, and Robert Baillie, as ministers, and Lords Cassilis, Maitland, and Warriston, as elders; and this appointment was approved by the Commission, and by the following Assembly. As these ministers took an active part in the compilation of the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the Form of Presbyterian Church Government, and the Directory for Worship, it might be proper to give some account of them, if our limits would admit it. I can only, however, refer to some of them, and in very general terms.

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

Commis-
sioners from
Scotland to
the West-
minster
Assembly.

Alexander Henderson, or Henryson, was a man of uncommon powers of mind. He appears to have been a native of the parish of Creich, in Fife. He was educated in St Salvator's College about the year 1600, when the prosperity of this university was at its height. He became one of the regents of philosophy ten years afterwards, when the abettors of Presbytery were banished, and the tyranny of the bishops had begun to engross the patronage of the universities, as well as the government of the Church. After acting in the capacity of regent several years, he was, by the Archbishop of St Andrews, appointed minister of Leuchars; but the people were so adverse to his admission, that it was necessary to enter the church through a window on the day of his ordination. He became afterwards, however, a most diligent and useful pastor, and paid uncommon attention to the education of the young, in which cause he was so zealous that he founded a school in his native parish, and another in

Alexander
Henderson.

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

the parish of Leuchars, destining to the support of each a very considerable fund, as well as houses and land.^a He was one of the first who refused to use the Book of Canons, or the Service-book imposed by the King. From this period he may be considered as the leader of the Covenanters till the time of his death, in the year 1646. He was, during the last seven years of his life, one of the ministers of Edinburgh; but almost his whole time was occupied with the charge of public affairs, and with the composition of the public papers, which were during that turbulent period issued in name of the Church, as well as in giving his assistance to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. His death was justly attributed to the unremitted fatigue and anxiety which he endured in conducting the presbyterian controversy with the King; but there is certainly no reason for the episcopalian assertion, that he died of grief at being unable to answer the controversial papers which were issued in name of his Majesty.

Robert
Douglas.

Robert Douglas, another most powerful preacher, was said to be descended from the royal family. He also was a strenuous defender of the presbyterian interest; and when he was afterwards pressed to accept a bishopric, he magnanimously refused it, although the alternative was want, neglect, and persecution. He was the person who first proposed the restoration of Charles II., and through whose influence chiefly it was carried into effect. His sermon, preached at the coronation of Charles, is well known.

Samuel
Rutherford.

Samuel Rutherford is a name which has been treated with much ignorant and unmerited contempt by persons infinitely his inferiors. He was a man of honour-

^a Appendix, No. XX.

able birth and superior education, and at a very early age was elected professor of humanity in the university of Edinburgh, in the year 1623. Having resigned the office two years afterwards, he was appointed minister of Anwoth in Galloway, through the interest of Lord Kenmure, without having taken the oath of obedience to the bishops. His activity and diligence, while he held this charge, was almost unparalleled : from three in the morning till a late hour at night he habitually spent his time in reading, writing, visiting, and examining his parishioners and performing the other duties of his office. He was one of the first persons in Scotland who took a share in the Arminian controversy. For his learned treatise entitled *Exercitationes Apologeticæ pro Divina Gratia*, published in 1630, he was summoned before the High Commission ; but in the absence of the Archbishop of St Andrews, the diet was deserted, and for that time he was discharged. Six years afterwards he was prosecuted before the same court for writing this book, for preaching against the Articles of Perth, and for nonconformity ; and he was then deprived of his ministry, and ordered to be confined in the city of Aberdeen during the King's pleasure. While he remained in this confinement, he was not afraid to utter his sentiments ; and his disputations with the doctors of Aberdeen, all of whom, with scarcely an exception, were attached to Episcopacy, and among whom might certainly be numbered the ablest and most expert wranglers in Scotland (particularly Robert Bacon, the metaphysician, who had once been a professor in the University of St Andrews), would probably have exposed him to fresh severities, if the events of 1638 had not restored the Church to its freedom. On the restoration of

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

Presbytery he was appointed by the General Assembly professor of divinity in the New College of St Andrews ; but he could not accept the office unless he was likewise appointed to a ministerial charge ; and in compliance with his suggestion, the General Assembly ordained him to be admitted colleague with Robert Blair, minister of St Andrews. While Rutherford resided in London (from the year 1643 to 1647) he published a great number of works, most of them controversial, being written chiefly against the Antinomians and Independents, schismatics whom he conceived to be at least equally dangerous to the peace of the Church as the Episcopalians. As the interest of the subject has now expired, few of these books are much known by the present age ; but all of them are fraught with great learning, and in many passages they exhibit traces of a bold and masculine judgment, as well as of a rich imagination. His book entitled *Lex Rex, or a Plea for the People's Rights*, containing "the causes of the most necessary defensive wars of Scotland, and of their expedition for aiding their brethren in England," was afterwards condemned and burnt ; and if the author had not died opportunely a few months after the restoration of Charles II., he might probably have shared the same fate with his book. As a writer, we cannot ascribe much merit to his style, and in the indulgence of an exuberant fancy he often expressed his meaning in terms which now excite the ridicule of the profane ; but if his situation be duly considered, it will be difficult to name any person who ever filled the same situations, of whom it can be truly said, that in extensive learning, as well as in native strength of talent, he has approached to Samuel Rutherford. In the age of Milton, this man's clo-

quence and judgment were admired by the English ; and however fantastical his expressions may often appear to us, they are not more extravagant than many which are to be found in the productions of the most celebrated episcopalian divines.

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

It is unnecessary to describe the character of Robert Baillie. Some of his works are well known ; others, it is to be regretted, have been long known only in an imperfect state ; but his adversaries proved in what respect they held his abilities, when they afterwards urged him to accept a bishopric. He was a man of profound and universal learning.

Robert
Baillie.

Of George Gillespie, the other commissioner to the Westminster Assembly, I would willingly speak at some length, because his character has been unhand- somely and untruly described. He has been derisively characterised as a mere fanatic, who had no pretensions to notice except the violence of his disposition. He was the youngest of all the commissioners sent by the General Assembly to assist the English divines, being not yet thirty years of age ; but five years before, he had distinguished himself by a most learned treatise, a *Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies obtruded on the Church of Scotland* ; and since that time he had been engaged in other works which still remain as monuments of his uncommon genius and erudition. He was admitted by a very competent judge (Principal Baillie ^a) to be at least equal to the

George
Gillespie.

^a [" Verie learned and acute Mr Gillespie, a singular ornament to our Church, than whom not one in the whole Assemblie speaks to better purpose, and with better acceptance by all the hearers."—(*Letters*, ii. 129.) After his death Baillie writes of him : —" Certainly he was as able a man as our Kirk had, of a clear judgment ; that which some mislyked in him wald easely have been bettered by experience and years."—*Ibid.* iii. 68. Ten years before (in 1638), Baillie had written to Mr Spang : " Ye have here some reasons against the service in print. . . . I took the

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

ablest men in the Westminster Assembly; and it is known that they listened with such deference to his opinions that he may be said to have had the chief hand in framing the Directory for Worship, the Form of Church Government, and the other productions bound up with the Confession of Faith. He would unquestionably have proved himself to be what all his colleagues then esteemed him, the chief ornament of our Church, if he had not been cut off by a premature death in the year 1648, in the thirty-sixth year of his age. Incomparably the best account of the constitution of our National Church which has ever appeared was written by this able divine—*An Assertion of the Government and Discipline of the Church of Scotland*. He was also the author of a large work, entitled *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, and another entitled *Miscellaneous Questions*.

The Solemn
League and
Covenant.

In 1643, commissioners from London arrived in Edinburgh, and represented to the Convention of the Estates of Parliament, and to the General Assembly, that because the prelatical faction was still pursuing the design of altering the religion of the whole island, it was necessary to unite the two nations for their mutual defence against them and their adherents, and not to lay down their arms till these implacable foes were defeated. It was agreed that the best method of accomplishing this purpose was to enter into a Covenant and League between the kingdoms. This league

author to be Mr Henderson; but I am informed since that they came from Mr George Gillespie. . . . This same youth is now given out also, by these that should know, for the author of the *English Popish Ceremonies*, whereof we all doe marvel; for though he had gotten the papers and help of the chief of that syde, yet the very composition would seem to be farre above such ane age; bot if that book be truely of his making, I admire the man, though I mislike much of his matter; yea, I think, he may prove amongst the best witts of this isle."—(*Ibid.* i. 90.)

was immediately prepared and sent to London by four of the commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, and was approved both by that Assembly and by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament. It was solemnly sworn and subscribed in almost all parts of that nation. An Act of Parliament was passed, containing instructions for the manner of taking it, and at the same time "an exhortation for satisfying scruples" was published by the Assembly of Divines. In the course of the same year it was sworn by all ranks in Scotland, and thus both nations solemnly abjured prelacy.

LECT.
XXIII.
1643.

I may here take occasion to read to you a few remarks on the Covenanters written for another purpose, at the solicitation of a friend, who inserted them in a periodical publication :—

[No tolerable account of the Scottish Covenanters has ever been published ^a in an extended form, and our National Church ought to feel deeply indebted to any writer of ability who shall supply this vast desideratum in her history. The task, indeed, is one which very few

Character of
the earlier
Covenant-
ers.
[Christian
Instructor
(1817), vol.
xv. p. 333.]

^a [The description given by a celebrated novelist of the period of the Covenanters is not historically correct. . . . The greater part of the description applying to the religion and morals of that class of persons in Scotland who are known by the name of Covenanters, must have been supplied almost altogether by the imagination of the writer. He seems equally to have forgotten the state of things before the restoration of Charles II., and the state of things which supervened upon that event, which was certainly hailed as joyfully by the Presbyterians of Scotland as by any other class of his Majesty's subjects, although they had great cause afterwards to complain of the harsh

treatment which they experienced, in violation of the solemn promises which that monarch had repeatedly made to them. But on that subject, as I believe the authority of the celebrated writer referred to is often thought almost the best that can be quoted, I think it right to state that he seems to have been utterly unacquainted both with the observances of the Presbyterian Church, and those of the Episcopalian Church which succeeded it. He imagines, for instance, that the Liturgy was observed after the Restoration of Charles II., whereas, in point of fact, the only change that took place in the worship in the churches consisted in the discontinuance of the Directory and the adop-

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

men are capable of executing well, and which the best qualified may be little inclined to undertake. . . .

It is not enough that the historian of the Covenanters should be entitled to quote the Memoirs of the Bishop of Dunkeld, the Dukes of Hamilton, and the Marquess of Montrose, Rushworth's "Collections" and Baillie's "Letters," Whitelocke's "Memorials," and Franklyn's "Annals," "Naphtali" and the "Hind let Loose," with the voluminous Histories bearing the names of Clarendon and Collier, Burnet and Wodrow, and a dozen or two of prosing biographical notices to be found in every village and hamlet, such as the "Lives" of Livingstone and Hog, of Robert Blair and Frazer of Brae, of Katherine Ross and Elizabeth West. The man who wishes to form an accurate estimate of the intellectual attainments and moral characters, as well as the theological views and political sentiments, of the leading Covenanters, must have the patience to peruse their numerous writings; not a few of which are only to be discovered in the smoky hovels of the poor, all tattered and defaced, not so much by the tear and wear of

tion of three Articles, which had not been thought offensive in the days of Knox, namely, the use of the Lord's Prayer, the repetition of the Creed by parents when they brought their children to be baptised, and the use of a doxology in connection with the singing of psalms. These were the only marked deviations from the worship which had been previously observed; and the whole objection of the people of Scotland arose from their belief that the hierarchy and his Majesty's claim of supremacy in matters ecclesiastical were not divinely warranted, and that the power of the Church, patronised by the King, had been exercised formerly, and they

were afraid would still continue to be exercised, in a manner inconsistent with the full enjoyment of their religious privileges. I refer to these particulars merely as specimens of the inaccuracy of the descriptions which have probably made an impression not easily effaced, though it has done great injustice to the characters of an oppressed and persecuted race, who, derided as they have been as feeble-minded fanatics, did more than any other body of men both to maintain the interests of religion, and to secure for their posterity the enjoyment of civil liberty.—(*Author's Evid. before Com. of House of Commons on Sabbath Observance.*)]

actual service, as by being long laid on the shelf amidst the wreck of baser matter—a sure token of the decaying zeal for the cause which the authors maintained with such vehemence and fervour.

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

Most of these writings present but few attractions to the fastidious readers of this lukewarm and conceited generation. In general, they are characterised equally by the homeliness of their diction, the extent of their erudition, and the cogency of their arguments. They breathe a keen spirit of controversy on points of systematic divinity and ecclesiastical polity; topics scarcely so interesting to many of our contemporaries, as the literary contests of the Realists and the Nominalists of a remoter age. We may be apt to blame the covenanting brethren for devoting themselves so generally to polemical discussions; but it was not altogether from choice that many of them took this turn. They were constrained to wield these weapons in self-defence; and there was not a man among their opponents whose dexterity or subtlety in debate was able to perplex them. With scarcely any exception, the Covenanters had been trained to the habit of disputation from their tenderest years; and at every stage of their lives they were familiar with scenes of contention. After having completed the usual academical course, many of the ablest of their number acted as regents in colleges; and in this capacity they could scarcely fail to acquire a turn for wrangling, and to gain a facility of utterance, by the practice of teaching the Aristotelian logic, and presiding in the daily examinations of the students. Thus Alexander Henderson, Robert Blair, David Dickson, Samuel Rutherford, James Wood, David Forrest, Hugh Binning, James Guthrie, Robert M'Ward, and several

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

others (of whom the small wits of the succeeding generation were accustomed to speak so scornfully), had, at a very early age, signalised themselves as professors of philosophy and the liberal arts, and had been universally acknowledged to be men of no ordinary talents and acquirements. When they were afterwards intrusted with the cure of souls, they were not suffered to divest themselves of their scholastic accoutrements. One of the weekly exercises in which it behoved all members of presbyteries to engage in rotation, was the elucidation of some common head in divinity, or a critical exposition of some passage of Scripture; and while a certain proportion of the brethren impugned the doctrines delivered, it was necessary for the authors to be ready with their defence.

Of the mode in which these combats were conducted, it is unnecessary to offer any description; and we have not leisure to discuss the advantages and disadvantages which must have resulted from them. It is sufficiently obvious, that they must have whetted the faculty of argumentation, and imposed on every preacher a necessity of applying, with some degree of earnestness, to the serious studies befitting his profession; and that they must, in no small degree, have fostered the disputatious humour, which was never at a loss for subjects on which to exert itself, so long as Papists, Episcopalians, sectaries, and heretics, were allowed to hold out a signal of defiance. The specimens of their reasoning powers which have descended to our times, cannot easily be matched by the most elaborate performances of their adversaries; and it is only to be regretted that the fugitive and perishable form in which their productions appeared, as well as the tran-

sient interest of the subjects, have long ago doomed them to neglect, if not to destruction.

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

It deserves also to be noticed that the descendants of some of these champions of Presbytery, having espoused less manly tenets, and moved in a more courtly sphere, have become ashamed of the puritanical recognisances engraven on the shields of their progenitors, and instead of wishing to perpetuate the trophies of their honourable renown, have rather been solicitous to blot out the memorials of the warfare which they waged against arbitrary power and prelatival usurpation. From this cause, among many others too obvious to require enumeration, it has happened that many valuable written documents are inaccessible, while a considerable number of those which were printed, being now either lost or mutilated, cannot be referred to with any degree of confidence.

In these circumstances, it is not very wonderful that the capacities of the Scottish Covenanters should have lately become a matter of dispute. One class has derided them as persons of weak intellects and contemptible acquirements. Another party has maintained that the leading men among them were highly respectable, both for their abilities and their information. A distinction, indeed, ought to be made between the earlier Covenanters, whose education had been completed before the constitution of their Church was overturned, and those who did not enter on their vocation till the time of trouble overtook them. But even of those who grew up under the shade of persecution, and whose minds were nurtured amidst alarms and strifes and perils, which rendered it impossible for them to pursue a regular train of study, it has

LECT.
XXIII.

1643.

been affirmed that they were men of no mean endowments, and that, though their stock of learning was but scanty, they acquired an uncommon degree of shrewdness in the discernment of character, and in tracing the connection of events (whence arose the popular belief of their prophetic gifts); while at the same time they became masters of a powerful and impassioned eloquence, to which, though it violated many of the established canons of criticism, it was not possible to listen without being deeply moved. These extraordinary specimens of oratory, whether extemporaneous or not, appear scarcely ever to have been committed to writing by the authors; and the printed sermons ascribed to them are in general nothing more than the notes taken by hearers, and afterwards filled up by the broken and incoherent shreds of sentences which their recollection could supply, and which their plebeian taste occasionally translated into more vulgar phraseology. Though we do not altogether admire the style of preaching which has been thus disguised and deformed by the reporters, to whose injudicious zeal we owe a few remnants of discourses, we are not ashamed to acknowledge ourselves in the number of those who respect the memory of the Covenanters, not only on account of their integrity and intrepidity, their love of truth and their hatred of oppression, but on account of their vigorous powers of thought, and their distinguished proficiency in valuable knowledge. . . .]

The Engagement.

The King's affairs were now in a state of desperation; and after vainly attempting to retrieve them, he surrendered himself to the Scottish army under General Lesley, who before that time had been created Earl of Leven. The Scots, on obtaining a promise

that he would be honourably treated, delivered him up to the English Parliament.

LECT.
XXIII.

1648.

Two years afterwards, the Duke of Hamilton prevailed upon the Convention of Estates to raise an army, and to appoint him commander, for the purpose of delivering the King from captivity. This expedition, well known in the history of our Church by the name of the Engagement, was the source of the greatest dissensions which had yet been known in this country. The purpose was to oppose the Independents of England, headed by Oliver Cromwell—a party whom the Scottish nation viewed with peculiar abhorrence; but when it was discovered that the ruin of this party would be the exaltation of the Royalists and Episcopalians, or, as they now began to be named, the Malignants, the undertaking was regarded by a great proportion of the Church as a presumptuous violation of the Covenant, and all who engaged in it were excommunicated. To distinguish the well affected from the malignants, it was now thought necessary to renew the Covenant in the year 1648, after which period^a the Church was torn asunder by various factions, till its constitution was utterly overthrown.

^a Appendix, No. XXI.

LECTURE XXIV.

PROTEST OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND AGAINST THE KING'S TRIAL—
 CONTROVERSIES BETWEEN THE PRESBYTERIANS AND THE SEC-
 TARIES—DISPUTES IN THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY RESPECTING
 CHURCH GOVERNMENT—CONCLUSIONS OF THE ENGLISH PARLIA-
 MENT—PAPERS BETWEEN CHARLES I. AND ALEXANDER HENDERSON
 —THE ENGAGEMENT—RESOLUTIONERS AND PROTESTERS—NEW
 MODE OF PREACHING INTRODUCED BY ROBERT LEIGHTON AND
 HUGH BINNING—RESTORATION OF CHARLES II.—JAMES SHARP—
 EPISCOPACY RESTORED IN SCOTLAND.

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.
 Protest of
 the Church
 of Scotland
 against the
 King's trial.

It has been very commonly asserted that the Presby-
 terians of England, combining with those of Scotland,
 brought Charles I. to the scaffold. This calumny has
 been so often and so completely refuted, that it is
 necessary only to say that, with regard to the Scottish
 nation, it was no sooner discovered that the sectarian
 army of England, having modelled the Parliament ac-
 cording to their own views, and erected a High Court
 of Justice, had resolved to bring the King to trial,
 than the Parliament of Scotland unanimously directed
 their commissioners in London to protest against that
 resolution. The Church of Scotland entertained the
 same views; and a meeting of the Commission of the
 General Assembly having been called, concurred with
 the Parliament in expressing their detestation of "so
 horrid a design against his Majesty's person," and in
 protesting that they were not responsible for "the

miseries, confusions, and calamities that might follow." The Presbyterians in London and the neighbourhood, to the number of eight hundred, also published a representation of their judgment on this subject, as it had been communicated in a letter to the General and his council of war, in which they remonstrated against the intention of doing violence to the person of the King, or divesting him of his royal authority; an intention which, they maintained, must have the effect of "subverting the constitution, and introducing anarchy and confusion." Again, the presbyterian Parliament of Scotland, after having received certain intelligence of the King's murder, immediately proclaimed Charles II. king, and sent to their commissioners at London a copy of the proclamation, with a remonstrance to the House of Commons, which gave so great offence to the regicides that they at first imprisoned the commissioners, and soon afterwards sent them back to Scotland, escorted by a troop of horse.

It is probable that the aspersions against the Presbyterians, as having been accessory to the King's death, have arisen in a great measure from the ignorant supposition that the whole force of presbyterian hostility was directed against the Episcopalians; a supposition which some of our ecclesiastical historians have taken pains to confirm by detailing circumstantially all the disputes of the Presbyterians with the prelatical party, and omitting altogether, or very slightly mentioning, the controversies which they carried on with an innumerable host of sectarians.

It is true that our Scottish Covenanters lifted up a testimony against prelacy, a form of Church government which they conceived to be equally inconsistent with

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

Controversies between the Presbyterians and the Seculars.

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

their civil privileges and religious freedom. In this contest they had a powerful auxiliary in the author of *Paradise Lost*, whose fine genius submitted to the drudgery of writing polemical treatises against Episcopacy and monarchy, but who soon became one of the fiercest enemies of the Presbyterians themselves, treating them with the utmost disdain, and applying the most virulent epithets to their conduct. It is easy to account for the rancour with which his irritable mind was infected, when we reflect that he was the apologist of all the excesses of the Independents in the army, and the chosen vindicator of the parliamentary rebels who determined on the death of their sovereign before they brought him to his trial.

But though the Covenanters contended earnestly against the prelatical hierarchy, which they conceived had been the ruin of the Church in the former age, this was not the only enemy, nor, in their opinion, the most dangerous enemy whom it was necessary for them to oppose. It appeared to them that the Church could never be established in its purity till it maintained unity of doctrine and uniformity of discipline; and when the abolition of Episcopacy was obtained, it was natural to expect that the sentiments of men would be divided with respect to the best mode of administering ecclesiastical affairs. Those, accordingly, who had combined in overthrowing the established order, were unable to agree in constructing a new system, and their different views concerning the government of the Church led them to a diversity of opinion on other matters of much deeper importance.

Disputes
relative to
Church

The strife of parties was carried to a great height in the Assembly of Divines which met at Westminster

in the year 1643.^a The episcopalian divines did not attend at all, and it may therefore be presumed that their opinions met with no support. At first a majority of the members appeared to be inclined to admit the name of bishops, and to define their functions according to the supposed practice of the first century. But the Scotch commissioners would agree to no propositions except those which, disclaiming Episcopacy altogether, established the presbyterian constitution as being expressly authorised and prescribed in the New Testament.

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.
government
in the West-
minster
Assembly.

The Independents, or congregational brethren, formed an able though not a numerous party in the Assembly; and there was scarcely an article proposed concerning Church government which they did not keenly debate for several weeks.

Independents.

This sect had arisen out of the party known by

^a [Their discussions were not confined to the Assembly itself. Both the House of Lords and the House of Commons were wont to assemble at least once every month, for the purpose of celebrating public fasts; and the sermons which were preached on those occasions by members of the Assembly of Divines, are generally very interesting memorials, both of the talents and the theological attainments of those eminent men, as well as of the prevailing spirit of the age. Some of them, however, assumed a very controversial tone, and it might have almost been said, in certain cases, that, as far as the preachers were concerned, they seemed to have fasted for strife and debate. Thus, on the 30th of July 1645, Mr Thomas Coleman, a man of great talents, and one of the leaders of the Erastian party, preached a sermon before the House of Commons on the 11th Chapter of John,

verse 20: "But the eyes of the wicked shall fail, and they shall not escape, and their hope shall be as the giving up of the ghost." In this discourse, to which he gave the title of "Hopes Deferred and Dashed," he took occasion to introduce his peculiar views on church government. "Establish," he said, "as few things, *jure divino*, as can well be; hold out the practice, but not the ground. This was the only thing that hindered union in the Assembly. Two parties came biased: the one with a national determination; the other with a congregational engagement. The reverend commissioners for Scotland were for the *jus divinum* of the presbyterial; the Independents, for the congregational government." He then insisted that all divine institutions have clear Scriptures to support them, and recommended the Parliament to lay no more burden of government on the

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

the name of Brownists, and its first distinguished member was a Norfolk divine named John Robinson, who had fled from persecution soon after the accession of James to the English throne, and erected a church of his own persuasion at Leyden. The first congregation of Independents in England was established in the year 1616 by Mr Jacob, who borrowed his tenets from Robinson. All their meetings were kept secret till the year 1640, when a number of them ventured to open a place of worship, and were brought to the bar of the House of Lords on the charge of having denied the King's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters. They confessed that they could acknowledge no head of the Church but Christ, that they could not believe it to be the prerogative of an earthly prince to make laws to bind the conscience, and that they disowned all foreign power and jurisdiction. The House of Lords dismissed them with a slight reprimand ; and

shoulders of ministers than Christ has plainly laid on them, and finally came to the conclusion that " a Christian magistrate, as a Christian magistrate, is a governor in the Church. Of other governors besides magistrates, I find no institution of them." At the next monthly fast, on the 27th of August 1645, Mr George Gillespie preached the sermon before the House of Lords in the Abbey Church at Westminster, and after exhorting his right honourable audience to settle church government in such a manner that neither ignorant nor scandalous persons may be admitted to the table of the Lord, he said : " I am sorry I have occasion to add another application. What will you say if any be found among the sons of Levi that will neither be active nor passive in the establishing of the Church, refusing government of Jesus Christ, but

will needs appear upon the stage against it? This was done in a late sermon, now come abroad, which hath given no small scandal and offence. I am confident every other godly minister will say, ' Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth before I do the like.' " He then added a long " brotherly examination " of Mr Coleman's sermon, by which he said, Coleman " endeavoured to strike at the root of all spiritual and ecclesiastical government, contrary to the Word of God." Hence arose a controversy, which was carried on with great keenness, in a succession of pamphlets characterised by great ability and learning, and which would probably have proceeded to a much greater length, if Mr Coleman had not died within a few months after the controversy began.]

as it was now perceived that they might safely declare themselves, a number of their most distinguished preachers returned to England, and speedily brought their peculiar opinions into notice. They held that every particular congregation of Christians has a complete power of jurisdiction over all its members, to be exercised by the elders within itself. Their form of worship was the same with that of the Presbyterians,—in their doctrine they agreed with the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the confessions of other reformed churches. Their officers and public rulers in the Church were pastors, teachers, ruling elders, and deacons. They practised no church censures but admonition, and excommunication on impenitent offenders in crimes of the deepest aggravation committed in opposition to the light of conscience. The principle by which they were chiefly distinguished was religious toleration,—a principle which was conceived by the Presbyterians, as well as by every other denomination of Christians, to be inconsistent with purity of the faith, and which, in that age, far from gaining to the Independents any credit for their liberality, exposed them to much obloquy, by extending to the whole sect the odium of indulging and harbouring the outcasts of other religious communities. At first the tenets of the Independents were embraced chiefly by men of education and rank; but when they found their way into the humbler conditions of life, they were soon associated with enthusiastic and antinomian error.

The opinions of the Scots Presbyterians in the controversy with the Independents may be found in a work already mentioned, Baillie's *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time*, in Rutherford's *Due*

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

LECT. XXIV.
 1643-1661. *Right of Presbyteries*, in James Wood's *Treatise against Lockier*, and various other treatises. The manner in which the Independents conducted themselves in the Westminster Assembly is well described in Baillie's *Letters*. Baillie was a determined enemy of their doctrines; but he admits that of ten or twelve, the whole number of this sect in the Assembly, at least eight were very able men, and that they spoke exceedingly well. Many of the party, he says, fell very soon into the heresies of Anabaptism, Antinomianism, and Socinianism; but this charge does not apply to any of the members of the Westminster Assembly.

[Baillie's
 Letters, ii.
 110.]

The Eras-
 tians.

Next to the Independents, whose active opposition retarded the progress of the presbyterian principles in England, the Erastians gave the greatest trouble to the Westminster divines. The chiefs of this party in the Assembly were Dr Lightfoot and Mr Coleman, supported by the learned John Selden and Bulstrode Whitelock, members of the House of Commons. They were denominated Erastians, because their views resembled those of Erastus, a German physician of the sixteenth century, whose peculiar notion was, that the pastoral office was only persuasive, like that of a teacher of science, and that the power of the keys was not annexed to it. The punishment of all offences (whether of a civil or religious nature) ought, in his estimation, to be reserved to the magistrate. This opinion was not very remote from that which had been maintained by many of the English reformers, who denied that the Scripture had prescribed any form of church government which ought to be perpetual,—declaring that this ought to be left to the magistrate, and that the government of the Church ought to be conformed to the government of the State. These

positions, as well as those of the Independents, were unanimously condemned in the General Assembly of our Church in the year 1647. It was then declared that, as “the rights of the civill magistrate are to be maintained according to the Word of God, and the confessions of the faith of the reformed kirks, so it is no lesse true and certain that Jesus Christ, the onely Head, and the onely King of the Kirk, hath instituted and appointed a kirk government distinct from the civill government ;” and that the “ecclesiastical government” is committed to “assemblies, made up of ministers of the Word and ruling elders.”

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

[Acts of
the General
Assembly
1647, p.
32.]

Though the power of the Erastians was inconsiderable in the Assembly of Divines, their influence in Parliament was sufficient to obtain an alteration of the fundamental article which the Presbyterians had carried in the Assembly,—namely, that a certain form of Government prescribed in the New Testament is of divine institution, and is binding in all ages of the Church, and that by this divine institution many particular congregations may and ought to be under one presbyterial government. In the House of Commons, the Erastians and Independents, both of whom denied the divine right of Presbytery, overturned this conclusion, and required the position of the Assembly to be expressed thus—that it is lawful and agreeable to the Word of God, that the Church be governed by congregational, classical, and synodical assemblies. On the subject of suspension and excommunication also, Mr Selden and Mr Whitelock prevailed upon the Parliament to limit the power claimed by presbyteries.

At last the two Houses of Parliament made an ordinance, appointing the presbyterian government to be received as the national establishment. This, how-

Conclusions
of the Eng-
lish Parlia-
ment re-
specting

LECT.
XXIV.
1663-1641.
Church go-
vernment.

ever, was done only as an experiment, and some of the modifications which took their rise in the Parliament gave offence to all parties. The presbyterian divines were particularly displeased with a clause in the Act, which allowed an appeal from the censures of the Church to a committee of Parliament.^a They were equally anxious to prevent the toleration of sectaries, which in their judgment was opening a door to all manner of errors. Many were the representations and petitions which they wrote, lamenting the growth of schism, and praying that all persons might be prevented from preaching who had not taken the Covenant,—that all separate congregations might be suppressed,—that heretics and schismatics might be punished,—and that such as refused to take the Covenant might be disqualified from all places of profit and trust. The want of such regulations appeared to them the chief causes of the growth of error, heresy, and blasphemy. The Assembly of Divines, having been disappointed of that support from the houses of Parliament which they solicited, published a *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Times*, the writing of which was intrusted to Mr Baillie of Glasgow. The work of the learned and most laborious, as well as ingenious writer, George Gillespie, entitled *Aaron's Rod Blossoming; or, the Divine Ordinance of Church Government Vindicated* (against the Erastians), contains one of the ablest expositions of the presbyterian tenets concerning the exclusion of the unworthy from the privileges of the Church. Mr Edwards, in a book entitled *Gangræna; or, a Catalogue of the Errors, Heresies, and Pernicious Practices of the Time*, inveighed with great rage

^a Appendix, No. XIII.

against sixteen different forms of heresies, and called upon the Parliament to suffer them no longer. Edwards is so violent a writer, as to be of very suspicious authority, and even his own friends were quite sick of his intolerant abuse.

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

One of the most remarkable controversies of this period is that which took place between Charles I. and Alexander Henderson, minister of Edinburgh. When the army of Scotland insisted that the King should take the Covenant, and establish the presbyterian government in both kingdoms, his Majesty replied, that though he was willing that the Scots should have their own discipline, he was bound in honour to support Episcopacy in England, which had been established there since the Reformation, and which he had also sworn at his coronation to maintain ; but he said he was willing to enter into a conference with any person whom they would appoint, and he would not be ashamed to alter his purpose if he could be convinced that Episcopacy was not of divine institution, and that the coronation oath did not bind him to support the Church as it was then established. For the purpose of convincing the King, Mr Henderson was employed to answer in writing whatever difficulties his Majesty might propose.

Papers between Charles I. and Alexander Henderson.

Three elaborate papers passed on each side, and as Mr Henderson died soon afterwards, it was pretended by the King's friends that he had not only vanquished his adversary, but broken his heart. The Episcopalians, not content with this unfair and ungenerous triumph over a man who, at the commencement of the controversy, was sinking into the grave, had the baseness to fabricate a recantation which they falsely declared had been dictated and signed by Henderson immediately before his death. This spurious paper, the disgraceful

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

[Acts of the
General
Assembly
1648, p. 43.]

forgery of which has been traced to a Scotch episcopal writer, was published as an authentic production by several of the English writers, but was declared, in one of the Acts of the General Assembly in 1648, to be "false and scandalous," contrived by an author "void of charity and a good conscience, a gross liar and calumniator, led by the spirit of the accuser of the brethren." The Assembly, in passing this Act, were guided by the attestations of several ministers who visited him on his deathbed, and particularly by two who attended him constantly.

It has been said that the King was the author of all the papers which were sent in his name to Mr Henderson, and no doubt this circumstance must have had its influence in securing from the English Church that veneration for his memory as a defender of the faith, which has always been associated with their hatred of Presbytery. The principles of which he was most tenacious were the divine right of Diocesan Episcopacy; the uninterrupted succession of bishops from the time of the Apostles, on which the whole validity of the administration of the sacraments depends; the necessity of a judge of controversies, which he lodged in the Fathers of the Christian church; the independence of the Church from the State; and the unlawfulness of all reformation which does not arise from the prince or legislature. The King rested his arguments chiefly on the consent of the Fathers, and Mr Henderson refused to admit any other rule than the Scriptures. It is impossible to conjecture how long the controversy might have been protracted had Mr Henderson lived, as the King's great object was to gain time, in the hope of obtaining some advantage by his correspondence with France.

Two years after the death of Henderson, the King, during his residence in the Isle of Wight, concluded a secret treaty with the Scottish commissioners, which, if it had been made while he remained in the Scottish camp, might have secured his preservation. He agreed to confirm the Covenant in Parliament, to establish Presbytery for three years till it was revised by the Assembly of Divines, and to concur in the extirpation of sectaries, as well as to grant the Scots a large share of every honour and advantage conferred by the Crown. In all these concessions he was insincere; but it was upon the report of these articles that a considerable proportion of the people of Scotland became parties to that treaty which was called the Engagement. The Church was almost unanimous in opposing this measure. They objected to the restoration of the King till he had sworn to consent to an act of Parliament for settling religion according to the Covenant, in all his dominions. But their chief ground of aversion was the introduction of Malignants into the army. All the enemies of the Covenant were proscribed under this denomination, and it was conceived that an alliance with them would be utterly ruinous. It proved so in the event. The Duke of Hamilton's march into England for the purpose of restoring the King to his former power, without exacting any conditions whatever, terminated in his surrender to the inferior army of Cromwell, and in the total dispersion of his troops.

After the execution of Charles I., England continued four years under the government of an oligarchy, which assumed the name of the Commonwealth. But from the very beginning the great body of the Presbyterians united with the Scots in attempting to establish Charles II., on condition of his taking the Cove-

 LECT.
XXIV.

 1643-1661.
"The Eng-
agement."

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

nant, and instead of acknowledging the ruling powers, characterised them as usurpers. The Parliament, on the petition of the army, passed a law in favour of toleration to the different sects, and immediately afterwards required their Engagement, an oath to be true to the government established without King or House of Peers, to be taken by all ministers, and other subjects, as well as civil and military officers, on pain of losing the benefit of the law. The Presbyterians not only refused this test, but preached against it as an oppressive imposition; and for this refusal to recognise the new government many of them were deprived of their preferments, both in the Church and in the universities.

Commissioners from Scotland were at this time treating with Charles II. in Holland, and endeavouring to prevail upon him to subscribe the Covenant, and to establish the Confession of Faith, the Directory, and the form of presbyterian church government in both kingdoms. With great reluctance he at last consented, after he knew that the Marquess of Montrose had perished in the attempt to establish him by force of arms, and that the Duke of Ormond and the Irish Catholics, on whose support he had vainly calculated, were reduced to insignificance by the victorious arms of Cromwell. Charles II. was proclaimed King of Scotland on the 11th of July 1650, and was crowned at Scone in the beginning of January in the following year. Before this last event Cromwell had gained a signal victory over the army of the Scots at Dunbar, and had taken possession of the metropolis. The King foolishly rejoiced in this event, which cut off so strong a body of those whom he accounted his most dangerous enemies. The Presbyterians were not, however, dispirited by this disaster. They resolved to provide

for the national safety by endeavouring to unite all parties in the public service. They prepared two resolutions ; one, that those who had hitherto been obnoxious either for their neutrality or for their share in the Engagement under the Duke of Hamilton, should be allowed and encouraged to make a profession of their repentance ; and another, that, after testifying their repentance, they should be admitted to share in the defence of the kingdom.

When these resolutions were adopted by Parliament, the Malignants and Engagers, eager to be received into the public service, complied with the forms required by the Church for the purpose of obtaining absolution. But this step was followed by new dissensions. The same party in the Church which had opposed the Engagement, now protested against the admission of any of the disaffected to serve in the cause, and declared that their pretended repentance was a profanation of the divine ordinances, from which no good could be expected. An association was framed against the sectaries, and a remonstrance against the King, by five western counties, Ayr, Renfrew, Galloway, Wigton, and Dumfries ; and from this period the Church and the nation were divided into Resolutioners, and Remonstrants or Protesters. The Remonstrants considered the treaty with the King as criminal, and proposed that he should be suspended from the government till he gave clear evidences of his repentance ; and they protested that it was unjust to impose on others a prince unworthy to reign in Scotland, or to interfere in the affairs of an independent nation. The Remonstrance was condemned by the Committee of Estates as seditious. They, in the mean time, withheld their levies, to the number of four

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

Resolution-
ers and Pro-
testers.

LECT. XXIV.
 1643-1661. or five thousand; and thus, instead of uniting to resist the aggressions of Cromwell, the Covenanters, by their violent divisions, were working out their own destruction.

It was the great error of the presbyterian churchmen of that age, that they interfered too much in the conduct of civil affairs. But they were the fittest men of those times for the management of public business, and if they had not been unhappily divided from one another, their counsels might have been productive of the most salutary effects. They were far more distinguished for their courage than many of the military leaders; and when the cowardice or treachery of Dundas, the governor of Edinburgh Castle, delivered up that fortress to the English, the ministers of Edinburgh, who had taken refuge in it, protested against its ignominious surrender. The moderate Covenanters, by far the most numerous party, united with the other royalists to defend the King and the country. But the ill-advised plan of marching into England was ruinous to their cause. The battle of Worcester almost annihilated their army, and compelled the King to abandon his dominions; and while the martial strength of the kingdom was thus wasted on a delirious expedition, Scotland, abandoned by its defenders, fell an easy prey to the ferocious General Monk.

The Parliament of England appointed commissioners to effect an incorporating union between the two kingdoms,—a pretence under which they attempted to introduce the laws and government of England into a country which they wished to consider as a conquered province. The magnanimity of the Marquess of Argyle, who fortified himself in the Highlands, seems to have deterred them from the attempt to overturn the laws

and the religious establishment. They interfered, however, so much in the affairs of the Church, that through the support of their emissaries, the Protesters, many of whom openly adhered to Cromwell, they drew aside vast numbers of the people from their more moderate pastors, and usurped an immoderate degree of power in the settlement of vacant parishes.

Three of the most violent of the Protesters were deposed by the General Assembly, James Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie, and David Bennet. But they denied the legality of this Assembly, and, in concert with a number of others, equally disaffected with themselves, erected a separate presbytery, and, under the auspices of the army of sectaries, planted many of the churches with persons whom the people refused to acknowledge as their ministers. One of the most learned of the adherents of this party was Samuel Rutherford, who, though he did not proceed to the same extremes with some of his brethren, had the imprudence to advance their interest till it was impossible to restrain their extravagance. The pulpits now resounded with the unceasing notes of contention. The multitude, distracted and confounded by the unaccountable dissensions of their spiritual guides, were most generally inclined at first to adhere to the teachers who preserved their loyalty to the King. But by degrees vast numbers were gained over by the enthusiasm of the other party, who, when they began to feel their strength, would accept no terms of accommodation except an implicit adoption of all their principles.

To ingratiate themselves with Cromwell they declined praying for the King, and framed their churches after the model of the sectarians. They introduced a mode of celebrating the divine ordinances, which till that

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

time had been unknown in Scotland, and which came afterwards to be generally practised by those whose meetings were interdicted by the severe enactments of the government after the King's restoration. They preached and prayed at much greater length, and with much greater fervour, than their brethren. At the administration of the communion they collected a great number of ministers, and performed divine service two or three successive days before, and one at least after the solemnity. On such occasions, not fewer than twelve or fifteen sermons were delivered in the course of three or four days to the same audience; but as the numbers attracted to the spot were often far greater than could hear the voice of one man, it was not uncommon to divide them into two or three separate congregations, to each of which a succession of preachers was assigned, and thus thirty or forty sermons were preached to the different groups of communicants and spectators. Their harangues were generally unpremeditated, and their devotions were supposed by the people, and perhaps by the speakers themselves, to be dictated by a celestial impulse. The great subject of their declamations was the degeneracy of the Church, corrupted in its doctrines, its discipline, and its worship. The state of public affairs was an inexhaustible fund of extemporaneous eloquence. In the fluctuations of political interests, something new was always to be discovered; and by choosing texts from the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament, it was not difficult to draw a parallel between some of the circumstances of the Jewish nation and the vicissitudes of a covenanted people, who had abused so many mercies, and burst so many sacred bonds.

In this style of preaching, and in the performance of other public exercises of religion, the Protesters were imitated by many of the Resolutioners, who still maintained their fidelity to the King ; but as this party was composed chiefly of more reasonable men, they could not allow themselves, for the sake of popularity, to adopt all that vehemence of utterance and that redundancy of matter, with that assumption of a prophetic character which distinguished some of their rivals. One mode of preaching, described by Principal Baillie, was introduced by Robert Leighton, afterwards Bishop of Dunblane, whom the English commissioners had made principal of the College of Edinburgh, and by Hugh Binning, a young man of uncommon learning, who had been for some years a professor in the College of Glasgow, and who, having joined the Protesters, died minister of Govan in the twenty-sixth year of his age. Both Binning and Leighton were men of distinguished abilities, incomparably the best scholars of the Remonstrant party, though this party, with all its follies, contained far more erudition than is generally believed. According to Baillie, their new way of preaching, which was followed by many of the young men, was first in the ordinary way to expound and divide the text, enumerating the doctrines and uses which might be drawn from it ; but instead of adhering to these, to run out on a discourse on some common head, in a high romancing and unscriptural style, tickling the ear for the present, but leaving little or nothing to the memory or the understanding.

The sermons, both of Leighton and of Binning, have been published, and the former at least are well

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.
New mode
of preaching
introduced
by Robert
Leighton
and Hugh
Binning.

LECT. XXIV.
1643-1661. known. With respect to the latter, I have reason to believe that he was the most learned preacher in Scotland at that period. It has been said that as an orator he was superior to all his countrymen, and equal at least to the most eloquent of the English; that his diction was fluent and perspicuous, void of all affectation, and abounding in passages equally elegant and profound. In the opinion of Durham, whose popularity was very great, "there was no speaking after Hugh Binning, so great was the impression produced by all his discourses."

While the Church of Scotland was rent by divisions,^a it is wonderful that the English sectaries were never able to make any progress in this distracted country at a time when an unlimited toleration was proclaimed by the Government. The Quakers alone, a sect newly established by the fantastical visionary George Fox, a young man who professed to be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, were able to effect a permanent establishment in any part of this nation.

The power of the church courts in Scotland was completely overturned by the commissioner appointed by Cromwell. To his decision the differences between the Resolutioners and Protesters were referred; but though he was inclined to favour the latter party, he had not the address to bring their disputes to any satisfactory termination.

Restoration
of Charles
II.

Meanwhile Charles II., during his residence in France, embraced the Roman Catholic religion, but still publicly pretended to be a Protestant. On the death

^a [On the period from 1649 to 1661, the General Assembly, and of the consult Baillie's *Letters*; Guthrie's *Considerations*, &c. (1658); *Testimony of Ministers in Fife and Perth* (1658); the Appendix to this volume, No. the MS. records of the Commission of 21.)]

of Oliver Cromwell, the Scots Resolutioners and the English Presbyterians were anxious for the restoration of the King, on the footing of the Covenant. Douglas, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was the first who ventured to propose this scheme to General Monk ; but Monk at that time professed to be averse to the restoration of the King, and evaded the proposal by saying that it was his duty to obey the Parliament. At the time when Monk arrived in London, with the secret intention of raising Charles II. to the throne, a number of ministers of this Church met at Edinburgh, and resolved to send as their commissioner, to attend to the interest of the national religion, a person unhappily too well known afterwards, James Sharp, minister of Crail.

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

This man was very far from being distinguished either as a divine or as a man of letters ; but he had been repeatedly in England, and being possessed of considerable address, he had formed an extensive acquaintance with the leading men in that kingdom. His instructions were to use his utmost endeavours that the Church of Scotland might enjoy the privileges of her established judicatures, ratified by the laws of the land ; to use all prudent means for repressing the sinfulness of the late toleration, which had opened a door to many gross errors and practices in the Church ; and to obtain the restoration of some of the powers granted by the covenanting parliaments, but taken away from the Church during the usurpation. Instead of following his instructions, he betrayed the cause of the Church. His correspondence, which is still extant, was understood by his brethren in Scotland to contain the most certain proofs of his diligence and zeal to promote their

James
Sharp.

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

interests. But he artfully kept them in the dark, and prevented them from sending commissioners to the English parliament, to represent their utter aversion to the event which he led them to expect, the establishment of what he called a moderate Episcopacy (by which he probably meant the scheme of Archbishop Usher). The Church of Scotland conceived that a moderate Episcopacy was only a preliminary step to the unbounded tyranny of prelates; and when they were anxious to express this opinion, and to make conditions with the King, Sharp led them to believe that any application to his Majesty at that time would be attended with the most dangerous consequences. How they were so infatuated as to listen to his counsels, may appear now to be inconceivable. But none of them, except the most violent party, with whom they had little intercourse, had ever suspected his honesty.

Episcopacy
restored in
Scotland.

The effect of his intrigues was the invitation of the King without any terms whatever. He also prevented the reconciliation which had nearly taken place between the Remonstrants and the Resolutioners, because he had a private hatred against some of the leaders of the former party, particularly Rutherford and Guthrie, who had been his colleagues in the university of St Andrews, and both of whom had a most unfavourable opinion of his character. Some of the Scottish nobility who had approved of the scheme of introducing Episcopacy in Scotland, being aware of Sharp's consummate dissimulation, recommended him to the Earl of Clarendon as the only person capable of carrying this design into execution. He entered with great keenness into the measure, and brought down a letter from the King which flattered the ministers with the

expectation that the government of the Church of Scotland, as settled by law, should be inviolably protected and preserved. At the same time, however, a proclamation was issued against Remonstrants. The Parliament of Scotland met, and instead of taking the Covenant, as had been expected, swore an oath of allegiance which included the King's supremacy. It condemned all leagues and bonds made without the sovereign, and declared the Convention of Estates, which entered into the Solemn League and Covenant in 1644, to be void. It discharged the renewing of the Covenant, or any other public oath concerning the government of the Church or kingdom, without the King's special warrant. The synods of the Church remonstrated; but those synods which did not submit to the ruling power were dissolved. The most zealous presbyterian ministers were persecuted; and at last, on the 14th August 1661, Episcopacy was restored by a royal proclamation. The arch-traitor Sharp was elevated to the metropolitan see of St Andrews; soon after, the zealous James Guthrie,^a whom he abhorred,

LECT.
XXIV.
1643-1661.

^a [Sir George Mackenzie, in his *History*, says, that "albeit much pains was taken to make him disclaim his opinions, yet he would not desert them;" adding, "really it was to be regretted that a more tractable and quiet person had not the keeping of his great parts and courage, for he was both the secretary and champion of his party." Great as this tribute to Guthrie's talents and spirit may appear, it comes far short of the compliment which is said to have been paid to him by Sir John Nisbet and the other lawyers engaged in his defence. Guthrie, however, was not the champion of the presbyterian party in general. He was a leading man among the *Protesters*; and so obnox-

ious and offensive was his conduct to a vast majority of the Church, that [as has been mentioned above] he was deposed by the General Assembly ten years before his death. He had only two adherents in his own presbytery; and in the vast extent of country, including Fife, Kinross, Clackmannanshire, Stirlingshire, and Perthshire, where his influence and that of his principal coadjutor Rutherford was the greatest, it is known that the entire number of ministers who joined in their testimony did not exceed seventeen, or about one-tenth of the whole. The person whose ascendancy was the greatest in these districts, was Mr Wood of St Andrews, whom Baillie represents as the most service-

LECT.
XXIV.

1643-1661.

was executed as a traitor. The most vicious, idle, and negligent of the clergy were appointed the parochial ministers, and the whole order of the Church was overturned.

able man in the Church. Baillie says of Guthrie: "Though few approved his way, yet many were grieved to see a minister so severely used." Burnet, who saw him suffer, appears to have been astonished at his intrepid and tranquil deportment. He was so far from showing any fear, that he

rather expressed a contempt of death. He spoke an hour upon the ladder with the composedness of a man delivering a sermon rather than his last words. He justified all he had done, and exhorted all people to adhere to the Covenant."

LECTURE XXV.

RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF EPISCOPACY—THE NEW BISHOPS—BURNET'S CHARACTER OF THE SILENCED MINISTERS, AND OF THEIR SUCCESSORS—PENAL LAWS AGAINST ENGLISH NONCONFORMISTS—COURT OF HIGH COMMISSION IN SCOTLAND—MILITARY VIOLENCE—PROPOSALS FOR AN ACCOMMODATION—THE INDULGENCE—LAWS AGAINST CONVENTICLES—SUFFERINGS OF THE COVENANTERS—THE CAMERONIANS—THE TEST ACT—THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT.

AT the commencement of the reign of Charles II., direction was given to continue the government of the Church of Scotland by synods, presbyteries, and kirk-sessions, till his Majesty should be pleased to appoint a new form. In August 1661 he signified to the Privy Council his resolution to restore the Church, by his royal authority, to its government by bishops, as it was before the late troubles. In the month of December he gave commission to two English bishops to ordain and consecrate four prelates, who were at that time in London, and who, after undergoing these ceremonies, were to confer the same orders on such of their brethren in Scotland as were to be elevated to the episcopal dignity.

The choice of the bishops (according to Dr Burnet, whose history of those times is by far the most interesting, and one of the most correct, which has yet appeared) was, with one exception, as bad as possible.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.
Re-establishment of
Episcopacy
in Scotland.

The new
bishops.
[Burnet's
Own Times,
i. 213.]

LECT.
XXV.
1661-1690.

Sharp, the chief contriver and author of the scheme, solicited for himself the archbishopric of St Andrews, because he pretended to be afraid that if a violent man obtained the primacy, the country might be utterly ruined; and knowing the necessity of moderation, he was anxious to cover good men from a storm which might otherwise burst on them. Fairfoul, archbishop of Glasgow, was a man of scandalous life, and totally destitute of abilities. He had scarcely ever been distinguished at all, except for his jollity and buffoonery; and now, seeming to lose even these poor qualifications, he sunk into a state of stupidity approaching to idiocy. Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, was another contemptible driveller. He (as well as Sharp and Fairfoul) had pretended great zeal for the Covenant, insomuch that, before dispensing the sacrament, he had been in the habit of using a form of excommunication borrowed from the example of Nehemiah. Shaking the lap of his gown he said, "So may God shake out every man from his house that dealeth falsely in this Covenant, even thus be shaken out and emptied." The only bishop who had any character at all, was indeed a man of a very superior mind; but he was the only one whose nomination did not originate from Sharp. This was Dr Leighton, principal of the College of Edinburgh, son of the famous Nonconformist of the same name who suffered the inhuman sentence of mutilation and imprisonment for having written the book entitled *Zion's Plea against Prelacy*. Leighton, with great reluctance, accepted the episcopal dignity, and chose the obscure diocese of Dunblane, the revenue of which was very inconsiderable. He was afterwards almost constrained to accept of the archbishopric of Glasgow; but, find-

ing that his moderate and pacific proposals, without gaining any of the Presbyterians, served only to render him odious among his own brethren, he almost immediately resigned it, and passed the remainder of his days in England.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

The Act of Parliament for settling Episcopacy was framed by Sharp, and conferred on the bishops a greater degree of power than even the most violent of them ever durst assume. This act, and many others which were at that time introduced into the Scottish Parliament, were prepared by Middleton the High Commissioner, and his confederates, in the Privy Council, while they were in a state of brutal intoxication. One of these acts rescinding all that had been done in Parliament for nearly thirty years, was proposed by the Clerk-Register in a frolic, and after the draught of it, which he prepared, had been thrown aside by himself as being too extravagant to deserve a moment's deliberation, it was adopted by the Council without the alteration of a single word, and carried through Parliament by a triumphant majority.

The Church took the alarm, but it was now too late. One of the acts declared that all the incumbents who had not been presented by the patrons, since the abolition of patronage in the year 1649, should within a limited time apply for presentation from the patrons, and should obtain institution from the bishops, otherwise their churches would be declared vacant. It was foreseen that this act would exclude all the most determined Presbyterians, as it would be a renunciation of their principles to take institution from a bishop. The term of Michaelmas was fixed in the act, because those who did not submit before that period, being deprived of their benefices, would lose the whole in-

LECT. XXV.
 1661-1690. come due for that year. In the north of Scotland most of the ministers obeyed the act; in the west the ministers universally disobeyed. Two hundred churches became vacant in one day, because the incumbents would not accept institution from the bishops; and one hundred and fifty other ministers were suspended for having disregarded the summons of the bishops to attend the diocesan synods and visitations.

Bishop Burnet's character of the silenced ministers. [Burnet's Own Times, i. 253.]

A general invitation was circulated over the country to induce qualified persons to accept the vacant livings. Even by Bishop Burnet's account, a woful change now took place in the ministry. The former incumbents, most of whom in the western counties were Protesters, had generally been treated with great respect by all ranks. Many of them were related to the first families in the country, and all of them possessed remarkable dignity and decorum of manner. But in addition to the gravity and solemnity of their deportment, their diligence, their piety, and their kindness to the people, secured for them universal esteem. It is said that few of them were distinguished by their learning; but it was a much rarer distinction to be illiterate. They were all tolerably well acquainted with the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages; they were all instructed in the controversies of the times; they were all familiar with the system of divinity; and they had all acquired by constant exercise a habit of expressing their thoughts with ease and readiness. Their sermons were almost all constructed on one plan, enumerating and confirming the various doctrines which might be drawn from every text, and then applying these doctrines in what they called uses of instruction, exhortation, trial, and comfort. If a man were ever so expert at illustrating the doctrines of

religion, he might be called a teacher ; but he was no preacher at all unless he was likewise powerful in application. It was also thought indispensable to preach to the times, to point out the national sins, and to lift up a warning against the corruptions propagated under the influence of public men. In some of these peculiarities they proceeded to an unwarrantable extreme ; but their conduct and their principles ingratiated them with all the serious part of the community. The discipline to which their congregations were subject by the laws of the Church, and which they were careful to execute with impartiality, was exceedingly strict. Meetings of the kirk-sessions were held every week, and the minister always demanded of the elders if they knew any scandal or scandalous persons in the parish, as Sabbath-breakers, swearers, blasphemers, fornicators, drunkards, or other offenders. All such persons, on confession or proof of their guilt, were not only severely rebuked in presence of the session, and required to pay a penalty to the use of the poor,^a but likewise compelled to make public profession of their repentance in presence of the congregation, and in certain cases they were imprisoned by the magistrates, who in towns were generally elders or deacons.

The new incumbents were in all respects the very reverse of these sober, upright, and conscientious men. Like their patrons who made a mock at sin, they gave every indulgence to the immorality of the great ; and as most of them were capable of running to every excess of riot, they could not with a good grace, or with any good effect, rebuke the vices of men of meaner station. Burnet, who lived among them, and knew many of them well, says that “ they were generally very mean

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

And of their
successors.[Burnet's
Hist. of his
Own Times,
i. 260.]^a Appendix, No. XVI.

LECT. and despicable in all respects, the worst preachers
 XXV. he ever heard, ignorant to a reproach, and many of
 1661-1690. them openly vicious." "They were a disgrace to their
 order, and were indeed the dregs and refuse of the
 northern parts. Those of them who were above con-
 tempt or scandal were men of such violent tempers
 that they were as much hated as the others were de-
 spised. This," he adds, "was the fatal beginning of
 restoring Episcopacy in Scotland, of which few of
 the bishops seemed to have any sense."

The Non-
 conformists
 in England.

In England matters were conducted in a manner
 equally oppressive to the Presbyterians. By the Cor-
 poration Act all persons appointed to the magistracy
 or any place of trust were required to abjure the
 Solemn League and Covenant as unlawful, and to take
 the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of
 England. A conference between the episcopal and
 presbyterian divines was appointed to be held at the
 Bishop of London's lodgings at the Savoy; but it
 terminated without giving the smallest satisfaction,
 as the bishops had resolved to make no concession.
 By the Act of Uniformity brought into Parliament
 about the end of the year 1661, and passed about
 the middle of May following, it was ordained that all
 ministers should subscribe the Liturgy, renounce the
 Solemn League and Covenant, obtain license from the
 archbishop or bishop, and publicly before the congrega-
 tion declare their unfeigned assent to all things
 prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. All this
 was to be done, on pain of deprivation, before the 17th
 of August, the Sunday before St Bartholomew's Day;
 and as the Book of Common Prayer was then under-
 going alterations, none of which had transpired, the
 clergy were in fact required to subscribe a book which

they had never seen. Scarcely any of the copies were ready when the day arrived. Bartholomew's Day was fixed on for the same reason as Michaelmas Day in Scotland, "because," says Burnet, "if they were then deprived, they would lose the profits of the whole year, since the tithes are commonly due at Michaelmas." The Presbyterians, remembering what a Bartholomew's Day had been held at Paris ninety years before, did not scruple to compare the one to the other. The truth is, that not one divine in ten, at a considerable distance from London, could have perused the book before the expiration of the period allowed for that purpose; but the matter, says the same author, was driven on with such precipitancy, that it seems to have been expected that the clergy should subscribe implicitly to a book which they had never seen; and this was done by too many, according to the account of the bishops themselves. Besides declaring their entire approbation of all the rites of the Church of England, and abjuring the Solemn League, and the lawfulness of bearing defensive arms against the King, those who had not been episcopally ordained were to be re-ordained, and to take the oath of canonical obedience. Not one alteration in the Book of Common Prayer, which had been suggested by the Presbyterians, was adopted, and many of the corrections (as they were called) were thought to render it more exceptionable. The promises made to the Presbyterians before the King arrived in the country were thus violated—the zealous exertions of Presbyterians to promote the King's restoration were thus rewarded; and for the purpose of prevailing on Parliament to proscribe this numerous class by the operation of a law almost unexampled in its severity, the base device of ascribing to them plots

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

[Burnet's
Own Times,
i., 302.]

[Ib., i. 303.]

LECT.
XXV.
1661-1690.

and conspiracies dangerous to the State was put in practice by the persons at the head of public affairs.

The Presbyterians in the Church and universities of England, after consulting with one another, resolved to cling together, and to refuse compliance with a law which they could not in conscience obey. Some of the most eminent, for the purpose of making their resolution generally known, resigned their appointments a considerable time before. When the day arrived, 2000 ministers resigned their charges, or refused to accept of any on the terms of the Act of Uniformity. The ministers forcibly ejected were, according to the statement of Mr Locke, learned, pious, and orthodox divines; and the farewell sermons of many of them left an impression upon the minds of their disconsolate flocks, which no time was ever able to efface.

There was no small difficulty experienced in filling the vacancies. Many of the persons newly ordained were quite illiterate, many others were too young, and more than a thousand are said to have been of profligate lives. This new set of men began a new way of preaching, formed upon the speculations of the ancient profane writers, and upon the flowery descriptions contained in the modern romances, with scarcely a word of gospel truth. For a while this flimsy oratory caught the fancies of the young; but it was disgusting to all men of sense and sound principle, and at last it became wearisome and insipid to the frivolous minds which had at first applauded it. One of the pleasantest topics with those who had nothing else to say, was to rail at the schismatics and fanatics, who were now reduced to absolute want. A few of the persecuted ministers practised occasional conformity, and a few of them, whose scruples had never

been so great as those of their brethren, remained in the Church ; but the government was determined rather to compel them to obey its dictates than to allure them by gentle methods, and enacted a series of penal laws, of which, for the sake of connection, I shall now briefly take notice.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

I have already mentioned the Corporation Act and the Act of Uniformity, the former of which took away from all the Nonconforming people the power of serving their country in the lowest offices of trust ; and the second of which silenced and deprived of their support all the Nonconformist ministers throughout England. The Conventicle Act, passed in the year 1664, declared the Act of the 35th of Queen Elizabeth to be in full force, condemning to banishment, and in case of return, to death, all persons who peremptorily refused to attend the Established Church ; and farther provided that any person above the age of sixteen, who should be present at a meeting under pretence of any exercise of religion in any other manner than is allowed by the Liturgy, where five or more persons besides the family assembled, should, for the first offence, be imprisoned for three months, or pay £5 ; for the second, suffer six months' imprisonment, or pay £10 ; and for the third, be banished to some of the American plantations seven years, or pay £100 ; and, in case of return or escape, be adjudged felons, and suffer death without benefit of clergy. The conviction of such persons was not placed in the hands of a jury, but in those of a single justice of peace. The act was executed with a mitigated rigour in all parts of the country ; and as if it had not been sufficiently severe, some additional clauses were annexed to it seven years after-

Penal laws
against the
English
Noncon-
formists.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

wards. In the year 1665 an act was passed, commonly called the Oxford Act, requiring all Nonconformist ministers to take an oath that they would not at any time attempt any alterations either in Church or State, and prohibiting all who did not take this oath to come within five miles of any city, town, or borough, or within five miles of any parish or town where they have preached, upon forfeiture, for every such offence, of £40; and any two justices of the peace were empowered to commit the offender against this act to prison for six months, without bail. There were a few of the Nonconformist ministers who took the oath, but the great body of them refused it, and were compelled to sequestrate themselves from their former homes, or to incur the penalty of imprisonment. In the year 1671 an Indulgence was published by the King, suspending the laws against Nonconformists, and allowing persons of this description to attend divine service, performed by teachers approved by his Majesty, and in licensed places, which should be open and free to all persons. Many ministers took out these licenses. The House of Commons, however, declared that penal laws in matters ecclesiastical could not be suspended except by Act of Parliament; and the King recalled his Declaration when he found that the House of Commons would not pass a money bill unless he complied with their desire. The real object of the Declaration of Indulgence had been to establish the King's absolute and unquestionable prerogative in matters of religion. The Commons afterwards themselves brought in a bill to give relief to the Protestant dissenters, which, after it had been twice read, was defeated by the machinations of the bishops,

in conjunction with the King and the cabal at the head of the government.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

In the same year (1673), with the view of excluding Papists and Jesuits from places of trust and profit, and from all military commands, the celebrated Test Act was brought into Parliament, and after considerable opposition on the part of the ministers of the Crown, was passed into a law. It required all persons bearing any office of trust or profit publicly to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in some parish church, and to declare that they disowned the doctrine of transubstantiation. This law had little effect on the dissenters at that time, as none of them held any places of trust. During the whole reign of Charles II. the English dissenters continued to be treated with the most inhuman cruelty; they were beset by informers and spies, and their private meetings were punished as if they had been the most seditious and illegal acts.

The Presbyterians of Scotland were persecuted with still greater barbarity. A Court of High Commission was again established under the auspices of Sharp, consisting of nine prelates and thirty-five other members. But a bishop with four others constituted a quorum, and the times and places of meeting were left entirely to the discretion of the judge. The method of proceeding was altogether arbitrary, disdaining all the usual formalities and maxims of law. The persons brought before it were generally seized without being informed for what cause; they were often prosecuted without any written indictment, and when a specific accusation was brought against

Court of
High Com-
mission in
Scotland.

LECT.
XXV.
1661-1690.

them, the judges did not think it necessary to adhere to it, but admitted new matter at the time of the trial. Witnesses were sometimes suborned by the judges; and in many cases no witnesses were called at all. Ensnaring and captious questions were put, and if these were answered satisfactorily, or if the allegations of their adversaries were disproved, the accused might still be condemned for refusing to take the oath of allegiance, or for hesitating to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the King. In many cases the questions were such as could not be answered to the satisfaction of the judges by any honest man. "What think you of the government?" was one of these puzzling interrogations. No person was allowed to offer any defence till he took the oath of supremacy, or some other engagement which his conscience disapproved. The consequence of refusal was either imprisonment or banishment, or a heavy pecuniary fine. Conviction of the offence libelled was invariably followed with the utmost severity of punishment, even when the accused was induced to confess by the promise of being dismissed with impunity. Some of the parishioners of Ancrum, after the banishment of their minister, because he declined taking the oath of supremacy, except with an explanation, remonstrated against the admission of a curate of infamous character, who at the same time enjoyed two other livings. They were brought before the High Commission, and confessed that they had expressed their dissatisfaction at the intrusion of a man whom they thought unworthy of the charge. The Commission immediately sentenced them, as contemners of the ordinances, to be scourged through the town, stigmatised (that is, branded with a red-

hot iron), and thereafter imprisoned, and with the first ship conveyed to Barbadoes. For the same opposition to the entry of the curate of Ancrum, two brothers were soon afterwards transported to Barbadoes, and their sister barbarously scourged through the town of Jedburgh. This is but a slight instance of their procedure at an early period, during which this Court of High Commission and the Privy Council divided the exercise of illegal oppression. At length the lay commissioners, shocked at the excessive cruelty of the bishops, refused to take any part in the proceedings; the people, preferring the risk of being outlawed, refused to obey the summons of the judges; and the Commission, in the course of two years, was allowed to expire.

The abolition of this court, however, was not the dawn of better times. The western part of Scotland was exposed to all the fury of military violence. Sir James Turner, an Englishman, was sent with a considerable body of troops into Dumfriesshire, Galloway, and Ayrshire. Wherever the people deserted their parish churches, they were fined, imprisoned, plundered, beaten, wounded, and hunted through the mountains like wild beasts. The clergy stimulated the soldiers to all these acts of oppression and inhumanity; and the soldiers were allowed to act both as judges and executioners. Though innumerable families were dispersed and ruined, though the prisons were crowded with the victims of clerical jealousy, and though comfort and peace was banished from the whole country, Turner declared afterwards that he was never able to satisfy the bishops that his severities were sufficient.

After a time the peasantry, driven to distraction, began to resist, and obtained possession of the person

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

Military
violence in
the west of
Scotland.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

of the commander under whose violence the country had groaned for two or three years ; but on discovering that, with all his harshness, he had been far from acting up to the full measure of his instructions, they spared his life. They now marched towards Edinburgh, without disorder, under the command of two inexperienced officers, and, increasing in numbers as they advanced, they renewed the Covenant, and published a declaration that they did not rise in arms against the King, but that they only desired deliverance from the tyranny of the bishops, and the restoration of their own ministers, and the form of Church government established by the Covenant. Their force at one time amounted to two thousand ; but when they arrived at Colinton, two miles from Edinburgh, more than one-half of the number had withdrawn, probably in obedience to the proclamation which required them to lay down their arms within twenty-four hours, though it contained no assurance of indemnity. General Dalziel, who commanded the royal forces at Glasgow, advanced to meet them, and agreed upon a cessation of arms till the following day, that they might have an opportunity of presenting their petition to the Council. In the mean time an attempt was made to surprise them, while they were worn out with fatigue, watching, and hunger. They began to retreat ; but when they found the enemy pressing close upon them, they drew up their diminished line of eight hundred men on the south of Pentland Hills, and in successive attacks repulsed their opponents. The sun had set in a cold frosty evening at the end of November, when the last encounter took place. The insurgents were completely broken and routed, forty were killed, and

one hundred and thirty taken prisoners. Almost all the rest escaped unhurt ; but the prisoners were condemned without mercy at the instigation of the unmanly prelates. Above twenty were executed in Edinburgh, thirty-five were hanged at their own doors in the country, and many of them were tortured before their death, to compel them to discover the authors of the rebellion ; the other prisoners were banished. The numerous and frequent executions at length shocked and alarmed the Court, and an order came down to the Council to proceed no further. This order was withheld by Sharp and the Archbishop of Glasgow till their bloodthirsty vengeance was satiated with the torments and death of a youth named Mac-kail, who had left the insurgents before they reached Colinton, and whose real offence was an expression in a sermon, which was supposed to allude to the oppressions of the government. He had said that in former times the Church had suffered from a Pharaoh on the throne, a Haman in the State, and a Judas in the Church ; and as Sharp began very early to be known by the name of Judas, the application was understood to be made to him.

LECT.
XXV.
1661-1690.

The west was now again surrendered to military outrage. The country was burdened with heavy contributions to support the cavalry, and at the same time the soldiers were permitted to take free quarter, and to demand whatever they chose. Many persons were put to the sword,—others were crowded together in dungeons, so that there was not room for them even to stand,—some were shot or hanged without even the form of a trial,—some were tortured to death because they would not inform where their nearest relations were concealed,—and the brutal agents of

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

these horrid atrocities were allowed by their commanders to commit every revolting crime which licentiousness, or avarice, or malice could dictate. The judges partook of the iniquitous rigour which disgraced the army. In opposition to the laws of the land, they tried and condemned many gentlemen of property in their absence, and conferred their estates on the military leaders or the officers of state; and knowing that these proceedings were illegal, they applied to Parliament for their confirmation. Every prisoner against whom there was no proof, was required to abjure the Covenant, and if he refused, he was transported to the English plantations, and condemned to slavery. There was no statute authorising such a penalty; but the King's instructions were at that time equivalent to law.

Proposals
for an ac-
commoda-
tion.

On the fall of Lord Clarendon, a milder government was for a season introduced into Scotland. Sharp was ordered to withdraw from the management of public affairs. He and the Archbishop of Glasgow had intended to perpetuate the military government in the western counties, for the double purpose of oppressing the disaffected, and enriching their own adherents who were placed in the command of the troops. The new ministry removed the army from the west, and required the suspected, instead of abjuring the Covenant, to enter into bonds.

In the year 1670, the Bishop of Dunblane proposed an accommodation which was expected to satisfy the more moderate Presbyterians. His plan may have been in a great measure dictated by his humanity; but in spite of all the praise which has sometimes been bestowed upon it, there can be no doubt that its

object was to allure the existing race of Presbyterians to the acknowledgment of Episcopacy, in the expectation that the opposition to the government of prelates would die away with that generation. The dissenters, on coming to presbyteries and synods, were not to be required to renounce their opinions about church government. They were to have free votes in the management of church affairs ; intrants were to be solemnly ordained at the parish churches, and not at the cathedrals ; and at their admission they were not to be engaged to any canonical oath.

If these articles, in which, however, the prelates were by no means agreed, had been acceptable to the Presbyterians, it would not have been difficult to come to an understanding with respect to the mode of worship. The bishops had never so much as attempted to introduce the liturgy, or the ceremonies which had been so offensive in the days of Charles I. The communion was administered without kneeling, the sign of the cross was omitted in baptism. There were no altars nor surplices, and the service was in all respects the same with that of the Presbyterians, except that the Episcopalians used the Lord's Prayer and the doxology, and required the Creed to be recited by parents when their children were baptised. Instead of lecturing in the forenoon, the reading of the Scriptures before sermon was introduced ; but this having been the revival of an ancient practice authorised in the Directory, though in a great measure superseded by the manner of lecturing generally used, could not be objected to by those who were most tenacious of the presbyterian forms, except in so far as it was provided that this part of the

LECT. XXV.
1661-1690. public exercises of religion should be performed by readers, whose office had been abolished by the General Assembly.

The terms of accommodation proposed by Leighton were, however, unanimously rejected as being altogether inconsistent with presbyterian principles. It was objected to the scheme that the presbyteries were to be dependent on the commission of the bishops; that they had no power of ordination or jurisdiction, which was reserved by the bishops themselves; that they had no ruling elders; and that they would probably have been led by gradual steps to acquiesce entirely in that government of the Church which all the dissenters now reprobated as sinful.

The Indulgence.

About the same time, another remedy for the divisions of the Church was proposed and partially adopted. A part of the ejected clergy, who had lived peaceably, were permitted to preach in the parish churches, and to exercise other functions of the ministry, on condition that they attended the Presbyterians, and abstained from speaking of public affairs. On the other hand, as it was said that by this provision all pretence for conventicles was taken away, his Majesty's pleasure was to proceed against all who held these assemblies as seditious persons. About forty ministers were in this way restored to their churches, and at first they seemed to be exceedingly acceptable to their congregations. But those who rejected the conditions exclaimed against the Indulgence, as a stragem devised to establish an Erastian dependence on the civil magistrate. The people soon began to despise the indulged pastors, who, being restrained from uttering their sentiments freely, were denominated dumb dogs. Conventicles, instead of being suppressed

by this device, now increased rapidly ; and when Lauderdale, who had hitherto suggested the measures which were generally found most acceptable to the country, unhappily fell under the influence of the ambitious and unprincipled Countess of Dysart, whom he afterwards married, a series of acts was procured from the Parliament, destructive to the safety and liberty of the country.

One of these acts declared that the government and regulation of the Church was an inherent right of the crown, and that whatever his Majesty should enact with respect to ecclesiastical matters, meetings, or persons, should acquire the force and operation of laws. This was intended for the purpose of recommending Lauderdale to the Duke of York, the heir-apparent to the throne, by providing a discretionary power to introduce into the Church whatever religion he chose ; and as the duke was a bigoted Papist, it could scarcely be doubted what his choice would prove. Another act ordained an established militia of 22,000 men, to march wherever the honour and safety of the King might require, or wherever the Privy Council should direct. The army was intended chiefly for the dispersion of conventicles and the suppression of all tumultuous risings. In the following year, 1670, a most severe statute was made against conventicles. All who performed divine service in any house (except their own, while no other persons were present) were subject to oppressive fines. Field conventicles were interdicted as rebellious. All who preached, prayed, or expounded the Scriptures at any of these meetings, were to be punished with death and confiscation of goods ; and all who attended were to be severely fined and punished as seditious persons. A reward of five

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

Severe laws
against con-
venticles in
1670.

LECT. XXV.
 1661-1690. hundred merks was offered for their persons, or indemnity for their slaughter ; and whoever refused to inform against them upon oath, might be punished by imprisonment, arbitrary fines, or transportation to the colonies. The King was said to have disapproved of part of this sanguinary law, which declared preaching, praying, and expounding the Scriptures to be treasonable ; but he never interposed to procure its repeal, or to prevent its renewal in the following Parliament.

Sufferings of
 the Cove-
 nanters at
 this period.

The people now frequented the conventicles more than ever ; and to secure their persons against aggression they now attended in arms. The fiery rapacity and tyranny of Lauderdale became every day more intolerable. Persecution, violent as it had been in the hands of the prelates, was now much more severe when it was made a source of emolument to himself and his friends. When offenders declined to appear in Council, letters of intercommuning were published to outlaw the absent, and to subject all who had conversed with them as friends, or performed to them any kind office, to the same punishment as was due to the offenders themselves. Seventeen thousand persons in the west were oppressed for absence from Church, or attending the conventicles. Many of those who were outlawed, by being excluded from all human intercourse except with those who were liable to the same punishment, acquired a desperation of character and a ferocity of manner which rendered them truly formidable. The preachers and their attendants were now driven to the inaccessible mountains ; and vast numbers, far from any human dwelling, frequented these meetings, which were guarded by patrols of horse to prevent any sudden alarm from the King's troops. Many bloody encounters took place between them and

the military, and all who were taken prisoners were either delivered up as recruits for the service of France, or subjected to some more horrid punishment.

LECT.
XXV.
1661-1690.

In the year 1678, the men of property in the west were required to enter into bonds, under severe penalties, undertaking to prevent not only their families and their domestics, but their tenants, and the families and servants of their tenants, from attending field-preachers, and from giving succour to intercommuned persons. Most of the landlords engaged to assist the officers of justice in executing the laws; but they declined the bonds as illegal, and represented the impossibility of restraining their tenants and their servants. Upon this refusal, six thousand Highlanders and four thousand troops, chiefly English and Irish, were introduced into the southern and western counties, and encouraged by a previous indemnity to commit every excess. The whole country was plundered and ravaged; the people were tortured to discover where their wealth was concealed; they were robbed of their clothes and furniture, which were conveyed on their own horses to the mountains. When they were thus impoverished and oppressed, it was expected and wished by the Court that they would rise in arms.

The Covenanters were indeed driven to distraction and despair; but the forbearance which they manifested is almost incredible. They were at last goaded to resistance by the measures adopted by the Court, in consequence of the assassination of Archbishop Sharp. The whole body of the fanatics were represented, by the proclamation issued against the murderers, as being implicated in the crime. Field and armed conventicles were declared to be treason, and all who attended them were ordered (in terms sufficiently intelligible) to be

Battle of
Bothwell
Bridge.

LECT.
XXV.
1661-1690.

put to the sword. An accidental insurrection of about eighty individuals, on the anniversary of the Restoration, burnt the acts in favour of Episcopacy in the streets of Ruglen, and proclaimed their testimony against the corruptions of the times. The commander of the forces at Glasgow was ordered to seize or to extirpate the rebels. Some of the Scottish lords undertook to disperse the insurgents without arms, if their oppressors were removed and their sufferings mitigated; but through the villanous intrigues of Lauderdale, the Duke of Monmouth was not even permitted to negotiate. His instructions were not to treat, but to attack the rebels wherever they were to be found. At one time four thousand of them were brought to the field; but while their own divisions remain unadjusted, they were attacked by Monmouth at Bothwell Bridge, where, after an obstinate but unskilful resistance, they were totally routed. Three or four hundred were killed on the field. Twelve hundred surrendered at discretion, some of whom were executed, and the remainder confined five months in Greyfriars' churchyard, without any covering to shelter them from the inclemency of the weather. Several hundreds were shipped for the American plantations, but the vessel was wrecked in the Orkneys; and though they might all have been saved, the master of the ship closed the hatches upon them, so that more than two hundred perished. This savage, who had contracted to transport them for a certain sum, was afterwards indemnified by the government for the loss of his vessel; and suspicions were entertained that in devoting his prisoners to death he acted agreeably to his instructions.

Confiscations now became general all over the country. The Court of Justiciary made a circuit in

the west. The curates gave information against their parishioners. All who did not freely surrender were accused of the murder of Sharp, or their share in the insurrection. The innocent, if they did not compound, were committed to prison till they gave security; the absent were attainted; and the servants of the Crown were enriched by the multiplication of forfeitures.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

About this time a small but violent party arose among the Presbyterians, which renounced allegiance to the King. They were called Cameronians, from Richard Cameron, one of their first preachers. He published a declaration, at the market-cross of Sanquhar, that Charles Stewart, by his perjury in breaking the Covenant, by his tyrannical government and usurpation over the civil and religious liberties of the country, had forfeited his right to the crown. A party of them, not amounting to one hundred, was pursued to Airmoss, in Kyle, and was there completely discomfited. Cameron was killed on the field, and all the prisoners were executed. The Duke of York now assumed the administration of Scottish affairs, and sanctioned the most bloody and relentless severities. All who were brought before the Council were tortured, and during the intervals were harassed by ensnaring questions, such as, "Was the rising at Bothwell Bridge rebellion and a sin against God?" "Was the killing of the Bishop horrid murder?" "Is King Charles a king or a tyrant?" The Duke of York, it is said, indulged, without any appearance of concern, in contemplating the torture of the prisoners, while many of the other councillors, not remarkable for their clemency, recoiled from the spectacle.

The Came-
ronians.

In the year 1681 the Test was introduced into Scotland, and was violently opposed, even by those

The Test
Act.

LECT.
XXV.

1661-1690.

who had hitherto submitted to the established order of things. It was necessary to take it in its literal acceptation. Eighty of the clergy refused it, and resigned their livings. The Earl of Argyle subscribed it with an explanation, which was at first received ; but he was next day accused, on the ground of having committed perjury and treason by depraving the laws ; and, having been brought to trial, was convicted and condemned. He escaped from prison, but having been taken prisoner four years afterwards, he was executed in the most barbarous and ignominious manner. A system of extortion was pursued for augmenting the public revenue and enriching the creatures of the Court ; and by one circuit of the Court of Justiciary, in 1684, 2000 fugitives were prosecuted. During the same year the Council voted an absolute massacre of all who refused to disown an admonitory declaration which had been addressed by the persecuted outlaws to their oppressors. Military executions had become common in the fields, and it is not possible to think without horror of the numberless atrocities which were committed.

The Revolution.

Charles II. died suddenly, February 6, 1685, a professed votary of the Church of Rome. On the succession of James, the massacres continued to increase, with every circumstance of aggravated malignity. An attempt was made to introduce Popery ; and if the King's measures had succeeded, the Episcopalian Church would soon have been reduced to the same degradation and ruin to which the Presbyterian was doomed. But after this tyrannical bigot had exhausted all his efforts to annihilate the liberty of the three kingdoms during a dismal period of three years, a confederacy was formed against him ; and his son-

in-law, the Prince of Orange, afterwards William III., was invited into the country. The kingdom of Scotland, following the example of England, published a declaration of rights, and offered the crown to their majesties William and Mary. In July 1689 an Act of Parliament was passed, abolishing prelacy ; and, in the following year, the Act of Supremacy was rescinded, and the presbyterian ministers restored. The Act of the 7th June 1690, ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling presbyterian church government, rescinded all acts of Parliament in favour of Episcopacy, and revised and confirmed the Act of James VI., passed in 1592, entitled “Ratification of the Liberty of the True Kirk.” On the footing of these two Acts, and the Act of Queen Anne for securing the Protestant religion and presbyterian church government, our National Establishment now stands ; and from that period, though this Church has not been exempted from dissensions, it has enjoyed a degree of security and tranquillity to which it was formerly a stranger.

LECT.
XXV.

661-1690.

APPENDIX.

No. X.—(Volume I., page 260.)

GEORGE BUCHANAN.

GEORGE BUCHANAN was not, as is commonly imagined, a student in St Salvator's College. In the year 1525, the names Patricius Balquhannan and Georgius Balquhannan both stand in the list *Incorporatorum in Pædagogio*; that is, of those who were matriculated in the seminary, afterwards distinguished by the name of St Mary's, or New College; which seems to have been for the first time designed *New* in 1538, when its foundation was new-modelled by Archbishop James Beaton, its greatest benefactor. John Mair was one of the masters in the Pedagogy when Buchanan entered this college. Mair had become a member of the university only a year or two before, as appears from the following entry in one of the records of the university: "Die nono mensis Junii anno Dni Im.V^cXXIII. incorporatus erat venerabilis vir Mg^r nr Mg^r Johannes Major, Doctor Theologus Parisiensis, et Thesaur^{us} Capellæ Regiæ. Eodem die incorporati sunt Mg^r Patricius Hamilton et Mg^r Ro^{tus} Lauder in nra universitate." This Patricius Hamilton was the Abbot of Fearn, who was burnt as a heretic four years afterwards. That Mair was not at this time a member of St Salvator's College (as has been generally believed), is evident from his appointment, in 1523 and 1524, as one of the deputies who assisted the rector in the annual visitation of that college. The following minute mentions his nomination in 1523: "Congregatione Univ^{er}itatis Sancti Andr. in eccl^{ia} Stⁱ Johannis Evang^{el}icæ Pæda-

^a Notices of George Buchanan, communicated by the Rev. John Lee, M.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St Mary's College, and Rector of the University of St Andrews. (Dr Irving's *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of George Buchanan*, 2d edit.; Appendix, p. 373; Edin., 1817, 8vo.)

gogii intra civitatem Sancti Andr. die XVII. Mensis Ja^{rii} anno dñi Im.V^c.XXIII. in qua congrega. pro electione deputatorum ad visitandum Collegium S^{ti} Salvatoris, de mandato egregii viri Mg^{ri} Georgii Lockhart, Rectoris dicti Univ^{tis} electi fuerunt per Univ^{er}^{tem} congregatam venerabiles et egregii viri Mg^{ri} Mg^r Johannes Mayr, Thesaur^{ius} Capellæ Regiæ Strevilens. venerabilis vir Mg^r Georgius Fern, Præcentor Brechinens. Mg^r Johannes Lockhart, Rector de Innerkeithe, una cum D^{no} Rectore Universitatis, pro visitatione autedieta, per nationes Laudoniæ, Albanicæ, Anguscæ et Britannicæ, ad visitand. præfatum collegium hoc anno instante vigesimo tertio, ut moris est." The name of John Mair disappears from the registers of the university in 1525, and does not occur again till the year 1532, when he is mentioned as one of the rector's assessors, without any other official designation. An instrument of sasine still extant, of the date 21st January 1532, styles him "Vicarius de Dunloppie Glasg. dioces." In 1533 he became provost of St Salvator's (Ecclesiæ Collegiatæ Divi Salvatoris præpositus), having succeeded Hugh Spens, who had possessed that dignity nearly thirty years. Mair continued to hold his office till 1549, about which time he was succeeded by Martin Balfour.

While Mair was provost of St Salvator's, the College of St Mary had for its principals Robert Bannerman, Archibald Hay, and John Douglas, all secular priests; and St Leonard's College was under the superintendence of a succession of learned men, all of them regular clergy; namely, Thomas Cunningham, Alexander Young, John Annan, and John Law. This last was succeeded by John Duncanson, one of the brethren of the Augustinian priory, who became principal of St Leonard's College in 1556; and who, having been converted to the reformed religion, retained his office in the college, as his share of the rents of the convent. Whether he acted as minister of St Leonard's Church is not certain, but as he was in orders, and as St Leonard's was a parish long before the Reformation, it might be presumed that he did, if it did not appear from the minutes of the kirk-session of St Andrews, that, immediately after the Reformation, the inhabitants of St Leonard's were in the habit of attending the Trinity Church of St Andrews. When Duncanson retired from the principality in 1566, he gave to the college a great cup or maizer, double gilt, and other articles, to the

value of 30 pounds, also 20 pounds to purchase coals, 100 pounds to the new work of the college, with 50 pounds of his yearly pension for the abbey of St Andrews. In addition to these donations, amounting to 200 pounds, he gave two tin flagons for the use of the college, and (what appears to have been much more valuable) all his books, both great and small.

The office of principal of St Leonard's College is thus described in the original statutes enacted by the prior John Hepburn, and confirmed in the year 1544 by James, commendator of the priory, and Alexander (Myln), abbot of Cambuskenneth, administrator, with the approbation and consent of John Winram, subprior, John Annand, principal, Thomas Fyff, sacrist, Jo. Lamont, provisor, and Jas. Wilkie, David Guild, John Scheill, and David Gardyn, regents. "Volumus ex fratrum nostrorum Collegio, viz. ex Capitulo Sancti Andreæ per priorem ejusdem, perpetuis futuris temporibus, unum aliquem canonicum, virum gravem, prudentem et doctum, in sacris literis doctorem, licentiatum aut bachalarium, seu alium quemvis eruditum ex Capitulo Sancti Andreæ canonicum, eligi et nominari, ac dicto nostro pauperum Collegio præfici, locique magistrum principalem nuncupari, cui omnes alii presbyteri, regentes et discipuli humiliter obediant, ad ejus monita et directiones diligenter auscultent, correctiones pro delictis ab ipso benigne suscipiant, eumque in ea quæ decet reverentia semper et ubique tueantur et habeant. Singuli etiam loci officarii sibi quotiescunque voluerit de bonis collegii rationem reddant. Ipse vero semel in anno domino priori computum de rebus ipsis exhibere teneatur. Et in festis majoribus vespervas cum missa, et collectas post salve cantabit, omnibusque feriis quartis et sextis presbyteris, regentibus, et aliis quibuscunque interesse volentibus, lectionem in sacris literis aut in speculativa theologia scite et mature docebit. . . . Ipse etiam principalis, presbyteri et regentes pro suis laboribus habebunt intra locum cameras et victum quotidianum honeste ut decet. . . . Et præter victum ac ea quæ ei debentur ex monasterio, principalis habebit pro stipendio annuo decem libras, una cum juvene servitore, qui scyphario in magna mensa adjumento sit," &c. The original statutes continued in force after the Reformation (till the year 1579), in so far as they were consistent with the purity of religion.

(George Buchanan succeeded John Duncanson as principal of St

Leonard's in the year 1566. The following is the earliest notice of him which occurs in the rector's books :—

“Septimus decimus Rectoratus Magistri Johannis Douglasii, præpositi Novi Collegii Mariani, 1556.

“Electores hoc anno fuerunt viri præclari, ex Laudonia Magister Jacobus Vilkie, Regens Collegii Leonardini, ex Albania Magister Johannes Lamond, ejusdem Collegii Provisor, ex Angusia Magister Gulielmus Skein, juris licentiatus, ex Britannia Magister Georgius Buchananus, Collegii Leonardini Gymnasiarcha, hujus seculi Poetarum facile princeps. Assessores ex Laudonia Magister Johannes Vinram, superintendens Fyffia, Magister Jacobus Vilkie, et Magister Alexander Hammyltoun, junior, Regentes, ex Albania Magister Gulielmus Ramsay,^a secundus principalis magister Collegii Salvatoriani, et Magister Joannes Brown, causarum procurator, ex Angusia Mg^r Gulielmus Skein, juris licentiatus, Magister David Guild, tertius magister principalis Collegii Salvatoriani, et Magister Johannes Carnegie, Novi Collegii regens, ex Britannia Magister Georgius Buchananus, Magister Johannes Rutherford, Collegii Salvatoriani præpositus, et Magister Robertus Hammyltoun, minister verbi Dei, &c.

“Deputati per Universitatem designati, qui vicem Rectoris absentis gerant hoc anno, fuerunt viri præstantissimi Magister Johannes Vinram, superintendens, &c. Mg^r Georgius Buchananus, gymnasiarcha, &c., Magister Joannes Rethurfurd, præpositus, &c. et Magister Robertus Hammyltoun, minister, &c.”

The minute on occasion of the next election of the rector in 1567, is exactly the same as in 1566. It is remarkable that no students are enrolled as belonging to St Leonard's College either of those years, though the numbers both in St Mary's and St Salvator's are considerable. In 1568 more students entered St Leonard's than even St Mary's, which had generally been the most numerously attended of all the colleges; and in 1569, the numbers enrolled for the first time in St Leonard's were twenty-four, while those entering St Mary's were only eleven, and those at St Salvator's only eight. Buchanan's name appears in this book for the last time in 1568.

^a John Rutherford and William Ramsay, both of whom are named in the first edition of the *Memoir of Buchanan*, p. 81, are frequently mentioned in the

university books. The one was minister of Cults as well as provost of St Salvator's College, and the other was minister of Kembach.

His name is mentioned, as before, among the electors, the assessors, and the deputies of the rector; and each of these three times he is called "Poetarum nostræ memoriæ facile princeps." Buchanan's colleagues in St Leonard's College were James Wilkie, eldest regent, and vicar of Eglisgreg, Nicol Dalgliesh, Robert Wilkie, and William Collace.

The masters in St Mary's College in 1569 were Jo. Douglas, principal; Robert Hamilton, licentiate in divinity, second master; Archibald Hamilton, bachelor in divinity, third master; William Skene, professor of law, and commissary of St Andrews (brother of Sir John Skene, the lawyer, who had himself been a regent in 1564-65); Alexander Hamilton, John Hamilton, James Hamilton, George Gillespie, and John Carnegie.

The principal, professors, and regents of St Salvator's were John Rutherford, William Ramsay, David Guild, James Martyn, John Kerr, Thomas Brown, and John Arthur.

In the dean of faculty's register, the name Magister Georgius Buchananus occurs three times, viz., 2d Nov. 1567, 3d Nov. 1568, and 2d Nov. 1569, always as one of the dean's assessors. He was never either rector or dean of the Faculty of Arts.

In the register of the Faculty quæstor's accounts, from Nov. 1566 to Nov. 1567, he signs the discharge as one of the auditors. Thomas Buchanan,^a one of the regents of St Salvator's College, had been elected quæstor for that year; but as he left the college in the course of the year, James Martyn, another regent, and afterwards provost of the same college, was appointed to act for him. The other auditors of accounts, besides Buchanan, are John Douglas, rector (afterwards Archbishop of St Andrews); John Rutherford, dean of faculty, provost of St Salvator's College; James Wilkie, Buchanan's successor as principal of St Leonard's; Robert Hamilton, minister of St Andrews, and a professor of divinity, afterwards principal of St Mary's College. The signature

^a [Two persons of the name of Thomas Buchanan were enrolled in St Mary's College in 1556. The one who was George Buchanan's relation, was afterwards a distinguished minister and professor. Was the other Buchanan of Ibbert Keeper of the Privy Seal? Pollock, in the dedication of his *Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians*, "Thomæ Buchanano, Siresensis ecclesiæ pastori," says, "cum in schola tua educarer, quam tum Sterlini magno reipublicæ nostræ bono aperuisti, non sine auspiciis Georgii Buchanani patrum tui, viri omnium quos tulit hæc natio literatissimi."]

of George Buchanan is remarkably neat (more so than in the report of the commissioners of visitation); and he does not prefix Mr to his name, as was the general practice at that period. There are more deviations from this mode of subscription before than after Buchanan's time. In 1558 the accounts are signed by Jo. Douglas, Jo. Rutherford, James Wilkie, Alexander Arbutnot, and Thomas Smeton, all afterwards principals of colleges; and the only one who writes Magister before his name is Wilkie, the least considerable person of the whole number. From the year 1566 to 1617, when doctors of divinity were again introduced in Scotland by James VI., I have not observed one instance in which any subscriber of the quæstor's accounts omits the Mr before his name, except that of Andrew Melville, principal of St Mary's College in 1581. I find him, however, conforming to the usual mode in 1588. But his signature, wherever I have seen it, forms an exception from the rule to which Masters of Arts in this country generally adhered.

I have not been able to discover the name of George Buchanan in any of the other records of this city. The books of the kirk-session contain the names of most of the professors and other persons of education, who were generally elected elders every year, at least from October 1569 to October 1597. All the men of learning were required by the First Book of Discipline to attend the weekly exercise of expounding the Scriptures, in which all ministers and expectants within six Scottish miles of every principal town were obliged to take their turn, on pain of subjecting themselves to discipline in case of refusal. At this exercise all masters and students in the three colleges of St Andrews were required to be present by a statute of the university, dated 7th January 1561.

George Buchanan's predecessor, as principal, was a minister, as was also his immediate successor, James Wilkie, and indeed all his successors have been ministers. It may be presumed, therefore, that Buchanan was as much in orders as any of the other ministers admitted into the Scottish Church about the time of the Reformation, none of whom was set apart by the imposition of hands. On account of the omission of this ceremony, Archbishop Adamson chose to say, in 1586, that Robert Wilkie, moderator of Synod of Fife, was a layman; but the Synod said that he had been upon the exercise for sixteen years before, and been ordained by the Presbytery of St Andrews at its first erection in 1581; and besides,

they declared that it was heresy to maintain that the office of doctor is no ordinary ecclesiastical function. When Maxwell, bishop of Ross, in the year 1646, asserted that laymen had sometimes presided in presbyteries and General Assemblies, he did not repeat this instance, probably because Wilkie had afterwards submitted to Episcopacy, without, however, being re-ordained; but he referred to the cases of Robert Yule, Andrew Melville, and George Buchanan. Principal Baillie, in his *Historical Vindication*, p. 21, after animadverting on the two assertions, adds, "George Buchanan had sometimes, as I have heard, been a preacher in St Andrews: the eminency of this person was so great, that no society of men need be ashamed to have been moderated by his wisdom." Baillie, having been born in 1599, only seventeen years after Buchanan's death, might have enjoyed many opportunities of ascertaining the fact from some of his contemporaries; but his information concerning this, and several other topics introduced in that tract, is less satisfactory than might have been expected. Whether George Buchanan was a parochial minister or not, it is certain that he was at least a *doctor* or professor of divinity, and in this capacity was entitled to a seat in all church courts as teaching elder or presbyter.

The chamber which George Buchanan is said to have occupied as principal of St Leonard's College is now part of a private dwelling-house, and is supposed to have undergone scarcely any transformation. It is about 18 feet long by 16 in breadth, having a window to the south and another to the east, which last commands a view of the bay of St Andrews and the rocks of Kinkell. It is on the second floor of the building, and was formerly entered by an outer stair, having no communication with any other apartment. All the rooms, I believe, were constructed on a similar principle, being separated from one another by thick stone walls, and each having a door to the front; but there were no stairs or passages within the walls.

As a specimen of the comfort of living in colleges about this period, I shall insert the inventory of the most splendidly furnished chamber in St Leonard's College in the year 1544—the very chamber, I believe, which was allotted to the principal.

"In camera quæ est prima versus orientem proximior templi in parte australi, fuerunt hæc bona communia pertinentia ad locum collegii. In the first twa standard beds, the foreside of aik, and

the north side and the fuits of fir. Item, ane feather bed, and ane white plaid of four ells, and ane covering woven o'er with images. Item, another auld bed of harden, filled with straws, with ane covering of green. It. ane cod. Item, an inrower of buckram of five bredes, part green, part red to zailow. Item, ane flanders counter of the middling kind. It., ane little buird for the studie. It., ane furn of fir, and ane little letterin of aik on the side of the bed, with an image of St Jerome. It., an stool of elm, with an other chair of little price. It., an chimney weighing Item, an chandler weighing” In the year 1599, the furniture of the college is as follows :—

“Impr. In the hall four fixed boards. The hale beds almaist fixt. In every chamber ane board and ane furme pertainand thereto, w^t glassen windows, and the maist part of all the chambers ciellered above, and the floors beneath laid with buirdis.

“*Compt of Vessels.*”

“2 Silver pieces, ane maizer w^t common cups and stoups.

“3 Doz. silver spoons, ane silver saltfat, a water basin, an iron chimney fixed in the hall.

“In the kitchen, an iron chimney, w^t sic vessels as is necessar therein, with fixed boards and almeries.”

With respect to the books which Buchanan is said to have presented to the library of St Leonard's College,^a I have been able to lay my hands only upon nine.

1. Hieronymi Osorii de Gloria libri v. Conimbr. a Francisco Correa, A.D. M.D.XLIX. This volume has the inscription at the bottom of the title : “Ex libris communis bibliothecæ Collegii Leonardini, ex dono doctissimi Magistri Georgii Buchanani, principalis ejusdem.” The inscription is repeated at the end of the volume in the same handwriting—not Buchanan's own, it is almost unnecessary to add.

2 Παυλου Ἀιγυητου Ἰατρου ἀριστου βιβλια ἑπτα. Venetiis, in ædibus Aldi et Andreae Asulani soceri, M.D.XXVIII. fol. This is a very beautiful copy of the *editio princeps*.

3. Homeri Poetarum Supremi Ilias per Laurentium Vallensem

^a “Est etiam in eo collegio librorum, extant.” (Sibbaldi, *Comment in Vitam eidem a Buchanano donatorum, catalogus Buchanani*, page 66. Edinburgh, 1702, logus ; qui omnes adhuc in bibliotheca 8vo.)

in Latinum Sermonem traducta : accuratissime ac solerti cura impressum ac emendatum hoc opus per venerabilem d. presbyt. Baptistam Farfengum, impensa vero d. Francisci Laurini civis Brixiani, M.CCCC.LXXXVII. With regard to the accuracy of the impression, the following specimens, taken from fol. 1, may suffice : Agros for Argos ; gratia for grata, fasta for festa, orgis for rogis, innuet for juvet. These errors are corrected on the margin, in Buchanan's handwriting, I think. I see many others corrected in the handwriting of Professor Francis Pringle.

4. Marci Antonii Sabellici Annotationes veteres et recentes, ex Plinio, Livio, et pluribus Authoribus. Philippi Beroaldi Annotationes centum. Angeli Politiani Miscellaneorum centuria, &c., (8 other tracts). Impressit volumen hoc Jacobus Pentius de Leuco, Impressorum omnium accuratissimus M.D.II. — Many marginal notes in this volume seem to be in our poet's handwriting.

5. Augustini Steuchi Eugubini Bibliothecarii contra Laurentium Vallam de falsa Donatione Constantini libri duo. Ejusdem de Restituenda Navigatione Tiberis. Ejusdem de Aqua Virgine in Urbem Revocanda. Lugd. ap. Seb. Gryphium. M.D.XLVII. These three last are in folio.

6. Arithmetica Integra, authore Michaelae Stifelio, cum præfatione Philippi Melancthonis. Norimbergæ, ap Johan. Petreium, anno Christi M.D.XLIII. A quarto of 640 pages.

7. Terentiani Mauri venustissimus de Literis, Syllabis, et Metris Horatii Liber. (Johan. Petit.) Venundantur Parisiis in vico Divi Jacobi sub leone argenteo, apud Joannem Parvum. Bound up with this is Probi Grammatici Instituta Artium. Parisiis, 1.5.1.0.

8. Ephemerides Nicolai Simi, Mathematici Bononiensis, ad annos XV. incipientes ab anno Christi M.D.LIIII usque ad annum M.D.LXVIII. cum meridiano inclytæ civitatis Bononiæ diligentissime collatæ, &c. Venetiis, ex officina Erasmiana Vincentii Valgrisi, M.D.LIIII.

9. Le Epistole Famigliari di Cicerone, tradotte secondo i veri sensi dell' autore, et con figure proprie, della lingua volgare. Con privilegio del sommo Pontifice et della illustrissima signoria di Venezia M.D.LII. (Svo.)—All these books are marked in the same manner as No. 1, both on the first and the last page.

There is also a copy of Buchanan's translation of Linacre's

Rudiments, printed at Paris in 1540, with a great number of interlineations and marginal notes, written in a very small hand, whether Buchanan's or not, I am not able to ascertain.

I cannot take upon me to say that the above are all the books presented by Buchanan; but I have reason to believe that not many more are now in the university library. There is still preserved in some of our registers a catalogue of books, subscribed by Robert Wilkie, principal, and laid before a commission of visitation in the year 1599. The number of titles is not quite 300; but Wilkie says that there was not time to take a complete list. I have looked carefully at all of them which can now be found, and I perceive that a considerable number had belonged to the Augustinian Convent; many of them had been given by the Regent Murray, when a commendator of that priory; some of the oldest were a legacy from John Hepburn, prior of the convent, and founder of the college; some had once been the property of William Shivez, archbishop of St Andrews; many had been given by Thomas Cunningham, principal of the college, about the year 1537; and several more by John Duncanson, who was principal from 1556 to 1566. Some of the books are classics, and not a few relate to the school divinity. The name of Joannes Major occurs very often in the list, but most of the copies of his works have been lost. The only Scottish authors whose names I have noticed are Hector Boyce, Alexander Aless, John Hamilton, John Mair, and John Winram. The work of this last author, entitled *Catechismus D. Joannis Winram supprioris*, is not known to exist. It is possible that all the copies may have been studiously destroyed after the Reformation. Some of the finest copies of the classics in the library of St Leonard's College were the gift of Robert Wilkie, by whom the catalogue is subscribed. He was principal from 1588 to 1611.

No. XI.—(Vol. I., p. 271.)

THE VIEWS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND RELATIVE TO FORBIDDEN DEGREES IN MARRIAGE.—MARRIAGE WITH THE SISTER OF A DECEASED WIFE.^a

I have casually seen a long and elaborate Letter from the Right Honourable J. Stuart Wortley, on the subject of the Bill which he has introduced into Parliament for the purpose of legalising the marriage of a widower with a deceased wife's daughter or niece : allow me to offer a few hasty remarks on that part of the Letter which has a special reference to Scotland, and to what the right hon. gentleman calls the interpretation given *in evil times* to the ancient statutes against incest, which only proscribe such connections "as God in His Word has expressly forbidden." These eight words are quoted from the Act 1567, Dec. 15, c. 14 ; but Mr Wortley has not included the explanatory words, "as is contained in the 18th Chapter of Leviticus."

It is material to inquire whether the legislature did or did not, at the time, understand the terms of the Act as they have been interpreted in Scotland ever since. For the solution of this question we need scarcely look farther than the next Act (c. 15), which Mr Wortley has only partially quoted, having omitted the important words, "That seconds in degrees of consanguinity and affinity, and all degrees outwith the samen, contained in the Word of the Eternal God, and not repugnant to the said Word, might and may lawfully marry at all times sen the 8 of March 1558." These words, according to Stair and all other old writers on our national law, are considered as evidently assuming that the same degrees are prohibited in affinity as in consanguinity. This view was taken at that time in England by Archbishop Parker and Lord Coke, and on this principle the

^a{The fragments now printed on a subject to which the author had paid great attention, and on which he has left a large collection of materials, are extracted from notes of a speech delivered in 1850 at a public meeting held in Edinburgh, on the subject of the Marriage Affinity Bill of Mr Stuart Wortley. —Ed.]

table drawn up by the archbishop was set forth by authority in 1563. In Scotland, the phrase "*seconds in degrees*" was universally understood to signify cousins-german; and, accordingly, the General Assembly, in December 1560, had desired the Estates to interpose their authority in favour of marriages between parties, being of the second, third, and fourth degrees of affinity or consanguinity, and other "sic as are not prohibited expressly by the Word of God." This, it may be said, does not definitely show what the Church meant by the second degree. But it is clearly settled by the General Assembly, June 27, 1565, when a question was put, if a man may marry his cousin, his father's brother's daughter, who had borne children to him. The answer was, that the degrees being second of consanguinity, the marriage would not be contrary to the Word of God, and the parties might be joined in marriage after public repentance. In the next Assembly, December 26, 1565, "it was voted and found by the Word of God, that none may marry his wife's brother's daughter, or his wife's sister's daughter; and if any such marriage was contracted, the same to be null, and ought not to stand."

It appears from the Minutes of Parliament, 3d December 1567 (see Thomson's *Acts*, vol. ii., Appendix, p. 37), that several articles were presented in Parliament, after being treated and proposed by certain barons, commissioners of burghs, and ministers (viz., John Erskine, John Spottiswode, John Knox, John Craig, and David Lindsay); and as the laws for the punishment of incest, &c. were included in these articles and approved, with a recommendation that they be ratified, it admits of no doubt that they were understood in the same sense by the legislature and by the Church.

Mr Wortley maintains that in no other of the Confessions of the reformed churches of Europe is this marriage forbidden; and he greatly wonders whence the wide terms of the Westminster Confession of Faith were "imported into that solemn document." Now it is no difficult task to show that for nearly one hundred years before the Westminster Confession was framed, and for more than one hundred and thirty years before it was ratified by the Parliament in Scotland, the very same rule of interpretation of Scripture had been adopted and acted upon by vast numbers of the most learned divines, and embodied in the symbolical books of the chief of the reformed churches.

Passing over various other documents, I beg to take notice of the commission granted in 1551 by Edward VI. to Archbishop Cranmer, and various other divines, whose deliberations resulted in the well-known work entitled *Reformatio Legum*.^a Here it is asserted that the precepts on this subject of forbidden degrees were not confined to the people of Israel, but were addressed to the whole human race. The first rule laid down is, that the same conditions are presented for males and females in equal degrees of proportion and propinquity; and the second, that the degrees of consanguinity applicable to the husband, correspond exactly with the degrees of affinity which bind the wife. And then there is an enumeration of marriages prohibited in the Book of Leviticus, one of which is a marriage of a man with his wife's sister. As Cranmer's authority in this matter is not much respected in some quarters, I pass from this document, observing merely that it is very ably drawn up.

I next quote Martin Bucer, a learned Englishman, who died in 1551. One portion of his works, published in 1553, relates to unlawful marriages, and declares that with a wife's sister to be illicit, while it approves of the marriages of cousins, at that time interdicted by the pontifical law.^β

I next refer to the discipline which the Synod of the Reformed Churches of France prescribed in 1559, before the first Scots Confession was framed, or the First Book of Discipline referred to by Mr Wortley.

The Ninth Canon of this book is in the following words:—"It is not lawful for any man to marry the sister of his deceased wife, for such marriages are prohibited not only by the laws of the land, but by the Word of God; and although by the law of Moses it was ordained that when the brother died without children, his brother should raise up seed unto him, yet that law enacted for the children of Israel was temporary—relating only to the preservation of the tribes of the people. But the marriage of a

^a See cap. 3, 4, 5, and 6.

^β "Sunt autem quas lex Cæsarum vetat in conjugium accipere hæc tantum. Filia, neptis, proneptis, mater, avia, proavia, amita, malertera, soror, sororis filia, privigua, noverca, nurus, socrus, fratris uxor et soror uxoris. Has et lex Dei

ducere prohibet, quare consobrinis et fratruelibus connubium inter se contrahere licet, quicquid contra leges Pontificiæ statuerint."—M. BUCER in Mat. xix. (*Sacra Evangelia*, 1553), page 1486.

sister of a *betrothed* and deceased wife is of another nature, because that alliance was not contracted by a commixture of blood ; therefore such a marriage may be admitted and approved. Yet all possible care shall be taken that neither the civil magistrate nor weak Christians may be offended."

Let me next refer to Calvin on the Pentateuch, published in 1563, before the Council of Trent had completed its sittings, and before the Parliament of Scotland had passed the Acts relating to marriage, &c.

In this Commentary all the precepts in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus are included in the seventh commandment of the moral law, and Calvin indignantly repels the suggestion that there is no restriction against the marriage of a man to the surviving sister of a deceased wife ; and he remarks on the sixth verse that, verbally, a father's brother or a mother's brother is not in so many words forbidden to marry a niece, but when a nephew is restrained from marrying a mother's sister or a father's sister, the same rule must be applied to the other relatives of equal propinquity. He adds if the shame of a brother is uncovered when another brother marries his widow, not less is the shame of a sister uncovered when her husband, in his widowhood, is married to another sister.^a This is the case in point.

Immanuel Tremellius, a converted Jew, professor of divinity in the university of Heidelberg, who dedicated part of his translation of the Bible to Queen Elizabeth in 1568, clearly points out,

^a Lev. xviii. 6.—"Vetat Deus reterege turpitudinem uxoris patris, et patris, et filii ; quum de fratris uxore eandem sententiam totidem profert verbis, absurdum est diversos sensus fingere. Itaque si fas non est patris, vel filii, patris vel nepotis in matrimonio uxorem habere : unum et idem de fratris uxore sentire convenit, de qua similis prorsus lex uno contextu et tenore perlata est."—Lev. xviii. 18.—"Hoc loco freti quidam protervi homines, licere volunt, si quis uxore privatus sit, germanam ejus sororem inducere ; quia restrictio addita est. Ne viva priore alteram accipiat. Unde colligunt non prohiberi quin succedat in demortue locum. Verum ex-

pendere decebat Legislatoris consilium, ex disertis ejus verbis ; quia non tantum incestus, vel turpitudinis fit mentio, sed zelotypie et rixarum que inde oriuntur. . . . Si retegitur fratris turpitude, ubi frater ejus viduam ducit, non minus retegitur turpitude sororis, quum ejus marito post viduitatem nubit altera soror."—*Commentarii Jo. Calvini Quinque Libros Mosis*, pp. 406, 407.

In 1530 (Oct. 21) Calvin's judgment was requested on Henry Eight's divorce. He even then, although in opposition to the view of Erasmus, pronounced against the lawfulness of marriage with a brother's widow.—(See *Epist.* 384, Lausanne edition.)

in his notes on Leviticus xviii., that marriage with a wife's sister is distinctly, though analogically, prohibited in the sixteenth; and he explains the eighteenth verse in the same way as Mr Dwight. He inserts also, in a note, a table of degrees corresponding to that which we have received. A similar table was subjoined to the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus in the second edition of Bishop Parker's Bible in 1569, and from that time the quarto and some of the folio editions of the Geneva Bible, for the next forty years and more, contained a similar table. A table of the same description was inserted in the *Commentary on the Pentateuch* by David Paræus, professor of divinity at Heidelberg, from the year 1591. Francis Junius, who was conjoined with Tremellius in translating the Bible, published an analytical explanation of Leviticus, with a copious appendix, in which principles are maintained exactly coincident with the terms of our Confession. He was professor of divinity at Leyden from 1592 to 1602. Beza is equally decided on the same point. His theological treatises were published in 1573 at Geneva, where, on the recommendation of Calvin, founder of the college, he became the first rector and professor of divinity about the year 1560. His *Dissertation on Polygamy and Divorce* extends over more than one hundred folio pages, printed in a very small type, and it exhibits a most lucid view of all the principles connected with the degrees of affinity.

Passing by Zanchius, professor of divinity at Strasburg at the same period, whose work, *De Sponsalibus*, contains the identical principles of interpretation maintained in our Confession, and Mark Chemnitius, a divine of the Church of Brunswick, who wrote on this subject in 1565, I shall merely mention, for the present, Bishop Andrews, one of King James's translators of the Pentateuch, who wrote on the Moral Law; Bishop Babington, the author of *Notes on the Five Books of Moses*; Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter; the Rev. Charles Butler, of Magdalene College, Oxford, who wrote a succinct and able treatise on *Propinquity as an Impediment to Matrimony*, printed in 1625; the *Exposition of the Moral Law*, by J. Weemse, Prebendary of Durham, in 1632; Willet's *Hexapla*, 1631; Ainsworth *On the Books of Moses*, 1624; Perkins *On Christian Economy, or Household Government*, 1608.

* * * * *

The sense in which the Levitical law on this matter was understood by the Church of Scotland, may be inferred from the deference paid to the authority of some of the writers now named, and especially Calvin, whose *Commentary on the Pentateuch* appeared in 1563; and, as we have seen, nothing can be more explicit than the terms in which his interpretation of the 18th chapter of Leviticus militates against the principle of Mr Wortley's Bill. Farther, the editions of the Geneva Bible, which were in general use in Scotland, contained a table, in which these words occur: "A man may not marry the wife of his brother, or the sister of his wife."

Before the Assembly of Divines was called to meet at Westminster, Selden had published his learned work, *De Jure Naturalis et Gentium juxta disciplinam Ebræorum* (Lond. 1640), in which he shows clearly that, according to the best Jewish writers, the same degrees are prohibited as are specified in the tables annexed to the Geneva Bible, in English, and the Latin version of Tremellius. It was not without most deliberate consideration, in which Selden, Lightfoot, and other Oriental scholars took a leading part, that the Assembly of Divines arrived at the conclusion, unanimously adopted by the Church of Scotland in 1647, that "the man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own." In arriving at this conclusion, the Assembly proceeded on principles which had been previously recognised by all the most eminent Protestant divines, among whom it may be sufficient for our present purpose to refer again to Paræus, professor of divinity at Heidelberg, whose writings have long been regarded as among the most judicious of the age in which he lived.

Mr Wortley is singularly infelicitous in his attempts to trace the opinions of our Church to the papal system, or to the "money-net" of Rome. Our Reformers, from the first, proceeded on the principle of deriving every doctrine directly from the pure fountain of the Word of God; and in a case like that of the prohibition of the marriage of a man with the widow of his deceased brother, they could not fail to perceive that the same proximity of relationship interdicted the formation of a matrimonial connection of a woman with the widowed husband of a deceased sister. If the voice of reason is to be heard in the matter, the cases are undeniably parallel.

The Church of Scotland has uniformly acted consistently with its first professions in this matter, not only in Presbyterian times, but when Episcopacy has prevailed. The printed Acts of Assembly for the year 1690 make mention of a "sentence of deposition by the presbytery of Stirling against Mr James Forsyth, late incumbent at St Ninian's, for celebrating an incestuous marriage," as having been ratified by that Assembly. The particulars of this case have been preserved. It was proved by several witnesses, and it was confessed by Mr Forsyth himself, "that he had married John Liddell and Helen Adam, who was the said John Liddell's wife's sister's daughter, and that he was warned of their near relation" before he did it. In the printed *Historical Relation of the General Assembly, 1690*, published by an eminent Episcopalian clergyman, it is said that Mr Forsyth (who had been an Episcopalian minister, and had been dissuaded from doing it by the Episcopal clergy) desired the Assembly to pardon and restore him. The historian adds, "This they refused, and confirmed the sentence of his deposition, which was very just, and the only justifiable act of the Assembly from its sitting down to its rising." So that the antipathy at such incestuous connections was not in this country regarded as a mere remnant of Presbyterian bigotry.

No. XII.—(Vol. II., p. 25.)

DEMAND FOR BOOKS IN SCOTLAND AFTER THE REFORMATION.^a

Reading was not an uncommon accomplishment in that age. There were a good many schools in all the principal towns even before the Reformation, and they increased rapidly afterwards.

In fifty-six years (namely, from 1558 to 1614), fourteen complete editions of the works of Sir David Lyndsay were published, including two printed at Paris, and three in England. But there are

^a [Extracted from the Notes to the Author's *Memorial for the Bible Societies.*]

many other editions of his separate pieces (see Lyndsay's Works, edited by George Chalmers, vol. i. p. 90.)

There were three editions of Buchanan's History, in 1582, '83, '84; and there were thirty-one editions of Buchanan's Psalms between 1566 and 1610, printed at Paris, London, and Antwerp, but not one in Scotland. The first edition of his History was printed at Edinburgh by Arbuthnot, the printer of the Bible.

Of the works of Principal Rollock, who died in 1598, at least sixteen volumes were published before 1605; all of which passed rapidly through successive editions. His *Commentary on St John's Gospel*, a book fully as large as a Latin Bible, containing more than 1200 pages (pages containing nearly 300 words each), was printed at Edinburgh in 1599, and again at Geneva in 1599, 1600, and 1608. The Geneva editions are much more easily procured than the Edinburgh edition. Cowper, minister of Perth, published many books in London after the accession of King James. One of them, *The Triumph of a Christian*, passed through seven impressions before 1618, and through three more before 1630, besides being included in the collected edition of his works. In the same manner, the works of W. Guild, J. Abernethy, A. Symson, P. Symson, and others, passed through many editions between the year 1610 and 1633; during all which time we know of no complete edition of the Bible printed in Scotland, and of no edition of the New Testament, Psalms, or Catechisms, printed by any king's printer in Scotland.

If readers were not numerous, how is it that there were so many printers and so many booksellers in Edinburgh in the time of Queen Mary and James IV.?

Between 1579 and 1599 we can produce books printed by Robert Lekprevik, Thomas Bassandyne, John Ross, Henry Charteris, Alexander Arbuthnot, Thomas Vautrollier, Robert Waldegrave. Soon afterwards we find printers at St Andrews and Aberdeen,—and at St Andrews in particular we know of at least two printers, John Scot and Lekprevik, before the year 1579.

In the same period the Town Council Records of Edinburgh mention the following persons as booksellers; Robert Smith,^a

^a The following curious extract from the Testament of Robert Smith, *librar* (i.e. bookseller), who died May 1, 1602, gives an idea of the demand for books used for the purposes of religion and education at that period:—

Henry Charteris, Andrew Hart, John Gibson, Edward Catkin, John Woodhouse, and John Simson (all in 1592), besides John Norton, and others who dealt in importing books.

It has been mentioned in the *Memorial for the Bible Society*, page 73, that, in the year 1616, a book, entitled GOD AND THE KING, was printed in London by his Majesty's command, for the use of the kingdom of Scotland. We mention it here merely as an instance of a book which must have been expected to find a vast number of readers. We do not know how many copies were circulated in Scotland, but we know that thousands were sent to Edinburgh for the use of the citizens. In 1620 (April 7), it appears that "William Dick, and thesaurare, delyverit to Peter Somervell, thesaurare" of the town, among other articles, "the buikis called God and the King, extending to the number of 1562 buikis (copies), whereof the said Peter Somervell grantit the ressait."^a These appear to have been what remained of a cargo imported the preceding year to the amount of 2500 copies. We find in the Records of the Town Council of Edinburgh, 7th April 1619, the following curious entry: "Ordanis William Dick, The-saurare, for causes and considerations moveing thame, to pay Mr James Prymrois ane thousand pound, and the sam sall be allowit to him in his comptis; and als ordanis the said Wm. Dick, The-saurare, to ressave from him twa thousand bookis, called God and

"Item in his buyth the prentit buikis following, all unbound, extending in the haill to aucht scoir rymmis of prentit paper, price of the rym *ls.*

Followis the names of the buikis.

- 2860 First Partis of Latyn Grammers.
- 1820 Second Parts of Grammer.
- 840 Third and Fourth Partis.
- 1253 Colloquia Corderii.
- 815 Colloquia Erasmi.
- 1275 Select Epissilis of Cicero.
- 2000 Prayeris before the Psalmes.
- 300 Callendairs to the Psalmes.
- 248 Doubill Catechismes.
- 1034 Dundie Psalmes.
- 1243 Fabilis of Isope.
- 1134 Winter Nites.
- 1648 Cressedis.
- 232 Gray Steillis.

- 50 Psalme buikis.
- 55 Sevin Sagis.
- 736 Donettis.
- 377 Catois.
- 538 Second Rudiments.
- 155 Singill Catechismis.
- 680 Dicta Sapientum.
- 933 Sulpicius.
- 433 Concordances.
- 223 Latyne Alphabettis.
- Summa of the Inventar, 630*l.*"

In the Inventory of John Wreitton, Printer, who died Feb. 1640, we find "900 little Psalme buikis of David in Meitter in Octavo, estimat all to the soume of 180 lib." (That is, four shillings Scots, or fourpence sterling for each.)

^a Town Council Register, vol. xiii.

the King in Scotis, and fyve hundreth in Latine, and to disperse the same in the Colledges and Schools to the nichtbo^{rs} of this brugh, for aught schillings the pece, and to be charget with the price thereof in his comptis.”

If the book had been distributed gratuitously, it would be impossible to say what was the ordinary demand of the reading population. But it was sold at a price equal to two days' wages of a labourer,^a—a very high price surely for a pamphlet of 89 pages small octavo, or 40 pages small quarto, containing less letterpress than the Shorter Catechism with the proofs, or the Larger Catechism without the proofs. Yet in one year the Treasurer of the town of Edinburgh must have sold 938 copies, and it would be strange if the booksellers had sold none at all. The book had been authorised and printed in 1616, and therefore the supply of the year 1619 may be supposed to have been very trifling when compared with the original distribution. The fact is, that the book was a catechism, which was required, first by the Privy Council of Scotland in June 1616, and subsequently by the General Assembly at Aberdeen in August 1616, to be taught in all universities, colleges, grammar and English schools. It was very far from being popular,—but though constraint was necessary to induce people to purchase it, the sale must have been rapid and extensive.

Concerning the books published in London between 1610 and 1633, it may not be amiss to remark that the number was not diminished by the Proclamation, June 1615, anent printing of books *beyond sea*. These works are very numerous; and it is curious that the persons who were understood to be best affected to the King, generally published their productions in London, although we know that some of them never resided in England.^β

^a It appears from the accounts of the Master of Works that the barrowmen and other labourers employed in the repairs of the Castle of Edinburgh in Feb. 1619, received twenty-four shillings Scots in the week, or four shillings a-day. It appears from the same accounts that a pair of hens might be bought for two shillings Scots; and it is known that a Scots pint of claret at that time cost ten shillings Scots, or five shillings a bottle, *i. e.* 5d. sterling.

^β A few only are here mentioned. Various Treatises by *Couper*, Bishop of Galloway, from 1606 to 1629. *Abernethy*, Bishop of Caithness, 3 editions of one quarto volume, entitled *Physicke for the Soul*, from 1615 to 1630. *Simson* (Wil.) de Accentibus Hebraicis. Lond. 1617. *Symson's* (P.) History of the Church. Lond. 1624 and 1632. *Struthers'* Christian Observations. London, 1628.

The circumstance is worthy of notice, as a proof that though there were many printers in Scotland at the time when no editions of the Bible were printed in Scotland, yet the number of readers was so great that the Scottish press was far from being sufficient to satisfy the demand for books.

No. XIII.—(Vol. II., p. 41).

CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TO AN INDEPENDENT AND CO-ORDINATE JURISDICTION WITH THE STATE.

(Written in 1842.)

What have been called the standards of the Church of Scotland, have varied at successive periods.

The earliest of these Symbolical Books were the Confession of Faith, 1560, and the First Book of Discipline, also submitted to the Council and Parliament the same year. The Confession, we are told by Calderwood and by Spottiswode, was prepared by several ministers, not spontaneously, but by the desire of the nobility, and on the fourth day after the order exhibited to the Parliament, whose approbation and ratification were granted on the 17th of August 1560.

Knox informs us that commission was given to himself and four other ministers to frame the Book of Policy (commonly called the

- | | |
|--|--|
| <i>Lindesay</i> (Bishop of Brechin), a True Narration of the Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, holden at Perth, 25th Aug. 1618. Lond. 1621. | <i>Adamson's</i> Poemata Sacra. Lond. 1619. |
| <i>Pont</i> , de Sabbaticorum Annorum periodis. Lond. 1619. | <i>J. Leochai</i> , Scoti, Musæ Priores. Lond. 1620. |
| <i>Pont</i> , Chronologia de Sabbatis. Lond. 1626. | <i>Sempill</i> , Saerilege sacredly handled. Lond. 1619. |
| <i>Symson</i> (A.) on the Psalms. Lond. 1623. | <i>Guild</i> , Moses Unveiled. Lond. 1620-1623, &c. |
| <i>Wishart's</i> Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Lond. 1633. | <i>Yule</i> (Alex.), Eephasis Paraphr. G Buchananani in Psalmis. Lond. 1620. |
| | <i>Spottiswood</i> , Refutatio Libelli. Lond. 1620. |

First Book of Discipline) as well as they had done the Doctrine; and this they did, and presented it to the nobility, by part of whom it was subscribed, but it was never ratified by the State, nor even inserted in the records of the Church. The terms in which the framers of the book express themselves in addressing it to the great Council of Scotland, are deserving of attention, as proving that, in the exhibition of principles, they did not consider the judgment of the Church final. They say, "From your Honours we received a charge, dated at Edinburgh the 29th of August 1560, *requiring and commanding* us to commit to writing, and in a book deliver to your Wisdoms our judgments touching the reformation of religion, &c. And in unity of mind, we do offer these subsequents for common order and uniformity to be observed concerning Doctrine, Administration of Sacraments, Election of Ministers, Ecclesiastical Discipline and Polity, most humbly requiring your Honours, that as you look for participation with Christ Jesus, that neither *ye admit anything which God's plain Word shall not approve*, neither yet reject such ordinances as equity, justice, and God's Word do specify. For as *we will not bind your Honours to our judgments further than we are able to prove by God's plain Scriptures*, so we most humbly crave that ye repudiate nothing for pleasure and affection of men, which ye be not able to disprove by God's written and revealed Word."

It can be proved that this book was not regarded as an authoritative rule by the Church itself, except in a few particulars for a very short time. The greater part consisted of recommendations of measures to be adopted by the legislature, which never took effect.

It is equally certain that the Second Book of Discipline never became a *standard* recognised by the law of the land, and that even the general body of the Church had not signified their approbation of it ten years after it was registered in the books of the Assembly, in the year 1581, when it is generally represented as having been passed into a law of the Church.

The committee for preparing this new modification of the Constitution of the Church, is said by Calderwood (in his edition of the Second Book of Discipline) to have been appointed by the General Assembly in June 1564, and it was renewed by succeeding Assemblies. It appears from the printed Acts of the Parliament of

Scotland (Thomson's Edition, p. 35-37), that several of the members met the Lords of the Articles on the 2d and 3d of December 1567, and concurred in the propositions relating to the jurisdiction of the Church, &c., which were converted into Acts immediately afterwards; but the scheme of Ecclesiastical Polity was not matured till the year 1581, when it was inserted in the Records of the General Assembly, there to remain, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*.

It appears from the *Booke of the Universal Kirk*, p. 431 (Bannatyne Club edition), that in 1579 a conference had been holden at Stirling in 1579, when the commissioners appointed by the King agreed to certain conclusions of the Kirk. And from the same book (pp. 664, 665, 666) it is ascertained that in May 1586, certain brethren reported the result of a conference with the King and the Privy Council, at which little difficulty was found, except in certain articles noted with his Majesty's hand. His Majesty (James) agreed—

“That ther be Generall Assemblies once every zeir, and aftiner *pro re nata*.

‘ “*Matters to be Traited in the Provincial Assemblies.*

“1. Thir Assemblies are constitut for weighty matters necessar to be entreated be mutual consent and assistance of the brethren within the province, as need requireth.

“2. This Assemblie hath power to handle, order, and redress all things ommitted or done amiss in the Particular Assemblies.

“3. It hath power to depose the office-bearers of that Province, for good and just causes deserving deprivation.

“His Majestie agreed not with this article, but in this manner: It hath power to depose the office-bearers of that Province, except Commissioners and Bishops.

“4. And, generally, thir Assemblies have the whole power of the Particular Elderships (or Presbyteries) whereof they are to be collected.

“*Matters to be Intreatit in the Presbyteries.*

“1. The power of Presbiteris is to give diligent labours in the bounds committit to thair charge; that the kirks be keipit in good ordour; to inquire diligentlie of naughtie and ungodlie per-

sons, and travell to bring them in the way [again], be admonition and threatning of God's judgements, or be correction.

"2. It appertaines to them to tak heid that the Word of God be purelie preacht within their bounds, the sacraments rightlie ministered, the discipline maintained, and the ecclesiasticall goods uncorruptedlie distribute.

"3. It belongs to them to cause the ordinances made be the Assemblies, Provincial and Generall, to be keipit and put in executioun.

"4. To make constitutiouns quhilk concerns *τό πρεπον* in the kirk, or decent ordour for the particular kirks quhar they governe ; provyding they alter no rules made be the Provinciall or Generall Assemblies ; and that they make the Provincialls forsaid privie to the rules that they sall make ; and to abolesch constitutiouns tending to the hurt of the same.

"5. It has power to excommunicat the obstinat.

"His Majestie aggried unto this fyfth article after this manner : It hes power to excommunicat the obstinat, formall process being led, and dew intervalls of tymes [being observed].

"6. Faults to be censured in the Presbyteries ; heresie, papistrie, apostacie, idolatric, witchcraft, consulters with witches; contempt of the Word, not resorting to the Word, continuance in blasphemy against God and his trueth, perjurie, incest, adulterie, fornicatioun [common], drunkenness.

"Thir things for the present, and farther quhil ordour be taken in the conference. . . ."

The matters to be treated in the provincial Assemblies and in the presbyteries are almost verbatim what were agreed to in the conference ; but one part near the end of the extract is omitted, where, among the faults to be censured in the presbytery, some are inserted which, according to the First Book of Discipline (in the 7th head), are said to be under the cognisance of the civil authorities—viz. blasphemy, perjury, adultery, &c. This clause was afterwards left out, and in all other respects, except one (of the most trivial character), the functions of the church courts, as agreed to on this occasion, are the same which are ratified in the Act of Parliament, 5th June 1592, as "the Discipline and Jurisdiction of the Kirk, agreed upon by his Majesty in conference had by his Highness with certain of the ministers convened to that effect."

Farther than the tenor of those articles enumerated in that Act of Parliament, the Second Book of Discipline has no claim to be considered as a standard of the Church. Though, previously to the year 1581, attempts had been made ineffectually to obtain its approbation by the Government, it is certain that ten years afterwards the presbyteries themselves had not formally adopted it. On the 8th of August 1590, the General Assembly required all ministers to subscribe it (p. 773) before the meeting of the next provincial synods, under pain of *excommunication*, to be executed against the *non*-subscribers. Yet, on the third of July 1591, it is declared by the General Assembly that *the greatest part* of the presbyteries of this Kirk had not as yet satisfied the order of the Kirk, anent the subscription of the Book of Policy enjoined in the last Assembly,^a and the moderator of every presbytery (p. 780) was therefore required to see to the execution of their former Act, under pain of 40s., to be employed to the use of the poor, besides the public rebuke in the open Assembly. Notwithstanding this injunction, so frequently repeated, it is known that the Presbytery of Edinburgh did not subscribe for a considerable time afterwards, and on the 26th of August 1591, the Presbytery of St Andrews, the most zealous in the whole Church, declared that “as yet they found themselves not resolved in all points.” There is no evidence that the presbyteries generally received this book; and after the Act, 5th June 1592, ratifying the powers of the Church, there is no trace of its having been ever required to be subscribed. It is of some importance to bear in mind, that the part which relates to the appointment of ministers by the judgment of the eldership (or presbytery), with the consent of the congregation, has been omitted in the Ratification; and that even in the 12th chapter, containing “certain special heads of reformation which the Church craved,” several matters are enumerated in which the assent or concurrence of the Prince with the Kirk is advised, such as the distribution of parish kirks, and the designation of places for the meeting of the elderships; and in the concluding chapter it is seriously proposed that any surplus of Church funds may be profitably employed and liberally bestowed on the *extraordinary* support of *the affairs of the Prince and Commonwealth*.

The only standard of the Church of Scotland which is now in force is the Confession of Faith, as it was ratified by the Parlia-

^a [See also Appendix, No. XVIII.]

ment of Scotland in the year 1690. This Ratification does not extend to any of the contents of the volume bearing the general title of the Confession of Faith, but merely to the doctrinal portion, comprised in thirty-three chapters. This is commonly described as having been agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and approved in 1647 by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. But in the minutes of the Parliament of Scotland, May 26, 1690 (Thomson's *Acts*, vol. ix., supplement, p. 147), it is stated that when it was "moved that the approbation of the Confession may be as it was approved by the General Assembly 1647," it was "answered that this were contrary to the vote approving the *Confession as read*—the Confession as approved by the Assembly containing some differences ^a—the clause relative to the Assembly 1647 left out." On the 28th of May 1690, the Act for Church Government was again read (the statutory part). "Questioned, that in the draught of the Act read there is no mention of the Act of the General Assembly 1647? Answered, that last diet that clause was ordered to be left out, which amendment was again owned."

The difference between the Confession of Faith as ratified in Parliament 1690, and that which had been approved by the General Assembly 1647, appears to consist chiefly in the omission of the explanations or qualifications contained in the Assembly's Act of Approbation, relating to the several sorts of ecclesiastical officers and Assemblies, and to the thirty-first chapter of the Confession on the calling of Assemblies by the magistrate, and to the intrinsic power received from Christ for the good of the Church. But it is material to observe that, though, in the approbation of the Confession by the General Assembly, it is described as a principal part of the intended uniformity in religion in the three king-

^a [Many entries in the journals, both of the Lords and Commons, show that the several chapters were debated paragraph by paragraph, and some of them altered. Thus, Feb. 18, 1644, the last clause of the fourth paragraph of chapter twenty-four of the Confession was put to the vote, when forty voted for the clause and seventy-one against it; and so the question passed in the negative. The thirtieth and thirty-first

chapters, relating to Church censures and to Synods and Councils, were left out; as also the fourth paragraph of chapter twenty, on the manner of proceeding against disturbers of the peace of the Church by ecclesiastical censures, and the power of the civil magistrate. The Confession seems never to have been published in England in the form approved by the Parliament.]

doms, or a Confession common to them all, it never was approved by the authorities in England in the form in which it was presented to the General Assembly, namely, in the form of the Humble Advice of the Divines, which, in various important particulars, had not been acted on in England—and, indeed, several chapters of the Confession never received the approbation of the Parliament by which the Assembly had been called.

It is well worthy of consideration by those who, in referring to these standards, imagine that they have a right of an independent and co-ordinate jurisdiction with the supreme civil courts of the nation, that no such right was ever acknowledged to exist, either by the legislature or by any authoritative decision of the tribunals of justice at any period. On this comprehensive and fundamental article we are always referred with confidence to the Act of the Parliament of Scotland 1567, c. 12, said to be ratified in many subsequent statutes, particularly in 1592, to the effect of securing to the Church (and to “na uther judge ecclesiastical”) the regulation of all matters connected with the preaching of the Word, the correction of manners, and administration of the holy sacraments. It is not overlooked by those who lay so much weight on this Act, that it appointed a committee to consider *what other* points should appertain to the jurisdiction of the Kirk. It is maintained, then, that the jurisdiction of the Church in certain points was clearly and articulately defined, and that the purpose of the Committee, which included four Churchmen—John Erskine, John Spottiswode, John Knox, and David Lyndsay—along with a much greater number of privy councillors, was to superadd such other special points and clauses as might be found agreeable to the Word of God. Did the Church then clearly understand that the matter was permanently and immutably settled so as to bear out all the claims which are now founded on this Act? Had they in reality secured all that is asserted? or did the appointment of a friendly committee ever give them any further privilege or authority?

For an answer to these questions we must look at the *Booke of the Universal Kirk*, the ancient name for the Record of the General Assembly. Passing by the minutes 8th July 1568, 8th March 1568-9, and 7th July 1569, all urging the Regent Murray and Council to expedite the decision touching the jurisdiction of the Kirk, and to “separate the jurisdiction thereof fra that whilk

is civil," we find in March 1570-71, that the chief matters proposed to the next Regent and the Privy Council are the very articles which are alleged to have been definitively settled in the twelfth chapter of the Acts 1567, with a few other claims connected with beneficial clauses, robbing the patrimony of the Kirk, and processes of divorce. Again, in August 1572, John Knox, in his farewell letter, urges, "anent the jurisdiction of the Kirk, that the same be determined in this Assembly, because this article hath long been postponed." In 1573, 1574, 1576, 1577, the Acts of the Assembly show that the Church never obtained any satisfaction; and in the Assembly at Glasgow, April 24, 1581, when the Second Book of Discipline was inserted in the Register, it is stated "that the suits made to the magistrate for approbation thereof, has never yet taken the happy effect which good men would crave." In the same Assembly, session nineteen, it is complained that the Commissariat of Edinburgh meddled with the jurisdiction of the Church, and in no respect was any redress obtained; for not only in cases of conjugal rights, of legitimacy and bastardy, but in those of slander, defamation, and libel, the Commissaries proceeded as they had done before. And whatever Acts and constitutions favourable to the Church passed in former years, were ratified in November 1581, and in June 1592 were merely retained in the statute-book in all their vague generality. It cannot be denied that in all these harassing and delusive proceedings on the part of the State, the Church was tantalised and aggrieved. The legislature ought either to have unequivocally sustained, and intelligibly recognised, or else explicitly rejected the claims of the Church, instead of always paltering with it in a double sense.

Neither were the Church's recent claims to an independent jurisdiction uncontested by all civil authority, or acknowledged even when the commissioners of the Kirk attempted to dictate the propositions which were to be adopted by the Conventions of the Estates of Scotland, which usurped the title and the authority of Parliament in the times of the Solemn League and Covenant. They could not have gained a fraction of the same ascendancy over the Lords and Commons of England at that disloyal period. The framers of the Westminster Confession, of which we have heard so much, possessed no ecclesiastical autho-

rity except what they derived from the two Houses of Parliament, by whose Act they were nominated merely in the character of advisers. They were not allowed to determine anything in the character of a Council of the Church, or even to treat of any matters which were not proposed to them. They were authorised only to confer and treat among themselves of such matters concerning the *liturgy, discipline, government, and doctrine* of the Church of *England*, as were proposed to them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and no other, and to deliver their opinion and advice from time to time in such manner as by both or either of the said Houses should be required, and the same not to divulge, by printing, writing, or otherwise, without the consent of both or either of the Houses. So peremptorily was this rule enforced, that when the Assembly applied to the House of Lords for leave to send, by the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland, an account to the Parliament of that kingdom of what they had done, in a letter to be previously approved by their Lordships, the Lords resolved not to agree to the writing of such a letter by the Assembly of Divines, but they were allowed merely to write of such things as, after having come from the Assembly, had been passed by both Houses. Such a letter was accordingly written, expressing a hope that the Church of Scotland would soon receive a satisfactory account of what had been done "so soon as it shall be passed in the Honourable Houses of Parliament." Indeed, the Assembly at Westminster was not an assembly of *divines exclusively*, even for the purpose of advice, but of *divines and others*—the others being at least ten of the House of Lords and twenty of the Commons, all of whom were members as truly as the divines, and some of whom (as appears from Lightfoot's *Journal*, and Whitelock's *Memorials*), took a very large share in the debates. The divines, as well as others, all nominated and appointed by the Parliament, had not even the power of choosing their own president or prolocutor; and when any member died, the Parliament filled up the vacancy. The Parliament exercised not only a veto, but the sole authority in determining what matters of faith or rules of government, or observances of divine worship, were agreeable to the Word of God. They also appointed commissioners (being members of both Houses) to frame rules concerning suspension from the communion, and to judge

of other cases of scandal. They ordained that persons aggrieved with the judgment of the commissioners should appeal to both Houses of Parliament, if they saw cause. They ordered also that persons aggrieved with proceedings against them before the eldership of any congregation, should have liberty to appeal to the Classical Assembly, thence to the Provincial, thence to the National, and thence to the Parliament. The commissioners from Scotland, in the year 1646, allowed some papers to be printed remonstrating against the subordination of the Assemblies of the Church to the Parliament, though admitting that the magistrate, being *custos utriusque tabulæ*, may, by *his authority*, compel the ministers and Assemblies of the Church to perform the duties which Christ requires of them; and that the ministers are bound to render a reason and account of their proceedings to the civil powers with all humility and reverence. The Houses concurred in a joint vote (April 14, 1646), that the matter contained in the said printed papers was false and scandalous against the Parliament and Kingdom of England, and that they should be burnt by the common hangman. — (See Rushworth's *Collections*, 1646, part iv. vol. i. p. 253-257; and see particularly the Declaration of both Houses, 17th April 1646, Rushworth, part iv. vol. i. page 258, at the bottom—"and first concerning Church government," &c.—to the end of the paragraph, top of page 259). The particulars were communicated by Baillie, one of the Scotch commissioners, to his constituents in Scotland, in a letter dated the 24th of April 1646; but the General Assembly, which met about six weeks afterwards, took not the slightest notice of the occurrence, or of the expressions of the Parliament, but addressed to them a letter, dated 18th June 1646, expressing their confident expectation that the Houses would "seriously endeavour the prosecution of all the ends designed in the Covenant, and the bringing the nations to the nearest conjunction in judgment and affection, especially in the things that concern religion."—(See *Acts of the General Assembly*, 1646, pp. 17, 18.) At that time the zeal of the Church of Scotland was not lukewarm; but they were either less sensitive than the modern Church, or at least more capable of bridling the tongue.

It might here be mentioned also, that among other powers assumed by the Parliament of England, and acquiesced in by the

divines both of England and Scotland, this was one :—“The Lords and Commons, on the 26th of April 1645, ordained that no person be permitted to preach, not ordained a minister in some reformed church, except such as shall be allowed for the trial of their gifts by those who shall be appointed thereunto by both Houses of Parliament.” Another ordinance, April 11, 1645, authorised the Earl of Manchester to nominate committees in every county to certify the names of ministers and teachers, whom he should have power to eject.

Never was any government less disposed to yield to the Church's claims than that of England at this period, when the monarchy was on the brink of annihilation. Baillie says in a letter, March 17, 1646, “The Pope and King were never more earnest for the headship of the Church than the plurality of this Parliament.” Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England* (vol. i. pp. 609, 610, 4th edition), has very correctly described the then House of Commons “as resolved to part with no portion of the prerogative which they had wrested from the Crown. They negatived a declaration of the divine right of presbyterian government. They voted a petition from the Assembly, complaining of a recent ordinance as an encroachment on spiritual jurisdiction, to be a breach of privilege. The presbyterian tribunals were made subject to the appellat control of Parliament. The cases wherein spiritual censures could be pronounced, or the sacrament denied, instead of being left to the clergy, were defined by law,” &c. These observations are introduced here merely to show that the claims of the Presbyterians for independent jurisdiction and irresponsible power were never sustained, even at the time when the English legislature established a modification of presbyterian government; and that the Presbyterians, though they murmured in secret, were compelled to submit to limitations, which some in this age assert were never imposed on them. Even in the solemn function of conferring orders, the Assembly seem not to have been allowed to proceed a step, except when candidates were remitted to them by the Parliament. Thus, on the 1st of October 1646, the House of Lords order that Dr Aylett shall give institution to Joseph Squire, Bachelor in Divinity, to the Rectory of Lyfton; John Harris, Esq., a member of the House of Commons, the patron. On the 6th of August, the Lords ordered the Assembly of Divines to certify the abilities of Richard

Symons, Henry Walter, and *Walter Cradock*, for the discharging of the work of the ministry, and on the 21st of October a favourable return is made in the case of Mr Cradock. The House agreed to Mr Cradock, and ordered the Assembly to certify their opinions of the fitness of Mr Symons and Mr Walters for the work of the ministry—to report in ten days. Almost every day, about this time, orders are given to institute and induct clergymen presented to livings. And these orders, at that period, seem to have never occasioned any surprise, much less remonstrance.

Soon after this time, indeed, the General Assembly of Scotland prevailed on the estates of the realm (not entitled to the name of a Parliament, for there was no King) to abolish patronage, and to leave to the Church the mode of filling up vacancies, which was effected by the election or nomination of the kirk-session, with consent of the people. But this order of things was not long suffered to continue, as Cromwell, in 1654, issued an ordinance taking away the ordinary powers of church courts previously established, and dividing Scotland into five precincts, in every one of which a few ministers, with others, were appointed to give testimony in order to the admission of ministers (four being sufficient for this charge in every province), so that ten ministers and ten other persons might exercise the power of planting churches for the whole of Scotland, whereby the entire power of presbyteries, in the trial, ordination, and admission of ministers, was made utterly void. At the same time, the right of ministers to their maintenance was committed to civil judges. It was complained by the church courts that the civil powers at their pleasure disposed of all ecclesiastical affairs, as election of ministers, and judging of their capacity and fitness. At this time the party which, though not the most numerous, was accounted the most zealous, had the favour of the Government; and this was the party, the remnant of which became the nucleus of the renewed Church of Scotland at the Revolution.

Many of the particulars which have now been transiently noticed, have either been overlooked, or purposely kept out of view, by those who have taken the keenest part in the controversies and contentings by which this country has been agitated for many years; and, for my own part, I never expect to see the period when any Government will venture to give effectual support to what in former times

were regarded as the essential principles of our National Establishment.

[With regard to the “power of the King and other magistrates in matters of religion, according to the ecclesiastical law of Scotland,” the following extract may be added from Note 5 to the author’s *Additional Memorial on Printing and Importing Bibles* (1826) :—

“The standards of the Church of Scotland nowhere assign to the civil magistrate a power either to establish a system of doctrines—or to prescribe modes of worship—or to preach the gospel—or to administer the Sacraments—or to exercise ecclesiastical discipline, either personally or by deputies—or to license and ordain ministers and other Church officers—or to suspend or depose Ministers and other Church officers—or to judge and authoritatively determine in controversies of faith—or impose rules for the ministration of the Word and Sacraments—or to frame ecclesiastical canons—or to remit or reverse the sentences passed by the judicatories of the Church. Under our present constitution, there can be no appeal to the King from the determination of the Church in any spiritual matter.

“The power in religious matters ascribed to the King and other civil rulers by divines of this Church, is of three sorts: 1. A defensive power: It is understood to be the duty of the civil magistrate to protect the Church in the observance of the ordinances—to provide and maintain places of worship—to remove all obstacles to the performance of divine service—to secure the support of ministers and teachers, and assist and maintain the discipline of the Kirk, punishing civilly those who will not obey its censures. 2. A ruling power, not only in the calling of Assemblies, but in requiring them to proceed to the enactment of necessary regulations, and in confirming their proceedings so as to give them the weight of civil authority. 3. A coactive power, which may be exercised over the persons and property of ecclesiastical persons in all matters civil or criminal—or in restraining church courts from overstepping the bounds of their peculiar jurisdiction—or in punishing, by civil means, those ministers and other Church officers who are found by the church courts to have violated the rules to which they are subject—or, lastly, in suppressing heresies and blasphemies, and inflicting penalties on the offenders who have been convicted by the Church.”]

No. XIV.—(Vol. II., page 115.)

NOTES ON CHURCH PATRONAGE.

(Written in 1842.)

The First Book of Discipline is considered as having made election by the people the rule—but it is evident that the Church of Scotland did not at first act on it, or abjure Patronage.

In the first General Assembly, December 1560, among those who are judged apt and able to be ministers, we find the name of Mr John Ramsay *presented by* Sir John Borthwick as minister for the kirks of Aberdour and Tirrie. He was admitted accordingly, and in 1567 his name appears in the printed register of ministers.

Throughout the whole of the Record called the *Booke of the Universal Kirk of Scotland*, presentations by the *just patron* are recognised. The Church had not the power of filling up vacancies in benefices, unless the patron had failed to present within six months. The Assembly indeed, on the 28th of December 1567 (*Booke of Universal Kirk*, pp. 113, 114), ordained superintendents to plant ministers in such places where the parishioners will gladly sustain them on their own expenses, till other order be had; but this temporary expedient did not interfere with the operation of the law by which patrons presented to vacant benefices. When the popish incumbent was alive, and not deprived for immorality or treason, the third of the benefice might be obtained to a certain extent for the Protestant minister,—but it was not imperative on the patron to present a minister thus serving the cure at the time when the vacancy occurred.

Mr Dunlop in his book on Patronage (§ 207), and other writers, assert that the Church had the power of filling up all the benefices which had been enjoyed before the Reformation by ecclesiastical persons or bodies; but this is a mistake, as is sufficiently proved by the Record of the Privy Seal of Scotland, and by the Register of Presentations, beginning in 1567, the year of the establishment of the Reformed Church. This Register, between December 25, 1567, and December 5, 1571 (not quite four years), contains 220 presentations,

of which about one-half, or at least 107, are to benefices having cure of souls. The livings were generally such as had been in the gift of churchmen before the Reformation. The succeeding years exhibit lists of Crown presentations equally numerous. Thus, from August 15, 1587, to May 16, 1588 (only nine months), there are 38 presentations, chiefly to benefices which became vacant by the death or forfeiture of the old popish rectors or vicars.

All these grants, conveyed in the most formal style, contain a clause requiring the superintendent, or the commissioner of the district, or the presbytery of the bounds, "*to try and examinat the doctrine, qualification, literature, and good conversation of the said —, and he being found sufficiently able to use the charge of a minister in the Kirk of God, to receive and admit him to the said vicarage for using the charge of the ministry; and*" (it is generally added) "*in case of his insufficiency for the said charge, to report the same again to his Highness (or his said Regent), that another qualified person may be presented to the same within the space of a month after the date hereof—ordaining also letters to be given to him by the Lords of Session, to the effect that he may be put in quiet and peaceable possession of the same; and charging also the parishioners, intermitters with the lands, glebes, teinds, &c., to make thankful payment, &c.*"

This legal instrument, it will not be disputed, rendered it imperative on the Lords of Session to grant warrant for putting the presentee in peaceable possession; but will it be maintained that this object might be defeated by refusing to take trial of the qualifications as an indispensable preliminary to admission or collation?

In some of the early presentations, a clause was inserted providing that, in the event of non-residence, or becoming slanderous in conversation and life, or negligent in doctrine, the presentation and all that passed thereupon should be null.

It is worthy of notice that in the last communication from John Knox to the General Assembly in 1572, a short time before his death, the Reformer called the attention of his brethren to the administration of the law of patronage, objecting not to the law itself, but to some recent abuses. He desired the Assembly to apply for an Act of Council, with inhibition to the Lords of Session to give any letters or decreets on simple gifts of benefices without

admission by the superintendent or commissioner of the province, or the bishop lawfully elected according to the order taken at Leith in January last—and the Kirk, *as far as lay in their power*, should declare all such gifts null. He also recommended that the first form of presentations, which were in the first and second regents' time, should not be changed, as had become common, but the clause be retained in the presentation, that if the person presented make not residence, or be slanderous or unworthy in life or doctrine by the judgment of the Kirk (to which always he shall be subject), or meet to be transported to another place, that the said presentation shall be null, and of no force and effect.

This letter of Knox shows clearly what, in his opinion, were the chief grounds of complaint at that period in the matter of appointing ministers.

Another particular relating to patronage is often misrepresented. The Act *ratifying* the liberty of the Kirk, June 5, 1592, concludes with a clause binding and astringing the presbytery to receive and admit whatsoever *qualified minister* presented by his Majesty or *other* laic patron.^a Mr Dunlop conceives that these terms were purposely used to provide for a new case—viz. the presentation of a party already found qualified, by the church courts having admitted him previously to the function of the ministry, who in this case were to have no discretion in the way of trying him as under the Act 1567, but were bound to receive him as already proved to be a qualified person; while, as to all other presentees, the matter would rest on the provisions of the Act 1567. His reasoning on the subject, § 219 and 220, needs not to be quoted; for his assumption may be proved to be void of foundation by the mere inspection of the presentations actually issued under the Privy Seal, immediately after the Act passed (June 5, 1592).

The first of these presentations was in favour of Mr David Myln, already minister at Dundonald, and was addressed to the presbytery of Kyle and Carrick, requiring them to "*try and exam-*

^a This term, *qualified minister*, was in use in the church courts before the Act 1592 passed. Thus it appears from the Record of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 26th April 1592, that the presbytery of Edinburgh was ordained,

in case the patron refuses to present a qualified minister to Etilston, to give it *jure devoluto*. The first presentation was to a preacher, James Hay (July 25, 1592), who was taken on trial.

inat the qualificatioun, literature, and good conversation of the said Mr David; and if he be able and qualified for using of the office, that they admit him to the vicarage, and that they receive the confession of his faith, and his aith for acknowledging our Sovereign Lord his authority, and due obedience to the Kirk." ^a

But it is more material to observe that the second presentation, subsequent to the passing of the Act, was granted (on the 9th of June) to one who was not previously a minister—namely, Mr W. Brisbane (son to Brisbane of that ilk); and the terms are in all respects similar to the former. The presbytery of Paisley were required to “try and examinat the qualification, literature, and good conversation of the said Mr W. Brisbane, and if he be found meet and habill to use the charge of ane minister within the Kirk of God, to receive and admit him thereto, and to authorise them with their testimonial of admission,” &c. In the course of the year (from June 7, 1592, to June 8, 1593), forty-six presentations to benefices were issued under the Privy Seal, and of these twenty-six were in favour of persons not previously ordained ministers.

In 1594 there are about forty royal presentations. In all cases (with one exception, in which the minister was already in possession) the presbytery is required (the term sometimes is “commanded”) to try and examine. Sometimes, as in the case of Mr James Hepburn (July 18, 1594), it is said, “and he being found meet and habill to continue in the office of the ministry in the Kirk of God, that they receive and admit him.” In another case, ratifying a gift of presentation by a subject, the presbytery of Glasgow are required, in respect of “Mr John Bell’s habitie for discharging of the office of the ministry ellis [already] tried, to give and grant him their admission.” In the same manner, on the 13th of February and 21st of March 1594, two presentees are stated to have been already found qualified. But this was no innovation introduced in the Act 1592, for the very first entry in the “Register of Presentations,” 1567, bears, “that *tryall* had already been taken, as well of the life and conversation, as of the

^a This, and several other presentations of the same kind, afford a presumption that Mr David Myln, though said to be present minister of Dundonald, was not a member of the pres-

bytery of Kyle previous to his collation to the vicarage of Dundonald, otherwise he would have been one of the judges of his own qualification.

qualification of the presentee in letters and doctrine ;" so that there is no ground for alleging that a new principle had been adopted when the Act, 5th of June 1592, was passed.

On this matter it would not be worth while to dilate, if it were not to show that various particulars have been asserted as momentous facts which are void of all foundation.

In the time of the Covenanters, the efforts to abolish patronage kept pace with the progress of democracy. It certainly was not foreseen by many of those who consented to the calling of the Assembly of Divines, that the plausible pretext of vindicating the character of the Church of England, and removing a few defects and blemishes from its ritual, would so rapidly lead to the revolutionary extravagances which issued in the obliteration of the liturgy, the sacrilegious spoliation of churches and colleges, the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, the extirpation of the hierarchy, the abolition of the House of Lords, the degradation of the courts of justice, the destruction of the monarchy, and the triumphant ascendancy of that usurping dynasty, which, if it had not been arrested by the unexpected death of its founder, would have speedily extinguished the almost expiring embers of British liberty.

It was my purpose to trace the progress of opinions on this matter subsequently to the Revolution, and to expose many of the misrepresentations of matters of fact which have been most offensively reiterated.

It is worthy of special remark that, among the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of the Estates of Scotland, containing the *Claim of Right*, and offer of the Crown to William and Mary, April 11, 1689, patronage is not included, and nothing is said of the interest of the people in the appointment of their ministers. The reason for abolishing Prelacy and establishing Presbytery is said to be, that the former had always been a great and insupportable grievance and trouble, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation. Accordingly, in the Act abolishing Prelacy, their Majesties declared that, with the advice of Parliament, they would by law settle the Church government in this kingdom which is most agreeable to the inclinations of the people. (See Act abolishing Prelacy, July 22, 1689.) But when the Act passed, nearly a year afterwards (June 7, 1690),

ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling presbyterian church government, it was not considered essential to abolish patronage. The Act passed over the law of patronage, which (it is added) is hereafter to be taken into consideration; and when, on the 19th of July 1690, the nomination of ministers was taken from the ancient patrons, and bestowed on the heritors, being Protestants, and the elders of the parish, the inclinations of the people were not consulted before this new system was adopted.

The Revolution settlement was altogether unsatisfactory to those who had suffered most during the years preceding the abdication of King James. There was a very zealous party who considered the inclinations of the people as a very unstable foundation for a Church, and who did not approve of this new modification of patronage. But it is strongly maintained by some that this constitution was immutably confirmed by the Parliaments both of England and Scotland, in the Act of Security incorporated in the Treaty of Union. When this was maintained in the memorial of the Commissioners from the Church of Scotland, before the Parliament of the United Kingdom restored the law of patronage in May 1712, the answer commonly given was not very explicit. The true answer unquestionably is this: The Act of Security confirms the Act ratifying the Confession of Faith, with all the other Acts of Parliament relating thereto, in prosecution of the Claim of Right, bearing date the 11th of April 1689; but the Act of Patronages could not be regarded as one of those which were passed pursuant to the Claim of Right, as this document does not refer to patronage at all. It is certain that the Act of Security was not considered by the Presbyterians in Scotland as affording very strong hopes for the permanency of the ecclesiastical constitution, at the time when the treaty was ratified; and the complaints of the commissioners of the Church in 1712 were not nearly so loud against the restoration of the rights of patrons, as against the toleration granted to Episcopalians in the same year.

It is always said that the introduction of the Act 1712 was a scheme of Lord Bolingbroke for advancing the interest of the exiled family of Stuart. But there is little ground for this charge. Lord Bolingbroke seemed to have no particular concern in the matter. The same measure had been seriously contemplated in 1703, when a very different party was in power, and at that time some able

tracts were written in favour of it by eminent Scotsmen friendly to the constitution as established at the Revolution. In less than three years after the Act was passed, the accession of George I. brought the Whigs into power, and Sir David Dalrymple, who had written and spoken vehemently against the restoration of patronage, became Lord Advocate of Scotland. But neither he nor any other friend of the Protestant succession appears ever to have made the slightest effort to have the Act repealed, and I cannot trace any earnest movement on the part of the Church or the people to have such a purpose accomplished. Some of the most popular men in the Church accepted presentations the moment after the Act was passed, particularly the Rev. Mr Robe of Kilsyth; and in his case (as appears from Wodrow's *Correspondence*, recently published) even the form of a call was not observed; (see Wodrow's *Correspondence*, vol. i. 1842, pp. 384, 404); and the presentee was settled by the then zealous presbytery of Glasgow without insisting on that observance, because the patron or his lady (Viscountess Kilsyth) disliked it.

It is often said that the preamble to the Act 1712, restoring patronage, is inconsistent with fact; but I find that, in various cases then before the church courts, the "heats and divisions" described in the preamble are stated to have been very detrimental to the influence of religion and good order. One of the overtures, printed by authority of the Assembly the previous year, contains a declaration to the same effect.

PRESENTATION by JAMES VI., with advice of the REGENT MURRAY, to THOMAS DUNKESOUN, Jan. 10, 1567-8. (The Acts of Parliament of Scotland establishing the Kirk were passed Dec. 20, 1567.)

Our soverane lord being informit of the qualificatioun, literature, and good conversatioun of his weill belovit Thomas Dunkesoun, and of his earnest affection to travell in the charge of the ministrie w^tin the kirk of God, yrfoir with advyiss of his dearist cousins, James Erll of Murray, Lord Abernethy, regent of his realm, ordainis ane lettir of presentatioun to be made, under the privie seal in due form, presentand the said Thomas to the vicarage of Bowden, liand w^tin the Diocies of Glasgow, and Sherriffdom of Roxburgh, vacand

be deceiss of unq^d Sir William Younge, last vicar and possessour y^rof, and pertaining to our soverain lord's presentation and desposition be the lawes of this realm, and that the said presentatioun be extendit in the best form, w^t all clauses needful, direct to the superintendent or commissioner appointit w^tin the boundis of Teviotdale, and in his absence to the superintendent of Lowthian, requiring yame or either of yame to try and examinat ye doctrine, qualificatioun, literature, and honest conversatioun of the said Thomas, and being abill to use the charge of ane minister or redar in the kirk of God, to ressave and admit him to the said vicarage, for using and exercising either of the charges of ministerie or reding above writin, at the discretioun and judgment of the said sup^t or commiss^r, and authorises him with testimoniall thairupon, in competent and dew forme, or in caiss of his insufficiency for the said charge, to report the same agane to his hieness and his said regent, that ane other qualifiet person may be nominat and presentit to the said vicarage w^tin the space of ane month nixt after the dait heirof. Ordaining also the Lords of Counsall and Session, at the sight of thir presents, and of the said superintendent's or commissioner's testimonial and admission, to grant and gif letters for answering and obeying of the said Thomas, of the teinds, fruits, rentis, proventis, and emolumentis of the said vicarage, and peaceable josing of the manse and gleib appertaining thairto, as use is, during lyftyme, and to nane uthers; providing that he mak residence at the said kirk, preche the word of the evangill, and administrat the sacr^t of Jesus Christ, be himself, or be sum uther qualifiet persoun in his absence, being occupijt in his charge of superintendrie, and lykewise remane honest in conversatioun and lyff, sua that na sklander^s arryiss be him to the evangele; and in caiss that be decree of the General Assembly of the Kirk, of qlk he salbe alwayis subject, he be fund either negligent in doctrine, or sclanderous in lyff, or for guid caussis worthie and meit to be transportit to ane uther place, and charge this present donatioun and presentatioun, w^t all that sall pas yairupon, to be null, and sum uther qualified person to be presentit to the said kirk of new.—Subscreyvit be my Lord Regent at Edinb., the 10 day of Jan^y 1567.

REG. SEC. SIGIL. lxiii. fol. 264.—1591-2.

Ane presentatioun maid to Maistir Johne Erskin, presentand him to the vicarage of Eglisgreg, lyand within the Dyocie of Sanctandros, and Scherifdome of Kincardin, vacand be the resignatioun or simple dimissioun of Mr George Gledstanes, last vicar and possessor yairof, direct to the Presbyterie of Conveth and ministrie within the boundis of the Mernis *requiring them to try and examinat* the qualificatioun of the said Mr Johne, and gyf he be fund meit to use the office of ane minister within the Kirk of God, *to admit him* to the said vicarage, resave the confessioun of his faith, his aith for acknowledging and recognoscing of our soverane lord, and his anc^{tie} and dew obedience to his ordinar, and to authorize him with testimoniall of admissioun as efferis, &c.—At Dalkeith, the 17 day of Maij 1592.

(This is the last presentation which was issued by the King before the passing of the Act, 5th June 1592, ratifying the liberty of the true Kirk, and astricting presbyteries to admit whatever qualified ministers should be presented by his Majesty and other laic patrons.

The following presentation was granted by the King four days after the Act 1592 was passed :—)

REG. SEC. SIGIL. lxiv. fol. 7.

Ane presentatioun maid to Mr David Myln, present minister at Dundonald, presentand him to the vicarage of Dundonald, with the haille fruites, rentis, teindis, &c., vacand and becum in our soverane lordis hands be depositioun of Mr Alexander Forsyth, last titular and possessor of the samyn be the laws and practick of the realme, direct to the Presbyterie of Kyill and Carrik, *requiring thame to try and examinat the qualificatioun, literature, and good conversatioun* of the said Mr David, and *gyf he be abill and qualifiet for using of the said office*, that they admit him to the said vicarage, and that they ressave the confessioun of his faith, his aith for acknowledging our sov^r lord his hienes auctoritie, and dew

obedience to the Kirk, and yat *thai authorize him with their testimoniall of admissioun* y^rupon in forme as effeirs, &c.—At Halierud hous, ye 7 day of Junij 1592.

No. XV.—(Vol. II., page 96.)

EARLY RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES.

The following extracts are from a statement laid before the House of Commons in 1829, by the author as convener of “A Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland appointed for the purpose of collecting and recovering the various manuscripts connected with their ecclesiastical establishment:”—

“It has been discovered that three volumes of the ancient record, entitled *The Booke of the Universal Kirk of Scotland*, are extant in the library of Sion College, London. . . .

“There is no difficulty in proving that the volumes in question were laid on the table of the General Assembly which met at Glasgow in 1638, and that they were pronounced by that Assembly to be true and authentic Registers of the Kirk of Scotland. The reasons proving their authenticity are inserted in the manuscript journals of that Assembly, and also, in a very satisfactory form, in the printed Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland of that year. The descriptions are so minute as to establish the identity of all the volumes which are still extant. The attestation of the clerk is superscribed at the beginning, and subjoined to the end of the first volume, in these words:—‘This is the great Volume aprovin be the General Assemblée at Glascew in November 1638. A. Jhonston Cl^r. Eccl.’ The autograph of this clerk is to be seen on various documents in possession of the General Assembly, and particularly on the copy of the printed Acts of the Assembly of 1638, in the custody of the present clerk. The other volumes have the well-known signature of a clerk named ‘Thomas Nicolson.’

“It is understood that, in 1649, the books were transferred to the charge of Mr Andrew Ker, clerk of the Assembly; and that

in 1652, most, if not the whole, of the originals were for some time intrusted to Lord Balcarras. During the troubles of the succeeding period they were concealed in the house of a private individual till the year 1677, when they were put into the hands of Bishop Paterson (of Edinburgh), who retained them till after the Revolution. The account of their discovery and subsequent fate may be seen in Keith's *History of the Church and State in Scotland*; but it appears from a paper preserved in the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, and published in the Appendix to Dr M'Crie's Lives of William Veitch and George Brysson, that Keith's narrative is not altogether correct in every particular.

"After the Revolution, some of the volumes and papers were delivered up to a son of the former clerk, Mr Secretary Johnston, who lent some of them to his cousin Bishop Burnet, and others to Mr George Ridpath, who about that time undertook to write a history of Scottish affairs. Three volumes fell into the hands of a person whose grandfather had been the intimate friend of Johnston, and had, like him, been executed for treason. This person was the Honourable and Reverend Archibald Campbell, grandson of the Marquess of Argyle, and son of Lord Neil Campbell. Mr Campbell was several years known as an Episcopalian clergyman, and subsequently as one of the non-juring Bishops in Scotland. During the latter part of his life he resided chiefly in England, without being in communion with the Church of England, and without maintaining any intercourse with the Episcopalian body in Scotland, to which he had been originally attached.

"About the year 1733 a correspondence was opened between him and Mr William Grant, Procurator and Clerk of the Church of Scotland (afterwards Lord Prestongrange), on the subject of the records in Mr Campbell's possession. Mr Campbell offered to surrender these records on certain terms, which did not appear to Mr Grant to be reasonable or equitable. He demanded a large sum of money for the restitution of the volumes in which he never had acquired any right of property; and even this sum he would not accept till the books had been published, as was proposed, under his superintendance, on the understanding that no member of the Church of Scotland was to be suffered to revise the sheets as they passed through the press.

"It could scarcely be expected that these and other humiliating

conditions would be acceded to without hesitation ; and while the negotiation was still in progress, Mr Campbell, as he had sometimes threatened to do, took a step which was intended to put the books for ever beyond the reach of the Church of Scotland, by entering into a deed of trust or covenant with the President and Fellows of Sion College, the effect of which has undoubtedly been to detain these records from their lawful owners for nearly a century past.

“ It is unnecessary to add that the hardship is deeply felt by all the members of the Church of Scotland, who are aware of the importance of these books, not merely as the only sure and satisfactory memorials of the course of ecclesiastical affairs in the times immediately succeeding the Reformation, but also because they are capable of shedding additional light on a most interesting and instructive portion of our civil history. . . . ”

To this statement may be subjoined extracts on the same subject from the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Church Patronage, 1834 :—

“ *Veneris, 25^o die Aprilis, 1834.*

“ The Rev. John Lee, D.D., again called in, and examined,—

“ Since I had formerly an opportunity of giving evidence before the Committee, I have had access to the Records of the Church of Scotland in Sion College, London, and I am fully satisfied that those volumes (which I am quite certain are authentic records) contain a great mass of information in a more complete and certainly in a more correct form than anything that has been exhibited in any of the publications upon the same subject which I have ever seen. I perceive that there are entries which are much more detailed in those volumes than they are in any of the books in the possession of the Assembly ; but from the short time during which I had an opportunity of inspecting the volumes, I cannot be expected now to furnish any particulars of importance. . . . ”

“ At what period does the date of that book commence, and to what period does it extend?—It consists of three volumes : the first begins with the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1560, and ends in the year 1589 ; it contains nearly 1300 pages, each of which is more crowded with matter than a page of this book which I now hold in my hand, [the abstract noticed

below (?)] and the number of pages in this book, extending to the same period, is about 380. The second volume begins with the year 1590, and ends in March 1596, or according to our present computation, 1597. The third begins with May 1597, and ends in August 1616. These books embrace the whole period between 1560 and 1616. Here is an abstract of the contents of the whole books made before they were deposited in Sion College; it contains a fac-simile of the manner in which the books are attested both at the beginning and end.

“Can you produce the Report of the Committee appointed to inspect the books belonging to Sion College?—This is the Report which I now beg to give in.”

(The Witness delivered in the same, which was read as follows:—)

“LONDON, 24th April 1834.

“In obedience to the order of the Committee of the House of Commons on Church Patronage (Scotland), we have this day, within the Library of Sion College, London Wall, inspected three books, in manuscript, bearing to be records of the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, from 1560 to 13th August 1616. We have also read the Deed of Agreement by which said books were gifted by Mr Archibald Campbell to the trustees of Sion College, and we crave leave humbly to report—That, in our opinion, these Records are the genuine and authentic register of the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for the above period. . . .’

“Perhaps I may be allowed to state in addition, that the Committee were at pains to compare the earliest and most important volume with a document which I formerly produced before the Committee, containing, along with other matters, the Book of Discipline, which belonged to Mr James Carmichael, minister of Haddington. This document is referred to in the Acts of the General Assembly 1638, in which the reasons for considering that earliest volume an authentic register are inserted: and not only did the book appear to be in the handwriting which is stated in the Acts of the Assembly to be at least partly found in it, but it likewise contained passages which are said to be found in particu-

lar pages, marked by Mr James Ritchie, the clerk of the Assembly. [One] passage is very remarkable ; but it would detain the Committee perhaps to mention it, though, if any report is to be given upon the subject, it might be material. It is stated in the printed Acts of the General Assembly 1638, that what is called ‘the fifth Book and greatest volume is marked on the margin with the handwriting of Mr James Carmichael, which is cognosced, who was appointed to peruse the books of the Assembly, and would not have margined the same by virtue of that command, nor extracted the general Acts out of it, if it were not in approbation thereof as an authentic and famous book. In the Book of Discipline, pertaining to Mr James Carmichael, subscribed by himself and by Mr James Ritchie, there are sundry acts and passages quoted out of the said fifth great volume, saying it is written in such a page of the book of the Assembly, which agreeth in subject and quotations with the said fifth book, and cannot agree with any other ; so that Mr James Carmichael, reviser of the Assembly books by their command, would not allege that book.’ Now, this little volume to which I have referred contains references to pages 828, 839, and 873, all of which, on comparison, were found to correspond with that earliest record.

“Have you any further particulars to communicate collected from the inspection of the books at Sion College?—No ; I think that nothing occurs to me, except that the second and third volumes are subscribed in a handwriting which is well known to me, that of Thomas Nicolson, who was long clerk of the Assembly ; and on a former occasion I had an opportunity of comparing the handwriting of that individual with the handwriting which is upon these two volumes.”

It must be added that the three volumes above referred to of the original records of the earliest Assemblies, were, by an unhappy casualty, for ever lost to the Church, at the very moment when the protracted efforts which had been made for their recovery promised to be at length successful. Having by an order of the House of Commons been produced before the Committee on Patronage of 1834, they were allowed to remain on the table of the Committee-room after the close of the Session, and, as seems to be too well ascertained, perished when that part of the Houses

of Parliament was consumed by fire on the 16th October of the same year.

For a full account of the ascertained facts relative to the history of these documents, of which no complete transcript is now known to be in existence, see the Preface and Appendix to the edition of *The Booke of the Universal Kirk* published by the Bannatyne Club.—ED.

No. XVI.—(Vol. II., page 101.)

PROVISION FOR THE POOR, AND EXPENDITURE OF KIRK-SESSION FUNDS IN SCOTLAND.

(*From the Author's Evidence before Committee of House of Commons on Poor-Law, Scotland.*)

I do not know that I could go on and state chronologically what was the first arrangement, or what were the successive changes with reference to the poor in Scotland. So far as I can ascertain, about the times immediately subsequent to the Reformation, the poor continued, in the burghs, to be provided for partly out of the rents of some religious houses, and also partly from church collections both in burghs and in the country. They were partly supplied from fines or penalties imposed on persons guilty of breaches of Church discipline, and from some other casual resources; but they were (I may say) chiefly maintained on the precarious bounty of the public, which appears to have required to be stimulated by the efforts of the magistrates, as well as ministers, elders, and deacons.

The following notes relate to the poor of Edinburgh soon after the Reformation :—

In April 1561, a duty of 12d. Scots was imposed on every tun of wine sold in Edinburgh, to be given to the support of the poor, 'failed merchants, and craftsmen.' At this time

Bordeaux wine was sold for 12d. a Scots pint ; and the consumption must have been very great, if this small tax yielded any considerable relief.

In December 1564, the Queen authorised the magistrates to lay a stent or extent on the inhabitants for the support of the poor and the ministers. They were authorised to tax every person at their discretion, according to their ability, to the relief of the said poor, and bearing of the common charges of the Kirk, and, if need be, to poind and distrain therefor.

January 2, 1564-5.—The crafts of Edinburgh, and particularly the tailors, bound themselves to comply with whatsoever order should be found good by the provost and council for sustaining the ministers and poor ;—and on the 6th of January it was ordained by the council that the hail inhabitants should be set to certain particular sums.

In 1567 a collector was appointed for uplifting and inbringing the rents, duties, &c. of all chapels, kirks, prebendaries, chaplainries, altarages, that formerly pertained to priests, monks, friars, &c., within the burgh, for the utility of the ministers, the poor, and hospitals.

It appears from the record of the General Kirk-Session of Edinburgh, that, in 1574, the ordinary poor generally received 2s. Scots for a single person in the week, and 4s. for a man and wife. Occasionally an augmentation of 18d. ouklie (weekly) was granted during sickness. In some cases, during sickness, the ouklie alms was 3s., and in others 30d.

At this time the collections were very small, and the magistrates appear to have taken means to induce the more wealthy inhabitants to give weekly or monthly contributions.—July 7, 1575, a complaint is made that some brethren, not under the jurisdiction of the provost and bailies, had promised ouklie contributions to the puir according to the order taken, and as yet had never paid ane penny thereof ; wherethrough the said puir are frustrat of their ouklie almus in tymes past. The kirk, therefore, maist humilie requests all sic brethren in the name of the eternal God, and of his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, to pay their said ouklie contribution in tymes past, and siclyke ouklie or monethlie in time cuming, sua that the guid order tane decay not in their default, &c.

“ August 25, 1575.—The kirk (session) request their minister that on Fryday next he travel in his sermon to persuade the brethren that support may be made to the French kirk banishit ; and also to request maist earnestlie yat the guid order begun for the maintenance and sustentation of the puir of this burgh be enterntenit and fall not in decay. Sept. 1, 1575.—The bailies and counsel to be earnestly requested to visie (inspect) of new the hail puir with a deacon of the kirk every quarter ; by reason it is come to the ears of the kirk that ane greit part of the said puir whilk receives the alms merit not the samin, and on the other part that sic as merits the said alms receives na comfort thereof, whilk is against all guid order.”

On the 16th of June 1575 this minute occurs—

“ Alexander Blyth being delated to the kirk for speaking of the words following, that is, that thair was honest men that gat the alms of the kirk that drunk mair wyne nor other honest [men] that wanted the same, whilk was ane heavy slander to the said kirk of qlk the alms of the puir was distributit. The said Alexander compearing, and being enquired thereof, declared that Robert Ker, merchant, shew to him the same. The kirk therefor ordanit to warne the said Robert to compeir befor them this day aucht days to answer *super inquirendis*.”

(At this time there was great scarcity of the articles of human food, but the price of Bordeaux wine was 16d. Scots, the Scots pint, equal to two English quarts. In 1520, no claret or white wine was allowed to be sold in any tavern in Edinburgh at a higher price than 6d. Scots [or $\frac{1}{2}$ d. sterling] the Scots pint.)

To these notes may be added the following from the *General or Six Sessions of Edinburgh* in the years 1643–9 :—

“ 1643.

Feb. 1.—Andrew Walker chosen ordiner chirurgeon to the poor, and being sworn to be faithful, was ordained to have the ordiner stipend for this charge.

Feb. 10.—Penalties and gifts for the use of the poor—

Given by Dr Pont as a voluntary gift,	. 100 merks.
Penalty for Neill Turner and his partie,	. 16 merks.

Feb. 15.—Given in by Geo. Stuart, advocat, for not coming to the ile, 20 merks.
---	---------------------

“ 1643.

Feb. 15.—Given by Col. Hume’s lady for private marriage with young Craigie, : 20 merks.

Given by Sir John Smyth as a yearlie voluntary gift,
100 merks.

Given by Mr Rob^t Smyth for private marriage, 20 merks.

Feb. 17.—Given in by the ballyie for Mr W^m. Johnston, 20 merks.

Item for his partie, Marie Elliot, 5 lib. 8s.

Sept. 6.—400 merks given for help to ransom John Schank, mariner, taken captive by the Turks.

Nov. 1.—100 lib. given to the two Hungarian students in the college.

Dec. 5.—300 merks to certain considerable persons, &c.

“ 1644.

Apr. 3.—1000 Merks to be advanced for the relief of Gilbert Boyd, taken captive by the Turks.

The six sessions ordain the ordinar poor enrolled to be threatened if they learn not the grounds of religion, and to be deprived of their weeklie pensione if they cannot answer to the Catechise.

May 9.—By Mr Luis Stuart and Isbell Geddes, for fornication,
[21 lib. 6s. 8d.

By Robert Martin, for his private marriage, 20 merks

“ 1645.

March 13.—Given for W^m. Salmond, relapse in fornication,
[53 l. 6s. 8d.

Item for Maggie Wauch, that vile pandresse, that brought in the said Salmond to Robert Murray’s house for whoredom, 4 merks.

The session ordains George Jolie, treasurer, to answer the *Mistress of the Correction House*.

March 18.—Given in for Tho^s Rennie, fornicator with C. Stuart,
[40 l.

Apr. 1.—Ordains Alex. Horsbrook to pay to the kirk treasurer 10 thalers * (26 l. 13s. 4d.) for transgressing the solemn fast in suffering a cook, J^o Black, to be hired for dressing a banquet for baptism of David Martin’s bairn, on Wedensday last.

* A thaler was 4 merks, or 2 l. 13s. 4d.

“ 1645.

Apr. 1.—Given in by the said David Martin, master of the feast,
3 lib. 1s. 4d. John Black, cook, to pay 2 thalers
(5l. 6s. 8d.)

Apr. 2.—Given in by Hen. Kinloch, for dispensing with the ile,
[20 merks.

Item, by Mr Thomas Byres for the ile and private marriage,
. 40 merks.

May 13.—Margaret Dickson to pay 2 thalers (5l. 6s. 8d.) for transgressing the Lord's-Day, having speets and roasts at the fire in time of sermon.

Thomas Carmichael, for profaning the Lord's-Day, 4 merks.

Given in by Mr Jo. Eleis for the ile 13l. 6s. 8d. (Marked on the margin Dispensation.)

June 5.—Ja^s Brown's wife, for profaning the Lord's-Day, 1l. 6s. 8d.

Alex. Johnston, for profaning the Lord's-Day, . . . 24s.

Daniel Robertson, for profaning the Lord's-Day, . . . 4 merks.

June 17.—Mr Jo. Eleis, for private marriage, . . . 20 merks.

Malcolm Fleming for some misbehaviour which escaped him in presence of the session, 40 merks.

“ 1646.

Apr. 8.—The six sessions ordains the magistrates to deal with the council for repairing the *House of Correction*.

The whole ministers, with any three of them, and six elders, to go to the council and consult what course shall be most convenient for providing and preparing some public and common fabric or houses for receiving and entertaining the whole ordinary poor of the city, so that none be suffered to go abroad, or be seen begging : But that all that is any ways able may be set to industry and labour.

May 12.—The six sessions elect John Murray to the vacant office of ordinar chirurgion to the poor.—Salary 150 lib. yearly.

“ 1647.

Sept. 15.—The six sessions ordains the kirk treasurer to answer the masters of St Paul's Work of the sum of 13s. 4d. weeklie, for ilk ane of the ordinar poor that sall be presented and placed in that work, by the advice of any of the six sessions.

Dec. 1.—The six sessions ordains all the elders, with their deacons, to make ane exact visitation, and to take up a list of all

strangers and new incomers, and to give ever ilk one in particular his list to the ballive of the quarter, and try likewise who is their landlord, as also what children they have to be put to some virtue and manufactorie.”

* * * * *

I do not find that nearly so much of the collections at the churches was given to the parochial poor as is generally supposed. On the contrary, I find a very great proportion of the collections have been given, in every part of the country of which I know anything, to the stranger poor, and to other purposes than the support of paupers,—for instance, the expenses connected with religious worship and education. These things were paid out of the funds collected at the churches; and the repairs of the church, I find, were very often paid from that source, besides many other things at the discretion of the session.

Collections were not the only sources from which the poor were provided. There were many other sources—for instance, what were called penalties in cases of Church discipline. In some cases I find that the penalties paid by those who had violated the rules of the Church, exceeded in amount the collections at the churches. Originally, too, the session had the disposal of the seats in the churches. In most of the churches there were scarcely any permanent seats provided. The session gave power to erect seats in different parts of the church; and I find various cases in which they erected seats at their own expense, or rather out of the funds at their disposal, and assigned the rents to support the parochial poor. I find that such was the case in Dunfermline, and in the Canongate; likewise in Liberton, and some other country parishes.

* * * * *

I have here some notes about the poor of the parish of Canongate. In September 1564, “it is ordained that no person get ony almes except that they haif been at the communion, saifand infants, fatherless, and sick persons as are in extreme sickness, or in extreme poverty.” At this time there were 900 communicants; two years afterwards there were 1200. Here is another note from the same record, dated 14th May 1619: “Anent the hospital now crected of late within the burgh of the Canongate for the comfort and help of the honest, agit, and pure persones wⁱn the same, failzeit craftsmen, burgesses, or other ancient burgesses wⁱn the said burgh

of the Canongait allanerlie (only), and also to their pure, agit, and failzeit widowes qho sal be thocht meit to be ressavit and admitted w^{thin} the samen, quhois honestie and gude conversation has been, be long experience, weill approvit baith to the session and counsall of the s^d burgh.

“Seeing the cair of the hospitall is *more ecclesiasticle nor civill in respect it concerns the pure and their entertainment, and seeing the haill expenses debursit in buying, building, and repairing grof, surmounting 3000 merks, is out of the session thesaurarie, as also the pure quho in ony time cuning are to be ressavit yrin most of necessitie be maintained be the session help*; therefore for yir and others divers gude respects, the s^d baillies and counsall of the Canongait agreit that qtsumever richt they have to the said hospitall either be infeftment or propertie, patronage, or qtsumever interes in possession they have or may claim yrto, the ministers, elders, and deacons of the said Canongait allanerlie and their successors, sall in all respects be equall with them, and have na les right nor power to the propertie and patronage of the said hospital, nor gif they were actuallie infeft in the same.”

In the records of various other sessions I find notices of public buildings in which the poor were maintained.

By what means were these public buildings founded?—I have reason to think some of them were built out of funds raised for the poor; but I believe that some of them were buildings that had existed before the Reformation. I think that was the case at Perth, where one building had continued to be maintained for the reception of the poor.

I mentioned that, in the case of the Canongate, a considerable portion of the funds for the poor was derived from letting seats. That is more than two hundred years ago. I think here is the first minute upon this subject: “Holyrude-house, 20th Nov., 1639.—The session finding what prejudice and detriment their poor sufferit in the matter of the pew-mailes (seat-rents) by some who having taken them and left them a little before the terme, has paid nothing, at all, whereby both the poor and session are abused (these seats being built upon the poor folk’s money, and the mailes thereof appointed for their maintenance), therefore the session ordains that ilk person that has a seat within the kirk

of Holyrud-house shall compear the next Tuesday, the 3rd of December, before the session, with the keys of the seals that may see all bygones payed, and that they take of new from the session, with this condition, that they pay the term they enter in," &c. On the 3d of December, the session ordained that "all having seats in the kirk shall pay half a year's pew-mail beforehand." I find the annual rents paid for seats in 1649 amounted to 234l. 13s. 4d. Scots. The Earl of Angus paid for his pew, 26l. 13s. 4d. ; the Earl of Lauderdale, 13l. ; the Laird of Scots-craig, 20l. ; Lady Bruce, 10l. The common yearly rent of a pew was 12l. Scots. There was also 450l. 13s. 4d. of house-rents, which went towards the support of the poor, the houses having been purchased for that purpose. At the same time, 23l. 12s. are mentioned as the rent of ground-annuals, according to the gift of Queen Mary

At Dunfermline also, as already noticed, the poor were partly supplied from the rents of seats. It may perhaps be proper to read an extract illustrative of the practice: "Nov. 9, 1647.—A stent of the seats, &c. Robert Sharp, wright in Pittencrieff, gave in to the ministers and elders of the kirk-session a stent of the hail particular seats and classes within the new loft buildit by him and John Sharp, his brother, on the north-east end of the said kirk, for the greater ease and relief to the said kirk-session," &c. (Ninety-four sittings were stented or estimated at 403l. 3s. 1d.) It is then stated that Robert Sharp is to require the several valuations from such as shall enter to the seats. "Likewise, in case the said seats shall be long in selling, the said Robert shall have power to take annual rent therefor, conform to the Act of Parliament, fra those that shall be long in entering thereto. Lykeas, the said Robert is content herewith, and obleiss him no to trouble or crave the session hereafter for any farther payment to him for the said loft and seats therein, and he received the key thereof, providing that those who shall enter to the said seats and rooms shall come to the session and get their license, and act thereupon fra the session, acknowledging the poor for the same." Then there is an enumeration of the seats, and of the rents assigned to each. Those seats were not let from year to year, but were apparently sold. The foremost desk holding three—price of every man's

room, 12l.=36l." This was the estimate ; but I find from a subsequent minute that that particular seat was sold for 60l. Scots to James Durie of Craighluscar, who also gave to the use of the poor 8l. 7s., so that the profit was very considerable on this adventure.

And does it appear that the profit went chiefly for the support of the poor?—Yes ; I think it went chiefly for the support of the poor, if it did not entirely go ; but, at least, the poor are described as receiving a stated sum.

Does it appear that the minister and remaining members of kirk-session conceived themselves to have property at that time in the area of the church?—I am not clear that they conceived themselves to have the property ; but I find that universally they assigned the seats. Not even the heritors could take possession of portions of the area for seats without applying to the kirk-session for leave to build—'bigg' is the word that is used.

Then the area of the church was entirely at their disposal?—It appears so. I stated as to Liberton, that seats were set apart and let for the benefit of the poor ; but that appears to have been on a different footing. I find that at least down to 1812 there were certain seat-rents allocated to the poor. I find that arrangement in existence so far back as 1762. I have here a statement of the rents for four years, and the average sum paid annually from 1762 to 1765, inclusive, is 7l. I find in 1810, the sum paid for such seat-rents was 12l. 3s. 6d., which went to the poor. The last I had an opportunity of seeing was the amount in 1812, which was 11l. 17s. 2d. They had also house property. In 1765, the whole funds for the poor in Liberton amounted to 60l. 7s. 7d. sterling ; and of that there was about 15l. of house-rents, and of seat-rents 7l. 0s. 4d. Thus more than one-third of the funds for the poor was derived from property. . . .

Do you know the proportion of the penalties for the different offences?—Yes ; I could state what they have been in different places. The session seems to have had the power of remitting them to a certain extent ; but some of them were fixed by Act of Parliament. The penalties varied according to the rank or ability of the individual. I find here in the parish of Lasswade, in 1628, one individual pays as a penalty for fornication, 4l. Scots ; another pays 40s., or 2l. Scots, the same year. I find another the same

year paying 20s.; and another in a case of adultery paying 30s., *i. e.*, because in the particular case the individual was poor. The General Assembly seemed to think they were entitled to allot those penalties to some particular purposes, for about 1641, I think, they gave directions to each presbytery to provide for a bursar of divinity during four years at the college; and by another Act of Assembly, passed in 1645, the said maintenance was directed to be taken forth of the kirk penalties, and I find it was so done. . . .

At the time of which I am speaking, I find in the distribution of the funds of the poor a very considerable proportion was given to strangers. In 1642, I find from the books of all the sessions that a great proportion was given to strangers from Ireland, who had taken refuge in Scotland on account of the violence and cruelties to which they had been exposed in their own country. In Lasswade, in 1642, I find sums given to "a minister's wife from Ireland, who had her husband cruelly execute by the rebels, and her goods taken away—12s." "Two gentlewomen, daughters to Captain Hay, from Ireland—12s." "Mr James Mark, a minister from Ireland—40s." Considerable sums are given to a class called "distressed gentlemen." John Cunningham, dumb, from Ireland, 6s. 8d. Margaret Campbell, a gentlewoman, and daughter, from Ireland, received 10s. "Jan. 9, 1642.—Collected for the relict and children of unq^l John Trewman, who was martyred and quartered by the depute of Ireland in Craigfergus, in Ireland, for our Scottis cause—8 lib. 10s."

Have you any documents in your possession showing the proportion given to stranger poor and parochial poor from the Church collections?—I am not aware that I have any statement which would show exactly the proportion. But I have a variety of notes from the registers, which show that, in general, the largest contributions on particular occasions were given to strangers, and they are generally marked first:—

Specimens of Contributions to Strangers from Money at the disposal of the Kirk-Sessions.

St Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, 1611, May 2.—The session payit and delivered to ane secret Christian, according to the act of the pres-

bytery, and according to the act of the session made upon the 4th day of April 1611, 20 l.

1622, May 9.—To the distressed of France, 800 l. Scots.

1631, June 16.—To the ministers, children, and wyfes of the distressed brethren of Bohemia, 393 merks.

Coldingham, 1701, June 29.—To a company of beggars, 1 l.

To one Mrs Gray in Berwick, in straits, 1 l. 10s.

To Jean Creighton, a poor stranger, 2s.

1702, July 27.—To a company of beggars, 2 l. 2s.

To John Paterson in Tweedmouth, 14s.

To Elizabeth Marshall in Ayton, 4s.

To an honest man, recommended by the Synod (*suppressio nomine*), 2 l.

Largo, 1642, Dec. 4.—Relief given to various distressed persons, some strangers from Ireland, and from other places. One was the wife of one Mr Thomas Murray, a minister in Ireland, who, she said, was crucified for the religion; and spearing what the session would bestow upon her, she was answered, they would be content to give her for their part 4 lib.

1643, June 18.—To a poor gentleman, 30s.

To three women come from Ireland, 24s.

Stow, 1646, May 17.—To ane gentleman of good report, with a testificat from Ireland, called Hector Turnbull, 12s.

To ane blind young man, out of Hamilton, 6s.

1661, June 10.—Debursed,—to Mr Henry Cockburn, bursar, 14 l.

A poor man in Smailholm, 30s.

A poor man in Nenthorn, 12s.

Poor stranger, 2s.

1711, July 16.—To the stranger poor, 4 l.

1712, July 14.—To the begging poor, 3 l.

1715, July 25.—Stranger poor, 2 l. 3s.

Lasswade, 1629, April 25.—To William Weill, extranean, 4s.

A poor woman, borne on ane barrow, 6s.

May 24.—2 sodgers that came out of Denmark, 9s.

Ane poor extranean quha had her guidman murdered, 9s.

Patrick Leslie, poor distressed traveller, sumtym a schoolmaster in the north, 6s.

Marg^t. Hamilton, in Kirkmuir, borne on a barrow, 3s. [Kirkmuir is in the parish of Fala.]

Elie, 1639, Oct. 21.—A distressed man, W^m. Lyndesay, who was spoiled in the north by the Gordons, 40s.

Kingarth in Bute, 1692, June 29.—Collection for the last season, extending to 4 l. 4s. Scots, to be divided as follows :

To John M^cKawy, in Kilmorden, 6s.

To another Highlandman, 4s. 8d.

1693, March 12.—Poor collection, 8 lib. 12s. Scots, divided—To Peter Stewart, 24s. ; to Donald M^cAlister, both of them from Ireland, 8s. ; to Arch^d. M^cIntier, from Kerry, 30s.

1694, Oct. 19.—Collection, 6 l. 18s. 4d., divided—To Jane Gordon, out of Ireland, 13s. 4d. ; to one M^cPharlan, out of Knapdale, 7s.

1695, March 2.—Collected 10 merks, divided—to one Duncan Fraser, out of Murray, 18s. 6d.

1695, July 15.—Collected, 7 l. 14s., divided—to an Highlandman, 4s. ; to a soldier's wife, out of Flanders, 4s.

1696, Jan. 1.—Collection, 11 l. Scots, divided—to Mary M^cPher-son, in Glasgow, 27s., &c.

Orniston, 1663, June 2.—To Thos. Hislop, a poor student, 1 l. 10s.

To Lau^r. Forrest, schoolmaster, Temple, for his son, another poor student, 2 l.

1670.—To George Sinclair, a gentleman recommended by the synod, 4 l. 14s.

Angus M^cKenzie, recommended by the synod, 1 l.

W^m. Sinclair, recommended by the synod, Dec. 30, 1670, 2 l.

1673.—To a certain barn person in necessity, 2 l. 18s.

1675.—To M^r W^m. Semple, in want, known to some of the session, 5 l. 12s.

1681, Oct. 8.—Ane familie in Edin., the master whereof is not able to win his living, through the decay of his sight, 5 l. 18s.

1680.—To the widow of M^r Semple, whose father was minister of Lesmahago (she hath ten children), 2 l. 6s.

Notes on the Poor, from the Session Record of Stow.

“1635, Dec. 13.—3 l. paid for badges to the poor.” (This was a

common custom in Scotland for more than 200 years. I do not know if it be now extinct, but it prevailed in the south about thirty years ago. Certain individuals were licensed by the session to go round and solicit alms, and in token of their privilege they wore a badge. I remember them in Dumfries, where they were known by the name of badgers.)

Stow, 1635, Dec. 29.—“The min^r. produced ane letter from superior powers, that no beggar be suffered to gang, but every paroch sustain their own.”

1699, Jan. 18.—Testimonials granted to such poor as are allowed to go in the parish.

Jan. 23.—Parish officer paid for keeping out the stranger poor from the paroch.

Twenty-three men and women, having children, allowed liberty “to go through the paroch, and receive weekly help.”

“The session appoints their clerk to give to the overseers of the poor, each of them, a just double of the stent-roll of one pound on each hundred pound of valued rent within the parish, together with a copy of the above list of the poor and their allowances, conform to which they are to depurse; and appoints the said list to be publicly read before the dismissing of the congregation on Sabbath.”

(Many entries afterwards concerning the collection of the stent, —precepts of pinding given by the sheriff against such as are deficient in payment of their proportion of stent for maintaining the poor. Some had their goods confiscated and sold.)

At the dates of which you are speaking, do you find any roll of the poor receiving regular relief from different parishes?—Yes, pretty frequently. In many cases, the whole names of the regular poor occur annually; and, besides, those who receive occasional relief are marked down with the relief granted. But in many cases, even when the parties are not specified, the number is given.

But the amount expended in relief to them is less than what is given to strangers?—It is sometimes less—pretty frequently so. Here is one of the sets of notes to which I refer. This is from Dunfermline; the date is November 16, 1640. So much is given in alms to various persons:—“30s. to the stranger seeking to be landward schoolmaster; 30s. to the poor writer in Edinburgh;

25 merks to the poor woman who has her husband and sons with the army." That is the whole given on that particular day at the week's distribution. Here is a singular entry in the same record of Dunfermline kirk-session:—"January 4, 1648.—Almes distribute to the ordinar poor, 36 l. Item, to an English esquire, his wyff, and 3 bairns, 6 l. Item, to twa other Englishmen, named Richard Gosman and Thomas Gulian, each of them having a wife and three children, 5 l. 10s. Item, to Sir ————, some time of ————, with provision that those that shall protest and seek for him hereafter shall pay the double of this almes themselves to him, and the session nothing, 13 l. 6s. 8d. Item, to Mr James Lindsay, bursar, 10 lib," &c. . . .

Here is a minute which I may read, from the session-book of Newbattle:—"Nov. 18, 1596.—Anent ye puir it is tho^t meit y^t a visitatioun shall be, and y^t sum help shall be maid to them y^t ar altogether unable, y^t may not travell to seik to themself, and the young shall get na almess bot on condition y^t thay com to the schooll, q^{lk} sa mony as does shall be helpet, and *the maner of thar help shall be, thay shall haif thrie hours granted to them everie day to go throw the town to saik ther meat, ane hour in the morning fra nyn to ten, at midday fra twell to ane, and at nyght fra sex hours furth; and the peiple ar to be desyred to be helpfull to sic as will give themself to any vertue; and as for others, to deall hardly w^h them, to dryve them to seik after vertue.*" . . .

I have some notes as to the distribution to the poor in the parish of St Andrews so long ago as 1641, down to 1660. At that time I find that, besides the collections in the churches, it was the practice to send every week through the town, under the inspection of the elders, a basket, or what is called a creel, in which were collected not money, but articles of food and clothing for the poor. The value of what was collected in that way is generally put down along with the amount of the collections, which are very considerable. On the 2d of December 1651, the collection at the church is 19 l. Scots; and of creel-money there are 2 l. 14s. 4d. On the 9th of December the collections, including those of two week-days, are 22 l. 13s. 8d.; creel-money, 2 l. 4s. 8d. On the 16th of December there are of collections 22 l. 10s., and of creel-money 2 l. 15s.—the proportion of the creel-money to the collections is one-tenth.

I have also some notes relating to the poor of Inverness, from the kirk-session record of date 6th December 1698. There is a list given of poor who are supplied out of the hospital, and of the sums given to each. I have not extracted the particular allowances, but the amount is 211 l. 3s. 4d.”

No. XVII.—Vol. II., page 104.

EXTRACTS FROM PROCEEDINGS OF CHURCH COURTS, SHOWING HOW THE LAWS AGAINST SABBATH-BREAKING WERE ADMINISTERED IN SCOTLAND.^a

Extracts from the Records of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews.

“ . . . Nov. 15, 1570.—Gelis Symson, spouse to George Utton, baxter, is decernit to desist in tyme coming fra selling of candel and bread on Sondays, and not resorting to the kirk for hearing of God’s word, missaying and disobedient to her husband, under pain of ten lib., and to sit in the joggis 24 hours, and likewise delatit for fliting with her neighbours, and selling of bread time of sermon on Sunday.

Feb. 18, 1572.—Tweddell accused for breaking of the Sabbath

^a [From the earliest period of the Reformed Church of Scotland, it has been a favourite object of the several ecclesiastical judicatories to secure the sanctification of the Lord’s Day, and the reverent observance of religious ordinances. Scarcely any subject is more frequently noticed in the proceedings of synods, presbyteries, and kirk-sessions in the 16th and 17th centuries; and during the same period it rarely failed to occupy the attention of the General Assemblies of this Church, by which there is reason to believe the civil statutes against Sabbath-breaking and other modifications of profaneness, were, from time to time, suggested to the legisla-

ture. Thus, in the year 1565, one of the articles ordained by the Assembly to be sent to the Queen was, “That such horrible crimes as now abound in the realm, without any correction, to the great contempt of God and his holy Word, such as manifest breaking of the Sabbath-day, may be severely punished, and judges appointed in every province for the execution thereof, with power to do the same, and that by Act of Parliament.”

Penal acts of this description appear to have been framed on the principle, that those whom Christian motives do not influence to the conscientious performance of the most sacred duties,

in threshing corn, for four hours morning till four hours at even : the correction is committed by the seat to the magistrates.

June ult., 1574.—Captors appointed to visit the town every Sunday.

April 18, 1582.—A great number of drapers, fleshers, and merchants accused of keeping the market of Crail on the Sabbath ; prohibited from repeating the offence under pain of exclusion, and debarring of themselves, their wives, bairns, and servants, from all benefit of the Kirk in time coming—viz. baptism, the Lord's Supper, and marriage.

May 1599.—Anent staying of dancing in Raderny on Trinity Sunday.

June 6, 1599.—David Wemis, in Raderny, ordained to be imprisoned in the steeple till he find caution to make repentance. He said that he never saw that dancing was stayit before, and that custom was kept in Raderny ere ony of the session was born, &c.

June 10, 1599.—David Wemis confessed his fault in dancing and profanation of the Sabbath.

Aug. 24, 1660.—It is thought meet that the elders of landward advert that nane of the landward break the Sabbath in shearing, leading, or labouring of their corns in this harvest season approaching.

Nov. 18, 1641.—Archibald Russel, in Wester Balrymont, and his servant-woman, for leading corn on the Sabbath evening, were ordained to crave God mercy on their knees before the session, and to pay 40s. penalty, which was given to ane Gordon, a distressed woman come from Ireland.

ought to be restrained from outraging the feelings of the serious part of the community, and corrupting the young and simple, by their open impiety, and that there might even be some reasonable hope of bringing them, by salutary severity, to consider the folly, the odiousness, and misery of sin. The Reformers did not expect that the vengeance of the offended laws would be sufficient to impress on the heart a sense of religious obligation,—but they did not, on the other hand, apprehend that civil statutes, made for the purpose of overawing the unholy and profane, and counteracting

or suppressing any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine, would ever excite in any perverse mind the mischievous supposition, that religious institutions are in any degree the creatures of human policy, and that the same power which can enforce the observance of them by fines and imprisonment and corporal inflictions, may with equal justice dispense with them altogether.

For a considerable time, the transition from the laxity of popish manners to the stricter solemnity of presbyterian discipline, was much more gradual than is generally imagined.]

May 31, 1649.—James Allan, for breaking of the Sabbath, to be scourged in the Tolbooth by one of the town officers, at the sight of the magistrates.”

Extracts from the Register of the Presbytery of Glasgow.

“Feb. 6, 1592.—The Presbyterie has fund William Craig, at Walkmill of Partik, to have been absent fra his kirk this lang time bygane, and thairby to have contravenit his obligations, quhairin he obligit him, under the pane of ten merks, to keep his kirk on Sunday to heir God’s word; is decernit to pay to the thesaurer of his kirk the said ten merks, and to make his repentance in his kirk for absence fra his kirk the twa Sundays next to cum, and that he be not absolved till he shew evident tokens of repentance, and that he find suretie, under the pain of ten pundis, to be present to hear God’s word on the Sunday in tymes cuming.

April 30, 1594.—The Presbyterie of Glasgow ordenis Steven Auldsorne, for working on the Sondaye, to pay to the thesaurer of his kirk of Ruglen 20 shillings on Sondaye next to cum, and to make his repentance publiclie ane Sondaye.

May 7.—The Presbyterie of Glasgow statutes and ordenis that gif Mungo Craig sall playe on his pypes on the Sondaye fra the sunrising till the sun going to in ony place within the bonds of this Presbyterie, that he incontinent thereafter sall be summarlie excommunicat. Lykwise statutes that upon the Sondaye in the said time, nane gif themselves to pastimes and profane games within the said bonds, under the pain of the censures of the kirk; and this to be intimat furth of pulpit the next Sondaye be everie minister within this presbyterie, and specialie be the minister of Ruglen.”

Extracts from the Records of the Kirk-Session of Anstruther, Kilrenny, and Pittenweem.

“Oct. 22, 1588.—Mr James Melvill, minister, produced before the Assemblie ane Commission fra the King’s Majesty and Council to put in execution the Acts of Parliament made anent violation of Sabbaths, desyrand some persons to take the same in hand, the whilk Andrew Melvill, in Anstruther, and David Strang in Pittenweem, undertook and promised faithfully to discharge.

Aug. 18, 1590.—It is ordained by the session, that according to the Act made before, there shall be visitation everie Sunday in tyme of preaching before noon and after, and that the absentes shall be noted and delated to the Assemblie.

It is ordained that the preaching shall begin every Sunday at nyne hours, or thereby, that it may end by eleven; that the afternoon's doctrine may begin about ane afternoon, that it may be ended before three, and the rest of the time may be spent in examination of the heads of the Catechism.

Oct. 21, 1590.—Ordnained that the millers of the Milltown shall be summoned for the profanation of the Sabbath.

July 18, 1594.—Because of the contempt of the Word and evil-keeping of the Sabbath, the session ordains that the maister and maistress of every house, and sa mony as are of years and judgment (except when need requireth otherwise), shall be present in the kirk in due time every Sabbath to hear the sermon before and after noon, under pain of 12d. the first, 2s. the second, and for the third 5s.; also 5s. *toties quoties* thereafter; as also, for the third fault to be debarred fra the benefits of the kirk till they make repentance, as the session shall enjoin."

Extract from the Records of the Session of Abercromby.

"1630.—The Session, considering the great abuse whilk followeth upon marriages made on the Sabbath, ordained that hereafter none shall be married on the Sabbath except they pay to the use of the poor 58s., and oblige themselves to keep good order; so that who-soever faileth in that kind shall make their public repentance, and pay to the box as transgressors of the Sabbath, according to the act made thereanent."

Extracts from the Acts of the Kirk-Session of Maderty.

"June 26, 1625.—It is ordained by the ministers and elders, that no banquet be in any brewster's upon ane Sunday, under the pain of 40s.

Oct. 9, 1625.—Janet Moris confessed that she sent ane lade to the mill on Sunday the 25th of September, and therefore it is

ordained that she sit in the repentance-stool in her awin habit, and pay 40s."

Extracts from the Records of the Kirk-Session of Stow.

" March 18, 1627.—The whole millers of the parochin being called, the session laying it to their charge that their mills did gang on Sabbath, in time of divine service, they did acknowledge the same to have been of verity, whilk in itself was ane great fault, the session did ordain that hereafter their mills—to wit, neither corn-mills nor walk-mills, should gang on the Sabbath, neither summer nor winter, from eight hours in the morning till four hours in the afternoon ; for the first fault to pay 40s., and to underly the censures of the Church ; the second fault to double the same, and so forth.

March 25, 1627.—Act against drinking on the Sabbath, and selling of ale. No person to go to any ostler-house on the Sabbath-day before sermon for to drink any (except in necessity), on pain of paying 20s. ; for drinking in time of sermons, to pay 40s.

May 13, 1627.—William Brunton for being drunk on the Sabbath, and unreverent carriage in presence of the session, was ordained to pay 40s., to stand next Sabbath in the joutes betwixt the bells, thereafter to come after sermon in presence of the congregation, and confess his fault to God, and crave mercy.

April 8, 1632.—The session, considering the great abuse in the Stow town on the Sabbath-day, by selling and buying of sundry sorts of wares, whereby the Lord's-day was profaned, they did ordain that nane sall be suffered to use any such traffic on the fore-said day, under penalty of 10s., and making public satisfaction.

Extracts from the Acts of the Kirk-Session of Crail.

" May 21, 1622.—Persons bleaching claith on the Sabbath sall be behodden transgressors of the Sabbath.

Oct. 15, 1622.—All persons who shear or lead corn on the Sabbath, or trail or set nets on the Saturday night, sall pay ilk person 20s., and make their repentance.

July 5, 1636.—Those who sall drink on the Sabbath sall be

fined 20s. the first time, 30s. the second, and 10s. more every succeeding time.

July 11, 1648.—The minister proposed to the session that for the restraining of the profanation of the Lord's-day by customary drinking after sermon in the afternoon, there should be an act made, ordaining that all such who were found in taverns or alehouses after the afternoon's sermon on Sunday drinking, should be proceeded against and fined as Sabbath-breakers, which was unanimously assented unto by the session.

Aug. 1, 1648.—Eleven persons delated for Sabbath-breaking. A woman, for seething bark on the Sabbath-day, is ordained to be jogged three several days, and the last day to make her repentance before the pulpit; a man to be jogged for frequent absence from the kirk; others fined.

Sept. 17, 1648.—Thirty-two persons delated for Sabbath-breaking, some by setting nets, others by receiving and carrying herrings; all fined—some a dollar, others 40s., others 20s. (In 1650, the Presbytery of St Andrews, in attesting and approving the proceedings of the session, appointed them to refer to the civil magistrate the enjoining of corporal punishment or pecunial mulcts.

Extract from the Records of the Synod of Fife.

“April 8, 1641.—The Synod ordains to be registrat in the provincial book of the Acts of the Presbytery of St Andrews, March 14, 1641, ordaining that the laudable Acts of Parliament and of general and provincial assemblies, made for restraining of such sins as blasphemy, cursing, swearing, &c., as also the profanation of the Lord's holy Sabbath by contempt of God's Word and worship, by tipling and drinking, by games and pastimes, &c., be put in execution by every kirk-session, and that the discipline of the kirk shall be no less against them than against whoredom, bloodshed, &c.”

Abstract of Cases of Sabbath-breaking found in the Record of the Session of St Cuthbert's or West Kirk, Edinburgh.

“1587.—David Dougal, for going to Cramond on the Lord's-day morning with shoes—censured.

1589.—David Mackie, for shearing corn on the Lord's-day—publicly rebuked.

1589.—Thomas Clarkson and others, for working on Sabbath—set at the pillar for delinquents, before the congregation.

1590.—John Dickson, for leading in corn on Sabbath—to stand two days before the congregation.

1591.—John Duncan, for ordering his servants to perform field-labour on the Sabbath—publicly rebuked.

1591.—Margaret Steel, convicted of repeated Sabbath-breaking, &c.—referred to the civil magistrate.

1591.—Alexander Johnstone, for shearing corn on Sabbath—publicly rebuked.

1591.—Marion Aikman, for dressing clothes on the Sabbath—rebuked before the church.

1593.—J. Muir, for leading in corn on Sabbath—publicly rebuked.

1593.—Malcom Begg, for shearing corn on Sabbath—set at the pillar for delinquents.

1595.—David Dugald, for carrying shoes to Cramond on the Lord's-day—publicly rebuked, and obliged to find caution that he shall never be guilty of a similar offence, under a penalty, for the first transgression, of 20s., for the second of 40s., and for the third of banishment from the parish.

1595.—Marion King, for suffering dancing in her house on the Sabbath, receives a similar sentence.

1596.—Alexander Lauriston, for shearing corn on the Lord's-day—publicly rebuked, and ordered to make confession of his sins before the congregation.

1597.—Walter Wilson and George Williamson, for baking bread on the Sabbath—censured, and bound, under penalty of 14s., to abstain from committing a like offence in all time coming.

1598.—Several persons in West Port, Potterrow, and Water of Leith, for profaning the Sabbath by 'May games;'—referred to the bailies of their respective districts.

1599.—Five individuals, for drinking in the country on the Lord's-day—admonished, and obliged to find security for their good behaviour in future, under a penalty of 40s.

1602.—David Ochiltree, for fishing on Sabbath, and other crimes—delivered over to the civil magistrate.

1605.—David Knipper, for playing at the bowls on Sabbath—set at the pillar.

1606.—Thomas Richmond, for thrashing corn on Lord's-day—publicly rebuked.

1610.—John Bowie, for keeping his mill on Sabbath—fined 20s.

1610.—John Douglas and other two persons referred to the Sessions for Edinburgh, for playing at the penny stones on Sabbath.

1610.—George Millar, for 'waulking' his clothes on the waulk-mill—fined 20s. for himself, and 10s. for his apprentice.

1610.—William Bowand and Archibald Wilson, for fighting on the Lord's-day—fined 20s. each.

1611.—John Douglas, bound under a penalty of 20s. that he shall never sell wine on Sabbath, or open the gate at the West Port during time of sermon.

1614.—John Brown and others fined 20s. each for playing at foot-ball on the Sabbath.

1614.—Janet Watson, for selling drink on Sabbath—fined 20s. ; other publicans fined.

1615.—Patrick Hardie and John Ranken, for tying up peas on the Lord's-day—fined 20s. each, and rebuked before the congregation.

1619.—Robert White, for going to see the 'May games'—fined 20s.

1620.—Marion Hamilton and Christian Howie, for 'flyting' on the Lord's-day—fined 20s. each.

1620.—Archibald Whyte, cautioner for Mungo Mann, obliged to pay 20s. of fine for the latter, being convicted of fighting and 'flyting' on Sabbath, and unable to pay himself.

1622.—William Whyte, for carrying timber on Sabbath—fined 10s. only, on account of his poverty.

1622.—Robert Boyd, for fighting on Sabbath—fined 20s., and imprisoned.

1623.—George Frazer, for keeping his mill going on Sabbath—fined 40s. ; and for refusing to appear before the session when cited, ordered to be imprisoned.

1625.—Alexander Wishart and George Purves, for selling bread on the Lord's-day—fined 20s. each.

1625.—George Mitchell, for selling bread on Sabbath in time of harvest—imprisoned because he was unable to pay his fine.

1630.—Several persons for taking 'laverocks' (larks) on Sabbath—fined 20s. each.

1630.—John Wilson, for drinking and fighting on the Lord's-day—fined 30s.

1631.—John Bower, for fighting on Sabbath—fined 26s. and 8d., and imprisoned 24 hours.

1631.—Several persons for fishing on Sabbath—fined 20s. each, and imprisoned.

1632.—A number of individuals for drinking on the Lord's-day—fined 20s. to 40s. each.

1636.—James Graig, for selling ale on Sabbath—fined 40s.

1639.—James Lapslie and John Scoular, for drinking on the Lord's-day—rebuked before the congregation.

1648.—James Bruce, his wife, and Margerie Masterton, for drinking at Tipperlin on Sabbath—fined 55s. each.

1649.—A servant's mistress, for compelling the former to work on Sabbath—fined 10 l.

1649.—Margaret Burns, for selling drink on Sabbath—fined 20s., and rebuked.

1649.—Several persons, for writing out, subscribing, and being witnesses to a bond on the Lord's-day—severely rebuked, and fined 20s. each.

1650.—Thomas Kerr, for being found drinking on Sabbath—fined 26s.

1651.—William Stevenson's wife, for being convicted of selling drink on Sabbath—fined 3 l.

1652.—Margaret Cook and Marion Stevenson, for 'flyting and scolding' on Sabbath—fined a dollar each, and publicly rebuked.

1652.—Alexander Nimmo, for selling straw on Sabbath—fined 30s.

1652.—John Coutts and others, for selling milk on the Lord's-day—fined 40s. each.

1654.—Three individuals, for drinking and fighting on Sabbath—fined 4 l. each, and rebuked.

1656.—John Stevenson, for carrying beer to his house on Sabbath morning—fined, and rebuked.

1657.—Several individuals publicly rebuked for drinking on the

Lord's-day, and the publicans who sold them the drink—fined by the magistrate.

1659.—William Gillespie, for carrying water, and his wife for 'knocking bear' on Sabbath—publicly rebuked.

1682.—Agnes Couper fined 2 l., and Margt. Lauder 1 l., 10s. Scots, and rebuked before the session, for fighting on the Lord's-day.

1683.—Archibald Cuthbertson's wife, for causing her servant to carry several bottles of wine on the Sabbath, and she having passed with them through the churchyard, is fined 3 l.

1684.—Henry Miller, for being drunk the whole Sabbath—fined one dollar.

1688.—James Hopkirk and his wife, referred to the magistrate to be put out of the parish for repeated and shameful violations of the Sabbath.

1696.—James Ramsay, for having people drinking in his house on Sabbath, is rebuked, and fined by the magistrate.

1696.—Alexander Begg, for drunkenness on the Sabbath, is rebuked before the congregation.

1696.—Elizabeth Thom, for persisting to carry in quantities of milk to Edinburgh on the Lord's-day—publicly rebuked.

1697.—The millers in Water of Leith, for keeping their mills going on Sabbath, are referred to the civil magistrate to be punished.

1697.—Several persons profaning the Sabbath, by drinking in a public-house in time of sermon, &c.—rebuked before the congregation, and fined.

1697.—William Robb, for pulling peas, abusing his neighbours, and drunkenness on the Lord's-day—rebuked and fined.

1697.—John Campbell, for drinking on the Lord's-day—publicly rebuked.

1697.—John Smart, for the same crime—also publicly rebuked.

1698.—Hugh Gray, for sending his servant to Edinburgh with milk to sell on the Lord's-day—rebuked before the congregation, and fined.

1698.—Janet Melville, for carrying flour and barm from Edinburgh to Cramond on Sabbath—publicly rebuked.

1699.—Henry Nisbet, younger, of Dean, his brother Patrick Nisbet, and John Paterson, for drinking in a public-house on Sabbath—rebuked, and fined by the magistrate."

No. XVIII.—Vol. II., pp. 17 and 106.

EXTRACTS AND NOTES RELATING TO THE SECOND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

“ Observations of the conferences betwix the King’s M. and Counsels Commissioners and the Kirks with the judgment of the Generall Assemblie, pp. 839 and 873. (See Mr James Carmichael’s copy of the book referred to in Acts of General Assembly, 1638.)

Cap. 1. The aughteen article y^of qlk in Conference was desyrit to be maid plain. The Assemblie thinks it sensible aneuch.

Cap. 2. The third article aggreit conforme to the Conference.

Cap. 3. The sevint article to be fary^r considerit.

The tent article tho^t plain in the self.

As to the 12 article, agreeit it will be framit conforme to Conference.

Tuiching the advyce cravit, q^t pain salbe put to the non-residents, the kirk tho^t meit ane civil law be cravit decernand the benefices to vaik thro^t non-residence.

The 9 article agreit conforme to the Conference, and the penalte of persons excommunicat decerned to be horning and caption be special act of Parl^t to be execut be the the^r Justice Clerk or as the K. M. and his Counsall pleiss to appoint.

Cap. 5. Aggreit with the twa suppeditations desyrit.

Cap. 6. The perpetuities of the persons of the elders aggreit.

Ed., 7th July 1579. Sess. 5., pa. 873.

Concerning the dowt maid upon the *second* article of the *first* chapter, the kirk explains that article, and declairs it is understud baith of the particular presbyterie and general kirk.

1. The third article is thought plain eneuch.

2. Aggreit to the delation contenit in the sext article.

3. The ix. article the kirk thinks it gude as it is in the buke.

12. And the 12 siclyk.

The kirk eiks to the government this word discipline.

10. The tent article to remain unalterit.

*In the Generall Assemblie holdin at Edr, the 24 Aprilis 1578.
Sess. 8, page 428 ;—*

This Gen^l Assemblie ordenit Mr Robert Pont, Mr James Law-son, and Mr David Lyndsay to review and oversie the Buke of Discipline ; and being written over conforme to the originall copie to be presentit be them unto his hyeness, with ane supplication pennit be them to that effect, with ane uther copie to the Counsale :

To my Lord Regent's Grace, the Ministers of Christ's blessed evangell, with the Commissioners and remanent members of this present Assemblie, wishe grace, mercie, and peace from God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the spreit of sobrietie and richteous judgment.

Seing that God of his grait favour and mercie, after grait blindness and ignorance, has granted unto this realme the sinceritie of his holie evangell, grait libertie, with ane peaceable quietness in the Commonwealth ; zit is not the policie of the Kirk of God so estab^d among us as God cravis in his Word, quhairthroucht we fear that the sinceritie of his Word is not able long to endure, except that the politie and frame of Government qlk God cravis in his Word be heirunto also jonit.

And seeing yo^r Grace not only fruitfullie hes travellit to establish ane quietnes and governm^t within this realme, bot also hes earnestlie preist to establische spirituall politie of the Kirk of God among us, the grait corruption and blindness of papistrie being removit ; therfor, as oftentyms heirbefore, we have imployit o^r hail witts and judgments that the samein self policie of the kirk micht be brawcht to sune gud success, swa namelie now in the Assemblie, it hes pleasit God of his grait favo^r toward us swa to assist us w^t his Spreit, y^t efter lang reasoning and conference be ane common consent, we have pennit the cheif and principall matters conserning the said policie of the kirk dealling the same in certaine schort conclusions flowing from the guid and pur fontane of God's word to be presentit w^t this our humble supplication to yo^r Grace, maist humble craving of yo^r Grace to accept this our labour in gud pairte as flowing from humble and obedient hairts willing to do weill. Zit mane we not that onything in this policie is so absolutlie be us concludit, bot we are willing to heare and resave bettir

rasones q^rever the same shall be shawin unto us ; nather zit understand we the samein to be sa compleit that nathing may be addit or deminished from the samen, bot rather as God sull oppin upon farther knowledge unto his Kirk or ony member y^rof, y^t the same may be proponit in tyme convenient. And because, in the heads of the policie, maters are sa liukit and jonit on with ane uther, we crave of yo^r g^r to consider the hail discours heirof separat, not ane part from the rest, q^u of gude reason mane be jonit together, and so everie on of them to leane upon ane uther, for utherways grait absurditees nicht ensew y^rupoun, and our labours be loist q^lk we carefullie bestowit. As to the heid of deaconship, we offer upe the samen with the rest, zit leiving place to sic as are not fullie satisfiet herein to propone y^r judgments in writt qⁿ yei sall think meit and expedient ather in zo^r G. presence or befor the Assemblie of the Kirk. Finallie, q^{nas} yo^r G. hes sichtit yir o^r labours according to the hail discourse yeirof, gif ony thing heirin sall appeir not agreable to solide grounds and gud reasons, and that yo^r G. in respect y^rof will crave of us foryer reasoning and conference, we gladlie offer our selffis to the samein upone yo^r G. dew advertisement, q^lk we maist humble require. And zat effect hes appoyntit certein of o^r brethern to awate upon the samein as yo^r G. sall pleis command, calling to God with o^r hairts, zat as God hes maid yo^r G. a notable instrument to settle the realme in peaceable quietnes to serve o^r God in full libertie according to his Word. Even sa zat be yo^r G. cairful diligence the spiritual policie of the kirk of God may be brocht to sic ane happie and prosperous end, zat the name of o^r God may be glorifiert, the kingdome of Jesus Chryst may be advanceit, ye kingdome of Sathane mot be abolisched within this realme, to the comfort of us and o^r posteritie for ever.

Yo^r Grace's humble and obedient serviturs, Mr James Richye,
Clerk of the said Kirk, at command.

J. RICHYE.

Records of the General Assembly.

Edinburgh, 8th August 1599. Sess. 10. — Forsameikle as it is certain that the word of God cannot be keipit in the awn sinceritie without the halie discipline be had in observance, it

is therefore, be common consent of the hail brethren and commissioners present, concludit that quhasoever has borne office in the ministrie of the kirk within this realme, or that presentlie beirs or heirafter sal beir office therein, sal be chargit, be everie particular Presbyterie q^r their residence is, to subscribe the heads of discipline of the kirk of this realme at lenth set down and allowit be act of the hail Assemblie in the buke of policie qlk is insert in the Register of the Kirk, and, namelie, the controvertit heids be the enemies of the discipline of the reformed kirk of the realme betwix and the next provincial Assembly, under the pain of excommunication to be executed against the non-subscribers ; and the Presbyteries qlk sal be fund remiss or negligent herein, to receive publick rebuke of the hail Assemblie, and to the effect the said discipline may be knawin as it ought to be to the hail brethren, it is determined that everie Moderator of ilk Presbyterie sal receive fra the Clerk of the Assemblie ane copie of the said buke under his subscription upon the expenses of the Presbyterie betwix and the first day of Sept^r nixtocom, under the paine to be openlie accused in face of the hail Assemblie.

Edin., 5 Julij 1591. Sess. 4.—(General Assembly.)—Anent the subscriptionn of the Booke of Policie injoynit in the last Assemblie. In respect the greatest part of the Presbyteries as yet hes not satisfied the ordour of the kirk, the Assemblie hes ordainit their former act to be performit and execute betwix and their nixt Assemblie,—and the Moderatour of every Presbyterie is ordainit to see to the executioun heirof under the pain of 40s. to the use of the poore, beside the publick rebuke of the hail brethren in open Assemblie.

Synod of Lothian and Tweddall.

At Edinburgh, Oct. 6, 1590.—Anent the ordinance maid in the General Assemblie of the kirk, ordaining everie Presbyterie to have the just and autentick copie of the Book of Policie, and every broy^r to subscrieve the sam, the Assemblie hes ordainit, that according to the said ordinance everie Moderator of everie Presbyterie seik out ye sam, and present it to the Presbyteries to be subscrivit.

Presb. of Edinburgh, 10th of August 1591.

Anent the ordinance of the last General Assemblie of the Kirk, halden at Edin^r in the month of July last, ordaining every Presbytery within this realme to have the Book of Polite, and to subsybe the sam : the said Book being presentit before the Presbytery, it was concludit and agreit to be subsybit be all the brethren. ^a

Ministers in the Presbytery of Edinburgh at this time :—

Mr Dav. Lyndsay.	Mr Jo. Craig.
„ Ro. Pont.	„ Pat. Galloway.
„ Ro. Bruce.	„ Jo. Duncanson.
„ Wal. Balcanquall.	„ Dan. Chambers.
„ Jas. Balfore.	„ Robt. Rollok.
„ Wm. Watson.	„ Philip Hislop.
„ Jo. Davidson.	„ Charles Pharn.
„ Jo. Brand.	„ Hen. Charteris.
„ Michael Cranston.	„ Patrick Sandis.
„ Jas. Bennet.	„ Thos. Watson.
„ Jo. Hall.	„ Geo. Robertson.
„ Chas. Lumsden.	„ Peter Hewat.
„ Wm. Arde.	„ Peter Bruce.
„ Richd. Thomson.	„ Dav. Colein.
„ And. Forrester.	„ Ad. Bannatyne.
„ Jas. Logan.	„ Jas. Kelli.
„ Mat. Lychton.	„ Geo. Kincaid.

The ministers of the Presbytery of Haddington subscribed Sept. 29, 1591.

The following is the entry before the signatures :—

This Buik of Policie being red apt [apart] priwatlie bi the maist p^t at sundrie tymis, and ye penult of September 1591 being [read] publickly in the eldership of Hadington, was subsyvit be the brethren theirof according to the Act of the General Assemblie, as follows.

Mr JAS. CARMICHAEL, &c.

^a It was not subscribed on the 5th of October 1591. See Records of Synod.

Synod of Lothian—Trial of Presbyteries, April 6, 1591.

(Presbytery of Linlithgow.)—Ament the ordinance made in the former Assemblie, ordaining everie moderator to seek out the Book of Policie, and present it to everie presbyterie, to be subseryvit be thame, the moderator of the presbytery of Linlytgow being inquiryt gif he had resavyit ye sam, ans^rit as zit it was not gotten. The Assemblie has ordanit yi haif it readie aganis the nixt Assemblie.

(No more entries of this kind are found during this synod.)

Synod of Lothian, Oct. 5, 1591—Trial of Presbyteries.

(Presbytery of Linlithgow.)—Being demandit gif, according to the ordinance of the last General Assemblie (July last), they had subscribed the Book of Policie? Ans^t., they had subscribed the sam.

(Presbytery of Dunbar.)—Being inquiryt gif, according to the ordinance of the last Gen^r Assemblie, haldin at Ed^r in the month of July last, they had subseryvit the book of policie? Ans^rit, thai had subseryvit the sam.

(Presbytery of Haddington.)—Being demandit gif, according to the ordinance of the last Generall Assemblie of the Kirk, haldin at Edinburgh in the moneth of Julij last, yi had subscr. ye book of policie? Ansrit, thei had subseryvit the sam.

(Presbytery of Dalkeith.)—Demandit gif, according to the ordinance of the last Generall Assemblie of the Kirk, they had subseryvit the b. of policie? Ans^t., thei had subseryvit the sam.

(Presbytery of Edinburgh.)—Being demandit gif, according to the ordinance of the Generall Assemblie of the Kirk, yei had subseryvit the book of policie? Ans^rit, that as yit it was not subseryvit, bot yei concludit to subseryve the sam.

(Presbytery of Peblis.)—In the tryell of the breither of the pbrie. of Peblis, thei being demandit quhat diligence yi had ussit

for obtaining of the Acts of the Provinciall and Generall Assemblie? Ans^{rit}, yei had done nane. *Item*, being demandit gif yi had subscriyvit ye booke of policie? ans^{rit}, not. And being demandit give ye booke of the pbrie was present? Answerit, not. For the quik the Assemblie tho^t thame [worthy] of rebuke.

(Presbytery of St Andrews, Aug. 26, 1591.)—The moderator of the Presbytery, as of before, hes this day proponit and desyrit the buik of policie to be subscribit be the breyern according to the Act of the General Assemblie, and speciallie because the breyern of the Presbytery tuik all avyss xx dayis, qlk now are expyrit, and the said breyern as zitt findis yaimselfs not resolvit in all poyntis.

Ministers at this time in the Presbytery :—

Mr Andw. Melvill.	Mr Jas. Balcanquell.
„ Robert Wilkie.	„ Thos. Baxter.
„ James Melvill.	„ Thos. Douglas.
„ Thos. Buchanan.	„ Alex. Scrogy.
„ Robert Buchanan.	„ Andrew Bennet.
„ James Martin.	„ John Rutherford.
„ Henry Balfour.	„ Henry Leech.
„ David Black.	„ Jo. Robertson.
„ Robt. Wallace.	„ David Martin.
„ John Ure.	„ Andrew Duncan.
„ Robt.	„ Willm. Merche.
„ Jas. Pitcairn.	

No. XIX.

FORMS RELATING TO THE SETTLEMENT OF MINISTERS, FROM THE BOOK OF THE PRESBYTERY OF HADDINGTON, 1590, &c.^a

A Signature of a Presentation of a Benefice.

“Our Sovereign Lord being informit of the qualification, literature, and gude affection of his weil belovit N., and of his earnest

^a This book contains various forms of Haddington, both before and after which had been used in the Presbytery the year 1592. It contains the form of a

affection to travell in the office and charge of the ministerie within the kirk of God, therefore ordainis ane lettre to be maid under the privie seale in dew forme, nominatand and presentand the said N. to the personage of N., lyand within the sherriffdome of N. and diocese of N., vacand be deceass of N., last persone, vicar, and possessor y^of, and that the said lettre be extendit in the best forme, with all clauses needfull, directit to the Commissioner of, or presbyterie of N., requiring him (or them) to trye and examinat the qualification of the said N., and gif he be fund meit to use the said office of the ministerie within the Kirk of God, to admit him to the said benefice, receive the confession of his faith, and his aith for acknowledging and recognoscing of our Soverane Lord his authoritie, and to authorise him with the testimoniall of his admission as effeirs; or in case of his insufficiencie for the said office, to report the samyn to his hienes within the space of moneths after dait heirof, that ane other mair qualifeit persone may be of new nominate and presentit to the said benefice. Ordanis alsua the lordis of Consale and Session to grant ane direct lettres at the sight of the said lettre under the privie seal and of the said Commissioner (or presbyteries), testimoniall of admission for answering and obeying of the said N., of all and sondrie rents, teinds, profits, emolumentis, and deuteis quhatsoever of the said personage (or vicarage), and to name uthers during his lifetyme in due and competent forme as effeirs, subscribit be o^r Soverane lord, at the day of
the year of God ane thousand five hundreth fourscoir yeairs."

A Presentation of a laick Patron of ane new Erection.

"Alex^r Home of Northbervik, undoutit patron of the personage and vicarage after-mentionat, unto the ry^t worshipfull the presb^{rie}

presentation by a laic patron of a signature by the King, of a gift by the commissioner of the kirk within the bounds of a presbytery, in the case of a church which had been vacant six months; of an edict; and of the act of collation and institution, but no form of a call. It is a genuine book of the presbytery, containing the Second Book of Discipline, with the signatures of the whole mem-

bers, and I believe the most authentic copy now to be found. It is especially referred to in the Acts of the General Assembly 1638, as "the Book of Discipline pertaining to Mr James Carmichael."—(*Evid. on Patronage.*) [Some of the forms have recently been printed in the *Wodrow Miscellany*, vol. i. p. 523.—*Ed.*]

or commissioner of Hadingtoun greting : Forasmeikle as I am heritable infest be o^r Sovereane Lord in all and hail the lands and baronie of Northbervik, with advocacion, donation, and ry^t of patronage of the personage and vicarage of the parochie kirk of Northbervik, as my infestment therof proportis ; and I considering that it becumes me of my dewtie to see that the said parochie kirk be sufficientlie provydit of ane hable and qualifeit persone, be quhais cair, travell, and diligence in serving the cuir at the said kirk, God may be glorifeit, and the flock of that charge sufficientlie instructit ; and being alsua informit y^t the qualificatioun, literature, and guid conversation of my lovit David Home, minister, and of his eirnest affectione to travell in the functioun of the ministrie in tyme cuming ; thairfoir I have nominat and presentit, lyk as I be their presents nominatis and presentis, the said _____ to the saids personage and vicarage of the said parochie kirk of Northbervik, and confer the samin to him, with all rentis, proventis, emolumentis, and dewties pertening y^rto for all the dayes of his lyf tyme. Requiring you, heirfoir, the said p^{brie} and commissioner foirsaid, to try and examine the qualificatioun and habilitie of the said

for serving the functioun and ministrie within the kirk of God ; and gif he beis fundin habill, meit, and sufficientlie qualifeit thairfoir, that ye admit him to the said personage and vicarage, and authorise him with your testimoniall thairupone, conforme to the orde^r observit be you in the saids casis ; and in caise of his insufficiencie to use the said office, that ye report the samin to me again within the space of ane moneth nixtocome after the dait hereof, that I may present ane uther qualifeit persone, as use is : In witnes heiroyf to thir presents, subscriyvit with my hand, my seall is affixit, at Northbervik the ferd day of April 1592, before y^{es} witnesses."

Ane Edict.

"To all and sundrie to quhom it effeiris, be it knawin that _____ is to be admittet to the office of the ministrie to the qlk he is prefit be the kirk q^o hes tryit this lang tyme his literature and gude conversatioun, and y^rfoir gif any man knawis ony impediment, or that his lyf and conversatioun be not sa honest as y^t office cravis, zat yai declair the samyn to the presbyterie of Hadington upon Wednesday next, the 22d of Julij instant, with

certificatioun y^t gif na man objects aganis his lyf, the pres^{brie} will proceid to his admissioun w^tout any langer delay ; and this we mak knawin be this o^r edict, given at Hadingtoun the 15 of July 1590.”

Collatioun.

“The Presbytery of Hadingtoun—*Maister James Carmichael, minister of God's word at Hadingtoun, and commissioner of the eldershippe of Hadingtoun*, to our lovit [Thomas Gregge, minister of God's word at Northberwick], or onie uther minister of the evangell within the kirk of God of the said boundes, grace, mercie, and peace, from God the Father through Jesus Christ, with continuall incesse of the halie Spreit. Forsamekle as the vicarage of [Gulane] lyand within the s^{reff}dome of Ed^r and constabularie of Hadingtoun, is vacand be the [non-residence or demission] of [N.], last vicar and possessour thair of : To the qlk also the presentatioun of ane qualifeit personn pertains to our Soverane lord, and the admissioun, collatioun, and confirmatioun thairupon belangs to us be act of Parliament and lawis of this realme, and our Soverane lord has presentit unto me be his hienes' letters geven under the privie sealle, my belovit brother [Mr Thomas Makgie],^a unto the said vicarage of [Gulane]: also according to his Majestie's direction, I have tane tryall, and has fund him sufficientlie qualifeit to instruct the people in the trew word of God, and the ry^t way of salvatioun, and also to be honest in lyf and conversatioun : Be ressoum q^rof I haif admitted him to the charge of the ministrie, resavit confessioun of his faithe, and his aith for acknowledging our Soverane lord's autoritie and dew obedience to his ordinar; and for his honest sustentatioun has gevin unto him the vicarage for-said, with all teinds, fruits, rents, profits, provents, emoluments, manss, gleib, kirkland, orchards, zairds, with their pendicles and uther pertinents y^rof q^tsumever during all the dayis of his lyf tyme. Quhairfoir in the name of the Eternal God, I require you, and ilk ane of you, as ye sal be requirit heirupon, to pas to the said parochie kirk of [Gulane], and thair give the said [Mr Thomas] lawfull institutioun of the said vicarage, and als to put him in reall and full

^a The father of John Makgie, who was settled as the colleague or assistant and successor of his father, five years

afterwards (in 1595), in consequence of a petition from the parish, which Dr M^cCrie represents as a call.

possession of the samyn, with all tiends, fruits, rents, profits, emoluments, manss, gleib, kirkland, orchards, zairds, with their pendicles and uther pertinents q^tsumever, be placing of him in the pulpit of the said kirk, if ony be, or delyvering of the booke of God, callit the Byble, in his hands, requiring all the parochiners, and inhabitants of the said paroche, to intend and obey to him as to the lawfull pastor of their saulls, with sic reverence and obedience as it becomes thame to do of the law of God, as ye will answer upon your dewtie and obedience, and to the effect he may the mair easelie intend to the feiding of his flock, and preaching of the word of God, and that he may be the mair reddeley answerit and obeyit of the fruits and emolumentis of the said vicarage, with the pertinents, without onie molestatioun, I humblie require the senatours of our Soverane lords counsell and sessioun to grant to the said [Mr Thomas] his hienes letters in all the four formis, to cause him be answerit and obeyit in all and be all thingis, all as above specified and conforme to his presentatioun induring his lyf tyme, under all hiest panis, usit and wont. In witnes hereof to thir my letters of collatioun and admissioun subscriyvit with my hand, my seal of office is affixt, at Hadingtoun the day of Februar the zeir of God, I^m. V^e. fourscoir ten, befor thir witnesses.”

Institutioun.

“Till all and sindrie faythfull in Christ to quhais knowlege thir presents sall cum [Thomas Gregge], minister of God’s word at [Northbervik], wisheth grace, mercie, and peace from God the Father, and His Sone Jesus Christ, with the perpetuall increase of the haly Spirit. Their presents sall testifie that at the command and charge of the commissioneris, speciall letters of admissioun and collatioun within written directit to me, I past to the paroche kirk of [Gulane] lyand within the sherifdome of Ed^r and constabularie of Hadingtoun, and thair gaif to [Mr Thomas Makgie], minister of God’s word at [Gulane], lawfull institutioun of the vicarage of [Gulane], and pat him in reall possessioun of the same, with all teinds, fruits, rents, provents, profits, emoluments, manss, gleib, kirkland, orchards, yards, with all pendicles and uther pertinents q^tsumever yairoff, be placing him in the pulpit of the said paroche kirk, and delyvering the boke of God, callit the Byble, in his handis,

and with all uther solemnities usit in sic cases according to the teno^r of the letters within written in all poyntes. Qlk thingis I did in the said parochie kirk the day of I^m. V^c. foursoir ten, about four hours afternoon or y^rby, in verificatioun of the premisses, I haif subscrivit yis my letter of Institutiuon with my hand, at day, yeir, and place above written. Befoir thir witnesses, A., B., C., D., &c.”

Instrument heirupon.

“In Dei nomine Amen. Per hoc præsens publicum Instrumentum cunctis pateat evidenter quod Anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quingentesimo octogesimo decimo, mensis vero Maij die decimo secundo Regnique Supremi domini nostri Regis vigesimo quarto Anno : In presence of us, connotars publict and witnesses underwritten, personallie comperit ane venerable man [Mr Thomas Makgie], minister of God’s word in [Gulane], having in his hands twa letters, the ane contenand the gift and presentatioun of the vicarage of [Gulane], daitit at Ed^r the day of the zeir of God, I^m. V^c. foursoir ten years, maid in the Kingis (M.) name, under his privie seall, written in paper direct to the commissioner of the Presbyterie of Haddingtoun, the uther letter direct from Mr James Carmichaell, commissioner of the Presbyterie of Hadingtoun, in that part, written in like manner in paper subscrivit and seallit according to the order gevin to [Thomas Greg], minister of God’s word at [Northbervik], for executing of the samyn, daitit at Hadingtoun the day of the zeir of God above written : Qlkis writinges the said [Mr Thomas] deliverit to the said [Thomas], requiring him for lawfull executing of the commissioner’s letters according to the teno^r thairof, qlkis writingis the said [Thomas] resavit reverentile fra the said [Mr Thomas], and with diligence delyverit the samyn rexive to us notaris publict, to read effectuouslie, and publishe the samyn to the witnesses underwritten ; and after the reading of the samyn, the said [Thomas], according to the teno^r of the saids commissioner’s letters direct to him, tuke the boke of God, callit the Byble, in his handis, and delyverit the saymn to the said [Mr Thomas Makgie], quha was alsua placit in the pulpit of the parochie kirk of [Gulane], to the effect that he suld y^rafter preache the word of God contenit

in that boke to his congregatioun as he wald answer to the Lord his God, and in that behalf put and investit the said [Mr Thomas Makgie] in corporall and reall possession of the said vicarage of Gulane, with all teinds, fruits, rents, provents, profeits, emolumentis, manss, gleib, kirkland, orchard, yards, with their pendicles and uther pertinents q^tsumever y^of, after the forme and tenor of the foirsaidis commissioners letters in all poyntis. Super quibus omnibus et singulis memoratus Tho. Makge a nobis connotariis publicis subscriptis sibi fieri petiit instrumentum publicum seu publica instrumenta unum vel plura. Acta erant hæc in ecclesia parochiali de Gulane apud suggestum ejusdem horam circiter quartam post meridiem præsentibus ibidem viris A., B., C., D., E., F., G., testibus ad præmissa vocatis pariterque rogatis et ego vero, &c.”

No. XX.

NOTICES OF PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS IN THE CHURCH RECORDS OF THE
16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES.

Long before the Reformation in Scotland, not a few schools were established by clergymen of the communion of the Church of Rome, . . . and I cannot but think kindly of the men who founded and supported the country schools in which Buchanan and Knox were educated forty years before the Reformation. But while I give those men the honour that it would be unjust to withhold from them, I must claim for the Presbyterian ministers of the Church of Scotland the credit of having been the willing and cheerful, and, as some would say, officious, instruments in the hand of Providence of effecting the establishment of parochial schools; and not only originating, but maturing the plans by which, though poor, they thus contributed to make many rich in faith and in good works.

[In the record of the “Synod of that part of the diocie of St Andrews qlk lyeth benorth Forth,” there is a report of the visitation of a number of the parishes in the synod in 1611 and 1613.

From this report it appears that, at that early period, of the parishes visited, "the parishes which had, were more than double in number to those which had not schools."—*McCrie's Life of Melville*, vol. ii. p. 396.

Above all, however,] the registers of all the ecclesiastical courts, particularly those of the presbyteries and kirk-sessions, prove what anxious attention was bestowed on the education of all ranks by the Church of Scotland after the revival of presbyterian church government in 1638. Soon after that time schools were generally established in almost every corner of the kingdom.^a Before the restoration of Charles II., we are told by Kirkton, "every village had a school, every family almost had a Bible, yea, in most of the country, all the children of age could read the Scriptures." Some of the leaders of the Covenanters had distinguished themselves by their zeal and activity in providing the means of instruction. Mr Alexander Henderson, about the year 1630, endowed a school in the parish of Leuchars, where he was then minister, and another in his native parish of Creich. Both endowments were liberal; and others were afterwards made by ministers of the National Church on a scale not much smaller. Thus, Mr Gabriel Semple, minister

^a [The system of parochial education was legalised about the year 1693; but though in the Lowlands it had been almost universally prevalent before the middle of the seventeenth century, I cannot venture to say that it became general in those parts of the country that required it most, till after the middle of the eighteenth century. In the year 1758, there were 175 parishes in the Highlands in which parochial schools had never been erected. . . .

"Is it not your opinion, founded upon your general acquaintance with the state of Scotland, that there was a very marked distinction, religiously and morally speaking, between the habits of the two great divisions of the country to which you refer?—There is the strongest evidence that there was a marked distinction between the two; for the Government of Charles II. could find no such fit instruments of the severities exercised on the Presbyterians in the

west as the Highlanders, whose principles and manners appeared to be altogether different. With such horror were these atrocities long remembered in Ayrshire, that for more than fifty years after the Revolution in 1688, it is said that a Jacobite or Roman Catholic was not there to be found; and it is ascertained that in that large country not so much as one man could be induced to follow the fortunes of the house of Stuart in the year 1745. It is recorded in reports almost annually transmitted to the General Assemblies, that in several parts of the Highlands the population was long in a state of almost entire heathenism.

"Up to what period?—I may almost say till after the year 1745, but certainly till after the accession of George I."—*Evidence before House of Commons Committee on Sabbath Observance*, 1832.

of Kirkpatrick-Durham, mortified 2000 merks for maintenance of a schoolmaster in that parish. Measures were taken by the kirk-sessions to furnish education to the poor upon the common expenses; and in cases of youths of promising ability and remarkable diligence, it was not uncommon to pay from the parochial funds an additional sum to prepare them for the university. The ornamental parts of education were not neglected. The General Assembly, in 1645, enacted, "that for the remedy of poesy, and of ability to make verses, and in respect of the common ignorance of prosody, no schoolmaster be admitted to teach a grammar-school in burghs, or other considerable parishes, but such as, after examination, shall be found skilful in the Latin tongue, not only for prose, but also for verse."^a Books were sometimes provided by the session for those who could not buy them. Thus we find in the register of the parish of Ormiston, "Schrevellii *Lexicon*, for the school, 4 lib. 16s. Scots—*i. e.* 8s. sterling." "Broune's *Rhetoric*, 10s. Scots—*i. e.* 10d." So great was the encouragement for teaching schools in considerable parishes, that various instances occurred of professors in the universities accepting those laborious situations. It was not merely in the low countries that education was vigilantly promoted. The Highlands (of Perthshire, at least) partook of the same benefit. In 1654, John Hepburn, who had been previously schoolmaster of Kenmore, was appointed to teach the children of Logierait, and was allowed eighty merks a-year of salary. The English language seems at that time to have been well understood in that part of the country. About this period, or soon afterwards, James Stuart was schoolmaster of Moulin. He was succeeded in 1683 by Duncan Menzies (afterwards minister at Weems), at whose school were educated Lord George Murray (son of the Marquess of Athole), Mr Adam Ferguson (father of the late Professor Ferguson of Edinburgh), and several other eminent individuals. A century before the period of which we are now speaking, reading and writing were evidently not very rare accomplishments in Argyleshire. John Carswell, bishop of the Isles, in his Gaelic translation of the *Book of Common Order*, printed by Lekprevik in 1567, has lamented

^a Simson's (Andrew, minister of Dunbar) *Rudimenta Grammatica*, first printed at Edinburgh in 1587, was the common grammar taught in Scotland till the time of Ruddiman. In 1607, the grammar of Alexander Hume was ordered by Parliament to be taught in the schools, but the parliamentary appointment was little attended to.—See Chalmers's *Life of Ruddiman*.

the misapplication of the gifts of writing and teaching, and says that much of the superstition which prevailed arose from the want of good books understood by all who speak the Gaelic tongue ; but he does not allege that reading and writing were very uncommon acquirements. (See *Scottish Descriptive Poems*, edited by Dr Leyden ; Edinburgh, 1803.) For farther information with regard to the state of education in Scotland about the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th centuries, see Dr M'Cric's *Life of Melville*, vol. ii., notes. It would not be difficult to make additions to the interesting particulars there recorded.

[The following extracts from the author's notes from session and parish registers, while they afford illustrations of the part taken by the Church in the establishment of parish schools, throw light otherwise on the history of education in this country. With one or two exceptions, it is believed they have not before been printed (ED.) :—]

Newbattle School.

“ 1617, Nov^r. 30.—A minute stating that the session votit John Wilson to be doctor to the school, for qlk pains he is to have 4s. of ilk quarter fra everie bairne.

1626, Oct^r. 15.—The hail session did consent that y^r sould be ane set rent providit for y^e scholem^r by and attowre his quarter's payment, provyding that he wald offer to teitch thaim Latine and English. Newbottall to pay xx l., Westhouses to pay x l., Easthouses to pay x merks, Coittis to pay v mks, Stobhill to pay v merks, Southaide (and other places) x merks.

Qlk day the session w^t ane consent hes set thair harts on Mr Wm. Trent, sone to James Trent in New^{ll} to be yair scholem^r and yrfore wills the minister to intimate to this parochine the next Sabot^t day of yair foirsaid conclusion, and of him on whom they have casten thair eyis to be y^r scholem^r, and to desyre Mr Wm. to be present in the session the next day to ressave his calling.

1626, Oct^r. 22.—For uptaking of the schole and establishing of gude ordor, the session ordains everie scholer to pay 10s. for lairning to reid and write Scottis, and for musiche to pay 6s. 8d., and for learning of Latine onlie xiijs. 4d. quarterlie, and this act to be extendit onlie to the parochiners of Newbattle.

Mr Wm. Trent compeirand before the session, acceptit of his calling to be scholem^r.

1627, Feb. 11.—The session wills the min^r w^t Andro Ker, Tho^s Hereiss, &c., to go thro the Easthouses and West to poynd yaim wha hes not payit y^r stent, and to try these qa may hald their bairns at the schole, and yat betwixt and this day xv days. As also, to go throu New^l for the same effect, betwixt and the said day, and the clerk to mind the min^r y^rof.

1627, Feb. 18.—Followis the nameis of the parochineres qubo contributes to the scholem^r." (The list extendsto nearly 200 names ; the lowest sum is 2s. and the highest 20s.)

(There seem to be no minutes preserved from 1628 to 1641—the time of Leighton. Little attention appears to have been bestowed on making up the minutes in general. There is one pretty full one relating to the education of the children. Great anxiety is evinced to induce the people to send their children universally to school, that they may all learn at least to read. And it is enacted by the session that the parents who neglect to send their children shall pay the same fees for those capable of learning, as if they were sent to school. There appears to have been not only a school at Newbattle (for the maintenance of which the heritors were stented), but another at Stobhall, which received aid from the session funds. In the accounts there are always payments to the schoolmaster for poor children, seven or eight at a time.)—*Session Book of Newbattle.*

Anstruther Wester School.

"1595, Oct. 26.—Anent ye complent given in be Henrie Cunningham, doctor in the schooll, the session thinkes meit that all the zouth in the town shall be caused com to the school to be teached, and that sic as ar puir shall be furnished upon the comone expences ; and gif ony puir refuiss to com to school, help of sic thing as thay neid and requyr shall be refused to them. And as for sic as ar able to sustein ther bairnes at the school, and do ther dewetie to the teacher for them, thay shall be commandit to put them to the school, that thay may be brought up in the fear of God and vertue, qlk if thay refuse to do, thay shall be called befor the sessioun and admon^t of their dewetie, if efter admonition thay

mend not, then farther ordo^r shall be taken w^t them at the discretion of the session, and the magistrates and counsall be desyred to tak fra them the quarter payment for ther child, and ane dewetic after ther discretion for ye days meat as it shall cō about unto them, whidder thay put ther bairnes to the school or not.—Nov. 18. Anent ye puir it is tho^t meit y^t a visitation shall be, and y^t sum help shall be maid to them y^t are altogether unable y^t may not travell to saik to them self, and the young shall get na almess bot on condition y^t thay com to the school, qlk sa mony as does shall be helpit; and the maner of ther help shall be, thay shall haif thrie hours granted to them everie day to go throu the town to saik ther meat, ane hour in the morning fra nyn to ten, at mid-day fra twell to ane, and at night fra sex ho^{rs} furth, and the peiple ar to be desyred to be helpfull to sic as will give them self to ony vertue, and as for uthers to deall hardly w^t them, to dryve them to seik efter vertue.—1596, April 18. Efter incalling of the name of God, it wes thocht meit for provyding a teicher to ye youth, that everie man w^tin the town y^t has bairnes suld put his bairnes to the school, and for everie bairne suld giv ten s. in the quarter, and be fred of givin meat bot at yr awin pleasure; and whosoever hes bairnes, and is able to pay this foir sad dewetic, the magistrates shall exact this dewetic of them whidder thay put the bairnes to shool or not; and if ony persone of a set maliciousness shall w^hauld his child fra the school, thay shall be unlawed be the magistrat, and censured be the session; and as for the children of the purer sort, thay shall be put to the school, and for ther intertinement thay that the Lord has granted habilitie to shall contribute.—1600. Sept^r 7. Anent ye schooll, agreed w^t Henrie Cunyngham that the puir of the town sall be put to the As many of them as has injynes, and he takes paines upone, shall giv fyv s. in the quarter, qlk the session sal pay: he sall try out the bairnes; thay sall be broght befor the session be ye elders of ye quarter; the session sal enter y^m to ye school and try ther profiting, and sa causse recompens acc. to his paines and ther profiting; and as for uther y^t are not able to profit y^t thay may reid and wret, whidder it be for want of injyn or tym to await on, sic sall be caused to learne ye Lorde's prayer, the commands, and belev, and ye heads of ye Catechise, y^t ar demanded in ye examinon to ye communion; qlk travell also ye session will acknowledge and recompence, and

as for ye standing zeerlie dewetie, referes that to the counsell of the town to tak ordo, w^t.—(*Session-Book of Austruther Wester.*)

Ormiston School.

“1662. June 9.

Given to Gilbert Ronnald for teaching poor people's children in Paistoun, preceding May 1662, conforme to his accomp ^t ,	£3	7	2
Given to the schoolm ^r for teaching poor children till ane accomp ^t ,	4	0	0
This day, after compting, it was found that there was aught- and for teaching poor schollers to the schoolmaster of Ormiston, to witt, for teaching William Cockburn two quarters at Latin, preceding Febr ^r last,	£2	0	0
For teaching Jas. Laidla two qrs. preceding May,	1	6	8
For teaching Jas. French 3 qrs. preceding May,	2	0	0
For teaching Jas. Hunter 3 qrs. preceding May,	2	0	0
For teaching John Stewart 2 qrs. prec. May,	1	6	8
For teaching Wm. Wilson 5 qrs. preceding May,	3	6	8
For teaching Jas. Veitch 4 qrs. preceding June,	2	13	4
For teaching Margt. Kemp 3 qrs. preceding June,	2	0	0
For teaching Margt. Chouslie 3 qrs. preceding May,	2	0	0
All w ^t according to ane acc ^t subscri ^d by the min ^r , &c.,	£18	13	4

1663. June 2.

To Thomas Hyslope, a poor student,	£1	10	0
To Laurence Forrest, schoolmaster of Temple, for his sone, another poor student,	2	0	0

1664. Oct. 16.

Given to Mr William Nicoll, teacher of the children of Paistoun, because of his poverty,	4	0	0
--	---	---	---

1665. Nov. 13.

Mr James Grierson's depursements to the poor and allowances for teaching poor schollers,	128	5	8
To George Paislay, a poor schoolm ^r ,	2	18	0
To ane honest Christian woman who bred her sone at the colledge,	2	18	0

1668. July 11.

To Margt. Wood, a poor woman who teaches the children in Paistoun,	4	0	0
--	---	---	---

1669. For Broune's Rhetorick to Andrew Kirkwood,	£0	10	0
1670. For Cicero's Select Oration to Andrew Kirkwood,	1	4	0
1672. To Isabell Lumisdall, who teacheth the children in the house of the Moore, Dec. 4, 1672,	1	9	0
Item for Schrevelii Lexicon to the school, Aug. 8, 1674,	4	16	0
1675. June 9.			
To John Adamson, who teaches the children in Paistoun,	6	lib.	
To Andrew Kirkwood, doctor to the school, because he has no fee from the heritors nor session,	6	0	0
(The meal at this time 15s. the peck.)			
1679. Oct. 13.			
To John Hyslope, a poor scholar,	2	18	0
Item, to John Adamson, schoolm ^r in Paistoun, for an encouragement in his office,	6	0	0
1677. April 3.			
To Mr James Scot, the burser for halfe a year, from Whitsunday 1676 till Martinmas 1670,	2	0	0
Item, for a book to the school, called Vosii Exerci- tationes Grammaticæ, to William Gibbe, conform to his receipt,	8	14	0
1681. Dec.			
Mr James Grierson, reader, a schoolm ^r , being also necessitate to quite his charge for not taking the test, was succeeded by Mr Geo. Crichton.			

Books belonging to the School—(About 60 vols.)

Dictionarium Calepini.
 Terentius cum Picturis.
 Ane old Virgil—cum notis.
 Ciceronis forensia et Oratorio Opera.
 Nizolii Cicero.
 Ovidii Epistolæ, cum notis.
 Cicero de Divinatione.
 Observations on the 6th and 7th B. of Cæsar's Commentaries.
 Aristotelis Organum.
 Lambini Plautus.

- Ane old Ovid's Metamorphoses.
 Tehmari Exercitationes Rhetoricæ.
 Buchanani Chronica.
 Schrevelius on Horace.
 Martialis Epigrammatii cum notis.
 Three vols. of Cicero's Orations.
 Schrevelius on Juvenal and Persius.
 Lubinus on Juvenal and Persius.
 Vossii Aristarchus.
 Scholia in Epist. Ciceronis.
 Terentius cum Donati notis.
 Vosii Grammatica, Lat.
 Schrevelius on Virgil.
 Rawlin's Practical Arithmetic.
 Persius cum notis Bondii.
 Ovid in English.
 Ascham's Schoolmaster.
 Sallustius cum notis Minelii.
 Gouldman's Dictionary.
 Virgilius cum Notis Servii.
 Schrevelii Lexicon.
 The Siege of Antwerp.
 Vellaius Patereculus cum notis.
 Terentius cum notis Schrevelii.
 Flori Historia Romana.
 Delvii Senecæ Traj. Syntagma.
 Robertson's Gate of the Holy Tongue.
 Item, the Hebrew text of the Psalms and Lamentations, without
 points.
 The Heb. text of the Psalms and Lamentations, without accents.
 The Hebrew Psalms and Lamentations in English Characters.
 A Key to the Hebrew Bible.
 Neper's Rods. All which are in a presse, standing in the Chappell.
 The following are wanting, qth were found in a catalogue of the
 Laird's :—
 Texter's Epithets.
 Linacer's Grammar.
 Erasmi Adagia.
 Cæsar's Commentaries in English."

Lasswade School.

“1615. May 12.—Provision for schoolmaster, clerk, and kirk-officer. The Earl of Roslin, 5 lib. ; the Lady Craigmillar, 4 merks ; John Vere of Auchindenny, 20 s. ; the Lady Hatherden, 2 merks ; Mr Alex. King of Dryden, 2 merks ; Mr John Nicolson, for Lonheid, &c., 5 lib. ; my Lord Rosse, for Melville, 5 lib. ; the guidman of Pendricht, 50s. ; Agnes Bellenden, his mother, 2 mks., &c.—1615. Aug. 20. The clerk to ring the bell ilk morning at seven hours, as near as he can be his judgment, to advertise the bairnes to come to the school.—1616. Nov. Mr Andro Watsone entered in paction with the minister and session to serve as schoolm^r, reader, and kirk-officer.—1625. Sept. 11. Daniel Blackhall to be reader, clerk, and schoolmaster. (At this time and afterwards, 4 lib. a-year given to a student of theology at St Andrews.)—1669. Act of Parliament (2 Feb. 1646) for founding schools in every parish inserted.—1650. Jan. 4. Provision appointed for Mr Daniel Blackhall, schoolm^r.”—(*Session-Buik of Laswaid.*)

Kingarth School.

“1649. March 15.—It was ordained by the common consent of the elders that there be ane school in the parish, to be kept in the most central part thereof ; and for maintenance to the scholem^r, ordanes and applots halfe ane merk upon every merk yeirlie land within the parish, and 40 pennies upon every cottar that brooks land, 20 lib. out of the penalties, with his other casualties—viz. out of every marriage 12s., out of every baptism 4s.

1649. Nov. 9.—Mr Jo. M'Gilechrist, scholem^r at Rothsay, gave in his petition, bearing their obligement to pay 10 pound yearlie out of the penalties to the scholem^r at Rothsay. The session appoints the treasurer to give Mr Jo. M'Gilechrist 10 l. out of the penalties.

The session, in consideration of their obligation to pay 10 l. yearly to the schole at Rothsay, and likewise that they made an ordinance for a schole to be kept wⁱn this par., by keiping q^rof thay may be eximed from any payment to the schole of Rothsay, they desire the minister to look out for a scholem^r for ourselves as soon as possibly may be.—Dec. 9. Joⁿ Fressell undertook to be scholem^r,

and accepted of the benefit of the act made by the heritors and elders for maintenance to the schole (see March 15)—(a house to be hired by the year to be a schole).—Dec. 25. The session ordered the treasurers to give Jo. Fressell, schoolm^r, 10l. in part-paym^t of the 20l. which is allowed him out of the penalties. Jo. Fressell, schole^r, declared that he has waited on the schole this fortnight, and that there came none to him but five or six bairnies, and that he would not attend longer unless the session took some course for causing these that had children to send them to the schole ; w^c the session considering, and that the most part of these that hes children for the schole is illiterat, and knowing not the good of learning, and that there never was a schole before in the parish, they recommend to the minister and elders to exhort these who has children to send them, and that the m^r next Lord's day exort them publicly.

Nov. 6, 1650.—The m^r and ane of the elders to tak tryell of q^t profit the bairnes that are at the schole maks, and how the scholem^r waits on, and to report.—Dec. 23, 1650. The report of the proficiency of the scholers, and on waiting of the scholem^r, is, that the children profits very well, and that the scholem^r does his dutie in his attendance.—Ap. 28, 1667. The heritors and elders do pitch on Manus O'Conacher to be their scholem^r to teach the children within the parish for the space of an year—to have 5s. out of each merkland, and of each cotter having sowing 3s. 4d. Scots, and for each child to be taught 8s. Scots.—Oct. 16, 1670. Agreement with John Graham to be scholem^r at the Moorbuttes. 8s. quarterly for each child.—Ap. 20, 1671. Manus O'Conacher to be scholem^r for a year and longer, as the heritors and elders shall be satisfied. He is to have the dues as John Graham the late scholemaster had.”

Dunfermline Landward Schools.

“1647.—The session, consid^g the great ignorance of children and of the youth in this parish, especially of the poorest sort, for lack of education at school, their parents not being able to sustain them thereat, which occasions gross ignorance and great increase of sin, has tho fit that schools be set up in the several quarters of the landward of this parish, especially in those parts that are re-

motest and that men or women teachers be sought and provided thereto, &c. Monthly roll of the children not educated, whose parents, able to sustain them [there], neglect [to do so], to be given in; also a roll of the poor ones. — 1656, March 11. Mr Tho. Walker, m^r of the grammar-school, gave in a supplication shewing the decaying condition of the grammar-school in this bur^t, not only by the pressure and burdens of the land disabling gentlemen strangers to train up their sons at public schools, but *also by the many schools in landward*, and supplicated the session to consider how a competent provision may be had for upholding of the grammar-school. The session recommends to P. Walker, &c., to meet the ministers, to think on a way for a competent provision for the m^r of the grammar-school.—March 18, 1656. Report anent ye provision of the grammar-school. The heritors to be spoken to and dealt with, that something may be agreed upon by them for the help thereof. Also thought fit that the schools in landward should be visited, and y^t the parents of such children as may come to the grammar-school may be spoken to put them to it. — 1658, Oct. 19. Collection for poor scholes, 271, which, with 81. taken out of the box, was distribut in paying ye said poor scholars quarters at this time, at the rate of 10s. for ilk quarter. (This collection for poor scholars is of frequent recurrence.)—1660, Jan. 10. It is tho^t fit the collection be only for these poor scholars who are learning to read English, and that the session be not burdened with paying of their quarter's payment after they can read the New Testament perfectly, except those who are of a quick and pregnant spirit.—1659, March 15. It is declared by Mr George Walker, that Mr Tho. Walker, school-master, wold remove to another place for sake of maintenance, q^hsoever he got a call. It's recommended to the elders to be advising hereupon till the next day. — March 22. It is tho^t fit y^t letters be written to the chief heritors of the parish recommending to the prov. to speak the town-council, and appoints public intimation to be made the next Sabbath to the rest of the heritors, &c. to meet next Tuesday, after sermon, to give their best advice and concurrence for augmentation of the schoolmaster's maintenance.—March 29. Recommended that something shall be gathered from heritors, feuars, and tenants, and all who have interest in the parish, to *make up some stock, that the rent thereof*

may come to the benefit of the schoolmaster. — 1660, Jan. 17. Contribution 28 lib., all distribut in paying the quarter's payments, conform to the rolls, paying at this time 6s. 8d. for ilk quarter. (The amount would have paid for the quarters of eighty-four children, if only one quarter was paid.)"—*Dunfermline Session Records*.

Dalyell School.

"1654, May 28.—The minister and elders tho^t fit to fee and conduce Johne Leckie, schoolmaster in the parish, for teaching of the infants and young children, and to be the precentour, and for that effect have agreed with him for the space of ane zeir. They did promise him for his service and attendance on the said charge 44 lib. of fee, ten sh. Scots at everie marriage y^t sal be solemnised or proclaimed in the parish, and 2s. 8d. of each baptism. And they tho^t fit that for payment thereof 20s. Scots be exacted of everie marriage, to be divided between him and the kirk-officer, and 6s. 8d. for everie baptism, whereof he to have the s^d 2s. 8d. ; also the s^d . . . have 12 shillings . . . comes to the school."—" 1682, Dec. 13. W^m. Flint appointed to be *session-clerk, schoolmaster, precentor, and kirk-officer, and maker of graves for the dead* ; to have 10s. Scots for the quarter wage of every child he teaches—the poor children's quarter to be paid out of the kirk-box ; all the profit of marriages and baptisms that formerly belonged both to schoolmaster and kirk-officer ; half-a merk as his benefit of the mortcloth, together with the ordinary benefit of the making of the graves, and 5 merks yearly for a house and school, also a boll of meal to take up his house."—*Record of the Kirk-Session of Dalyell*.

Miscellaneous Extracts.

" 1645, Aug. 3.—Being regretted that y^r is so many idle young children capable of instruction in yis citie that is not put to scooles to be instructed, their parents also being so careless of them, yrfoir it is ordaned that the elders and deacons sall take notice of these in their quarters that are able to put their children to the scooles and doth not, and also to take up the names of those w^t in y^r quarters who are not able to put their children to

scoole to be instructed, to bring their names to the session that these may be known who are not able, that they may be put to scooles, and ye session to pay ye quarter payment at the scooles.”—*St Andrews Kirk-Session Record*.

“1640. March 1.—The schoolmaster gave in his complaint to the session that the scholars went away from out of the parish without any just cause, whereby he was greatly prejudged. The session finding it not reasonable: for helping the master in that case, ordained that everie one that suld put or had put away their bairnes to other schooles sould pay their quarters to the master within the parish alsweill as if they were still present in the schole thereof.”—*Largo Session-Book*.

“1647. April 28.—Mr James Sibbald declared that there was 40 merks mortified be the pettie fewars at Torrie to the schoolm^r, &c., likewise 80 merks decernit be the Lordis of the Commission of Teindes to be payit furth of the lands of Torrie, and addit to the former dutie of other 40 merks of the lands of Torrie,” &c.—*Record of Presbytery of Dunfermline*.

“1647. May 12.—Provision for the school of Kinross.—The heritors condescendit to pay 110 merks by and attour the other duties due to the scholem^r and reader.”—*Ibid*.

“1598 (9). Jan. 25.—Mr Rob^t Buchanan [of Forgond] reportit that the gentlemen of his parochin desyrit him in their names to seek the presb’s licence to Mr Samuel Cunningham, their scholemaster, to *catechise* the barnes of the parochin upon Sundays before the sermonth; unto the qlk desyre the brethren agrees, and gives license to the s^d Mr Samuel.”—*Presby. Records of St Andrews*.

“1660. Sep. 26.—The brethren, entering on conference aent means for promoting of piety . . . exhort . . . 3. That schools in ilk parish be weill seen to and attendit for instructing of the youth, and that all young ones be appointed to be put to schools,” &c.—*Ibid*.

“1661. July 10.—Visitation of Beath.—The minister and elders regret that their schoolmaster is too gentle in correcting the children, which they allege to be ane ground of the said children their not [having] proficiencie in learning. But approves him in that he has ane sufficient good hand in writing, and in taking up the psalm, and declares that he attends weill upon the school, and is painful anuch.”—*Presby. Records of St Andrews*.

“1661. July 10.—Recommends to the heritors and session [of Beath] to provide their present schoolmaster and his successors to the sum of 100 merks yearly of stipend, conform to the Act of Parliament.”—*Ibid.*

“1640. April 9.—The mod^r and brethren visited the school of Elgin. The highest class had learned the 1st and 2d parts of grammar, and for their author had Virgil, his 2d book of the Eneid; the 2d class, the 2d part of grammar and the 7th book of Ovid his *Metamorphoses*; the 3d class, the 1st part of grammar, and Ludovicus Vivs his *Colloquia Scholastica*; the lowest class, the rudiments of grammar. The scholars thair progress found not altogether such as were to be wished, qlk was imputed to the present troublesome times, and the untowardness and insolence of youth taking occasion thereupon.”—*Presbytery Records of Elgin.*

“1654. Feb. 19.—Agreed with one John Hepburn for teaching of children, and to be precentor and clerkt to the session. Agreed for 40 mks. for an half-year, to be uplifted out of the annual rent of the two years' stipends, 1648, 1649, restand in the heritors' hands. But in regard the times were troublesome, and the country not in quietness, it was ordered that the said John Hepburn should be paid monthly out of the penalties, if the said annual rent could not be gotten. The said John being schoolm^r before at the kirk of Kainmore (2½ years), where Mr W^m Menzies is minister.”—*Session-Book of Logierait.*

“1651. Sep. 21.—To the bursar at the New College, 6 lib.—Item to the Philosophy bursar, 2 lib.”—*Ibid.*

No. XXI.—(Vol. II., page 295.)

STATE OF THE CHURCH FROM THE YEAR 1648 TO THE YEAR 1661.

(From the Author's Evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons on Patronage, 1834.)

. . . . One of the most obvious effects of the change made by the Statute of 1648 was the great length of the vacancies. At

first, indeed, several parishes were speedily planted; so speedily indeed, that the congregations did not wait for the formal moderation of calls, but sent petitions to presbyteries, to put certain favourite preachers on their trials, with a view to their appointments. Many charges were not supplied for five or six years; and I think there were some which continued vacant during the whole period that intervened between the year 1649 and the restoration of Charles II., chiefly in consequence of the dissensions which prevailed both in the presbyteries and in the parishes.

* * * * *

Kirkton certainly has pronounced a very warm panegyric upon the state of the Church at that period; but unless I were to believe that the whole of the records of the church courts that I have examined were fabrications, I must really look upon Kirkton's description as being something very extravagant—I would almost say a romance. I do not know what could possibly be the part of the country to which Kirkton refers. Most certainly it was not in the bounds of the synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, or in the bounds of the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, or the synod of Fife, or the synod of Perth and Stirling, or the synod of Angus and Mearns; for I have examined very carefully most of the records of these church courts, and I find that the state of the Church, in respect of divisions, was at that time most lamentable. This appears, indeed, from many of the published works of leading men in the Church; for instance, there is the book called *A Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ, or to the Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, and Government of the Kirk of Scotland*, by sundry Ministers of the Gospel in the province of Perth and Fife. It is printed in the year 1660; but the documents contained in this little work are dated in 1658. Some of them are subscribed by Mr Samuel Rutherford, professor of divinity at St Andrews, and other leading men. A great part of it is by James Guthrie, who was also a man of great influence amongst the Protesters; those were the most popular, and probably the most zealous of the ministers at that period, in one sense. Now they speak of that period as being a cold and declining time. They contrast the period of 1658 with the state of the Church twenty years before. They say, with great regret, that whereas there had been few sectaries twenty years ago, now they were very numerous. They speak of the government of the

Church being overthrown, and the Reformation obstructed. They state, in particular, that for eight or nine years there had been very little religion.

This is rather a remarkable passage, which I shall beg leave to read, in the *Considerations* (by Mr James Guthrie) *contributing to the Discovery of the Dangers that threaten Religion and the Work of Reformation in the Church of Scotland*. The author says:—"Is it not for a lamentation that in the public meetings which have been kept in the several shires of this nation, these eight or nine years past, there hath been little or no care or resentment of religion, or of the work of God, but these things have been, in a great measure, forgotten or laid aside?" He proceeds to say that the division prevailing in the Church "breedeth sundry inconveniences in the planting of churches, sometimes obstructing the plantation for sundry years together, sometimes planting them with men not satisfyingly qualified, sometimes making two different plantations in one congregation, by which both the ministers and the people came to be divided, or the dissatisfied party, if they cannot win at a minister, to be casten loose, and left without a ministry and the benefit of the public ordinances. The door is thereby shut sundry times against sundry able and godly expectants, who are thereby kept from entering into the ministry." And there is much more to the same purpose in this book. It is remarkable that he refers to the eight or nine years preceding the date of this testimony, which eight or nine years embraced the whole period from 1649 to the date of this work.

There is also much more to the same purpose in Baillie's *Letters*, a book with which most people are pretty well acquainted. The terms in which Baillie describes the proceedings of the church courts are really such as can be scarcely read without shame by any person entertaining a regard for the character of the Church of Scotland. He speaks particularly of numbers of depositions of aged ministers, which took place by young men of violent tempers, and he laments the rebellious conduct of some of them. In a letter dated July 19, 1654, he says:—"Our churches are in great confusion. No entrant gets any stipend until they have petitioned and subscribed some acknowledgment to the English. When a very few of the Remonstrants and Independent party call a man, he gets the kirk and the stipend, but whom the presbytery, and

well near the whole congregation, calls and admits, he must preach in the fields or in a barn without stipend. So a sectary is planted in Kilbride, another in Lenzie (or Kirkintilloch), and this guyse will grow rife to the wrack of many a soul." He states very strongly the unbecoming conduct which prevailed, particularly in the Protesting party. He says, in December 1655, 'All plantations must be taken from the congregations and sessions, to be put in the hand of a few, whom they count the godly, for they avow that the plurality of all congregations in the land are so ignorant and scandalous or ungracious, that they are to be excluded from the communion and voice in chusing of a minister. By this device they hope quickly to fill all vacant places with intrants of their faction, as they are careful to do wherever they have any power to do it.' This faction included Rutherford, Gillespie, Livingston, Denham, and Guthrie, and various other persons, who were the most popular writers of that day, or at least the most popular preachers, and the men who had been most active in bringing about the abolition of patronage.

I beg to refer to a few other passages relating to the years 1649, 1654, 1655, and 1656.—[See Baillie's *Letters*, Nos. 190, 194, and postscript, 195 (Mr Laing's edition).]

*

*

*

*

Here is a remarkable passage in the year 1656 :—"As to our plantations," that is, the settlement of ministers, "I am glad my hand is free from them totally. Mr James Ramsey, a very able and sufficient youth as we have of his age, planted by us in Lenzie, to the great satisfaction of all, except a very few, who chose an English sectary, to whom they promised the stipend, when, after two years' trouble, the Englishman removed our brethren, Messrs Gillespie, Durham, Carstairs. All much obliged to Mr Robert Ramsey for their own places, would not, for any intreaty, be pleased to let his son live in peace: so we let him go to Linlithgow, where he is much better than he could have been where he was; but in this place they have put one evidently of far meaner parts, Mr Henry Forsyth, lately a baxter-boy, laureated within these two years; a little, very feckless-like thing in his person, and mean in his gifts. To him the parish, weary of strife, wherein by the English power they were always oppressed, yielded in silence without opposition. In Campsie, likewise, one Mr

Archibald Denniston deposed by them without any considerable cause, much to my grief and against the hearts of his parish, who loved him, they have planted Mr J. Law within these three years, brought from a pottinger to be laureated. In Rutherglen, against the people's hearts, they have planted a little manniken of small parts, whom I never saw, and forced old Mr R. Young, albeit as able yet as ever, to give over his ministry. In Cathcart, where they had planted an Englishman against my mind, having, after two or three years' trial, enough of him, they shuffled him over to Ireland, and are to plant another young thing, lately laureated, with small contentment to the people. In Glasgow, Mr A. Gray being dead of a purple fever, of a few days' roving, the magistrates would have been at the calling of Mr James Ferguson, one of the most excellent young men of our land, but to this Mr Durham and the rest were so averse that they were ready publickly to oppose it : so the magistrates, knowing their inability to carry any call, contrary to their mind, yielded to let them call whom they pleased. Mr Durham would have been at Mr J. Law before they put him on Campsie ; but Mr Patrich carried it to Mr Robert Mackward, who lately, for inability of body, had left his charge in the College, and evidently was unable for such a charge as Glasgow : yet they put him in, *nomine contradicente*, and that without all the ordinary trials, being unable for his health to have undergone them. Appearingly the burthen shortly will crush him, except he go on to do so, as he has done frequently, to let his place vaik. Through the violence of that party, our Church, in these parts, is in a hard condition, and for the time remediless. They got a little stop lately, from whence it was not expected. At Blantyre, Mr John Heriot, of seventy-eight years, having admitted Mr James Hamilton, his helper, with two parts of his stipend, because he would not thereafter give over the whole, the presbytery of Hamilton intended a process against him, for small inconsiderable cause, and deposed him. When he is charged to remove from his house, and all he has there, his son, by the friendship of Swinton, got the English to take notice of the violent oppression : who, after a full hearing, decerned the old minister to enjoy all, even what before he had been content to quit. This preparative is dangerous for our whole Church ; but the unhappy violence of these unadvised men draws on these evils on themselves and others."

He mentions a number of others. Those statements I find to be confirmed, and more than confirmed, by the records of the church courts.

How do you account, then, for those seasons having been considered by great authorities as the days of the Church's great prosperity and glory, the seasons both of peace and of righteousness?—I do not know what the authorities are. I must own that I was very long disposed to believe Kirkton's description to be founded in fact; but I do not believe it to be entitled to any greater credit than is due to the vague reminiscences of a well-meaning but weak old man, who in his early life had belonged to the party which the more sober-minded members of the Church considered as the subverters of the ecclesiastical constitution. I think I could refer to a number of authorities which would sufficiently show that Kirkton's description, to say the least, is a very great exaggeration. I refer, in particular, to the record of the Commission of the Assembly from 1649 downwards. I might refer likewise to the printed pamphlets of the different parties in the Church at that period. I find, that among the causes of fasts which were appointed annually, the church courts speak perpetually of the great decline, not only of zeal but of orthodoxy, while they are contrasting that time with the time that immediately preceded it. For instance, the Commission of the General Assembly, on the 25th of February 1653, appointed a fast on account of the growth of sin of all sorts: uncleanness, contempt of ordinances, oppression, violence, fraudulent dealing; the most part of people growing worse and worse, &c. The presbytery of Paisley appointed fasts to be observed repeatedly at that time, for the gross ignorance and atheism which prevailed in the land: the horrible looseness and profanity in all sorts: the slighting of Church censures: the fearful polluting of the Lord's Supper by the promiscuous admitting of many ignorant and scandalous persons: the neglecting of the worship of God: the reviling, oppressing, and persecuting the godly everywhere through the land: the countenancing and encouraging of the ungodly and profane: the base love of the world, not only in the body of the people, but in many ministers, magistrates, &c.: the intolerable oppression of the poor: the defection of divers into separation and other errors of the times, &c.—(See *Minutes*, August 26, 1652; Feb. 3, 1653, &c.) The same presbytery, on the 4th

March 1657, assigned the following and many other causes of a fast :—Gross ignorance and profanity, especially lying, swearing, drunkenness, uncleanness, unrighteous dealing, Sabbath-breaking, and slighting God's worship, which exceedingly abound, lamentable decay, and often outbreakings of divers who have been of note for religion. In some congregations, so many qualified persons are not to be found as the necessity of the congregation doth require to be elders and deacons : many in these offices very unmeet for the same, and neglecting their duty : few persons of worldly quality, exemplary in piety : masters generally careless of the souls of those under their charge : as little hope of the young, few of them seeming seriously to seek the Lord in the days of their youth : the sad divisions of the Lord's servants and people : the damnable errors and heresies which are at this day spread abroad, and the wilful toleration thereof : the corruptions of many who have office in the house of God : the desolations of many congregations, which hath continued of a long time, notwithstanding of all endeavours used for their plantation : the dreadful self-murder of divers which hath, within these few years, fallen out in these bounds, &c., &c. (In some records the most revolting crimes are said to abound.) Not to multiply instances, I may quote again the records of the Commission of the Assembly, 25th Feb. 1653. In a letter to presbyteries they say :—“ Taking into our serious consideration the growing evidences of the Lord's displeasure against the land, in the continuance of sad afflictions upon all ranks of persons, the increase and heightening of our woeful differences and divisions, to the great scandal and reproach of the reformed Christian religion, and apparent ruin of the work of Reformation established among us, if the Lord in mercy do not interpose and prevent it,” &c. They say further : “ We perceive there hath been and is a studied overturning of the authority of the late General Assemblies, and an interrupting of the course thereof, and that lamentable divisions and subdivisions, joined with the deeds of unsound doctrine in sundry parts of the laws, have followed thereupon, together with the disrespect and open disobedience unto the sentences and authority of the late Assemblies, by which means also too much occasion is given to those who have now power over the land to wrong the liberties of the Kirk, and

to assume authority to themselves over the courts established by Christ in his house in matters ecclesiastical," &c.

* * * * *

In the course of the same year, 1653, I might add that there is an Act of the Commission of the General Assembly (dated 28th May), intituled, "An Act concerning disorderly and violent intrusion of ministers upon congregations," which evidently shows that what I have already described prevailed in other places besides the presbyteries of Linlithgow and Paisley and other presbyteries which I have enumerated. It says that the Commission of the General Assembly, being informed that in some presbyteries within this Kirk, some brethren, dissenting from the public judicatories, do assume to themselves a presbyterial power, in opposition to their respective presbyteries and synods, attempting to ordain and admit ministers into congregations without the consent and concurrence of their presbyteries; and that they have exercised this usurped power in such an arbitrary, unorderly, violent way, as hath not been heard of in the most corrupt times under prelacy, as appeareth by their intruding and forcing men into congregations without a lawful call, and against the order established in this Kirk; therefore the Commission, considering that such arbitrary and violent ways tend to the razing of Church government to the very ground, to the helping forward the affliction of God's people, in oppressing their consciences, and to the laying of a foundation of persecution, do find themselves bound to give testimony against such bold, disorderly attempts and usurpations deserving high censure.

INDEX.

- Abel, Adam, History of Scotland by, i. 34.
- Aberdeen, the National Covenant refused at, ii. 259.
- University, establishment of, i. 28—regulations of First Book of Discipline regarding, i. 196, 198—reformation of, i. 299.
- Abernethy, John, opposition of, to the Westminster Confession, i. 144.
- Adamson, Patrick, i. 228, 264—nominated archbishop of St Andrews, and refuses to be tried by the Assembly, ii. 16—its proceedings against him, 17—propositions against Episcopacy signed by, 35—on the office of Doctor, 47—the king's declaration regarding Episcopacy drawn up by, 85—he is excommunicated, 89—mutilation of the Church registers by him, 96—his death, 106.
- Act of Uniformity, the, ii. 324.
- Agobard, bishop of Lyons, i. 324.
- Aless, Alexander, i. 33; ii. 354.
- Alexander I., state of the Scottish Church under, i. 7.
- II., excommunication of, ecclesiastical endowments by him, &c., i. 10.
- III., independence of the Church under, i. 10.
- Andrews, bishop, ii. 359.
- Annard, John, i. 82, 85, 328; ii. 346.
- Anstruther-Wester School, notices of, ii. 432.
- Arbuthnot, Alexander, i. 229, 269, 300, 346; ii. 350—appointed principal of King's College, Aberdeen, i. 269, 300—his death, ii. 86.
- Argyle, the earl of, supports the Covenanters, ii. 265—trial and execution of, 342.
- Arianism, occasion of first Confession of Faith, i. 137—prevalence of, among the English Presbyterians, 143.
- Arminianism, spread of, under the influence of Laud, ii. 226.
- Arran, the earl of, his regency, i. 80—act passed under, authorising the reading of the Scriptures, *ib.*—joins Beton against the Reformation, 81, 82.
- Arran, earl of, James Stewart, favourite of James VI., ii. 77—displaced, but recovers his influence, 79—persecution of the ministers, 85—flight of, 87.
- Articles of Perth, the, ii. 207—resistance of the people to them, 213—are ratified by Parliament, 215—resolution of Charles I. to enforce them, 222—abolished by the Assembly of 1638, 265.
- Ascham, Roger, i. 359.
- Athanasian Creed, origin of the, i. 138.
- Augustan or Augsburg Confession, the, i. 141, note.
- Augustinian monks, the, i. 42.
- Babington, bishop, i. 319; ii. 359.
- Bacon, lord, character of James VI. by, ii. 218.
- Baillie, principal, i. 385; ii. 86, 249, 260, 269, 280, 283, 287, 304, 314, 351, 374, 444.
- Balcanquel, Walter, ii. 64, 85, 420—his Large Declaration, &c., judgment of the Assembly of 1639 on, 273.
- Balfour, Sir James, i. 359.
- , John, i. 252.
- Balmerino, lord, the trial of, ii. 242.
- Bancroft, archbishop, i. 164, 320; ii. 186, 187.
- Baptism, origin of dues for, i. 40—mode of administering it before the Reformation, 66, 91—the First Reformed Confession on, 129, 132—the Order of Geneva on, 153—administration of, as regulated by the Book of Discipline, 211—not required by the reformers to be reiterated, 278—exorcism of infants in, 326—regulations regarding it by the session of Lasswade, 404.
- Barbour, John, author of *The Bruce*, i. 21.
- Barlow, Dr, his account of the Hampton Court conference, ii. 157 *et seq.*
- Barons, the, commissioners of, to the Assembly, i. 297 note—the lesser admitted to Parliament, ii. 99.

- Bassandyne, Thomas, i. 254 ; ii. 23, 28 note, 362.
- Bible, the, ii. 19—account of it, 23 *et seq.*
- Baxter, Richard, and Baxterian theology, i. 142 and note.
- Beattie, Dr., on the principles of the first reformers, i. 2.
- Bellenden, bishop, letters from Laud to, regarding the introduction of the liturgy, ii. 238.
- Benedict XIII., controversy regarding the claims of, 16.
- Benedictine monks, the, i. 42.
- Benefices, origin of, i. 40—thirds of, 237, 282, 293, 350 ; ii. 10.
- Beton, James, archbishop of Glasgow, i. 29—intrigues of, with Wolsey, &c., *ib.*—persecutions under him, 30—constitution of St Mary's College as fixed by, 98—notice of, 371, 381.
- , cardinal, persecutions under, i. 30—sanguinary repressive measures of, 80—his imprisonment on the accession of the Earl of Arran, *ib.*—martyrdom of Wishart, and his assassination, 82.
- Beza, views of, regarding the civil magistrate, i. 133 note—friendship of, with Andrew Melville, ii. 12—on Rollock's works, 72.
- Bible, the, prohibition of, by the Romish Church, i. 37, 330—act authorising its reading in the vulgar tongue, 80 and note—appeal of the reformers to it, 139—first edition of it printed in Scotland, ii. 19 *et seq.*
- Binning, lord, royal commissioner to the Perth Assembly, ii. 210.
- , Hugh, the sermons of, ii. 313.
- Bishoprics, decision of the Convention of Leith regarding, i. 308 *et seq.*
- Bishops, the Scottish, measures of the Assembly regarding, 1573, ii. 10, 11—proceedings of the Assembly against them, 18, 19—declaration of the Second Book of Discipline regarding them, 55—protest against the act restoring them, 173—extracts from the Course of Conformity on, 174—the right of ordination, &c., conferred on them, 182—their consecration, 1612, 185—their increased influence under Charles I., 222—their subservience to Laud, 246—their flight to England, 259—proceedings of the Assembly of 1638 against them, 265—those appointed by Charles II., 319.
- Black, David, the case of, ii. 130—sentence against him, 134—his character, 136.
- Black Friars, the, i. 43.
- Blackburn, Peter, made bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 151 note.
- Blair, Robert, i. 401, 402.
- Boece or Boethius, Hector, i. 34, 35 note ; ii. 354.
- Book of Canons, the, ii. 167—introduction of it, 247—abolished by the Assembly of 1638, 265.
- of Common Order, the, i. 152—not composed by Knox, *ib.* note—identical with the Order of Geneva, 193—public worship as regulated in it, 210—decree of Assembly regarding it, 266.
- of Discipline, commission to prepare the, i. 149—account of it, 150 *et seq.*—its subscription by the nobility, &c., 219—its recognition by the General Assembly, 242 note ; ii. 366.
- , the Second, ii. 11—its progress, 17—laid before the king, and acted on by the Assembly, 18 *et seq.*—account of it, 40 *et seq.*—the assertion that it claims Divine authority examined, 58—how far a standard of the Church, 369—extracts and notes relating to, 416.
- of Sports, the, required by Land to be read on Sunday, ii. 245.
- Booke of Universall Kirk, ii. 96, 387.
- Books relating to religion to be revised by the superintendent, i. 254—presented by Buchanan to St Leonard's College, ii. 352—demand for, in Scotland after the Reformation, 361—belonging to Ormiston parish school, 435.
- Booksellers in reign of James VI., ii. 362.
- Borthwick, Sir John, tried, &c., for heresy, i. 31—process against, 186 *et seq.*, 327 *et seq.*—presentation by, in 1560, ii. 378.
- Bothwell, the earl of, proceedings of Assembly in connection with the Queen's marriage to, i. 293.
- , his attempt on James VI., ii. 109.
- Bower, account of Resby by, i. 13—account of the Hussites by, 17—his continuation of Fordun, 25.
- Bowman, Sir David, grammar-school founded by, i. 49 note, 334.
- Boyd, James, archbishop of Glasgow, i. 375, 385 ; ii. 6, 11.
- Brand, John, i. 293, 313.
- Brownists, the, ii. 300.
- Bruce, Robert, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, ii. 96, 126, 139, 148, 420.
- Bucer, Martin, on unlawful marriages, ii. 357.
- Buchanan, George, his epigram on John Mair, i. 33—a member of Assembly, 1564, 260—a commissioner of As-

- sembly of 1565, 270—moderator of the Assembly of 15th June 1567, 287—in orders at this time, 286; ii. 350—notices of him in University papers, 345—early demand for his works, 362.
- Buchanan, Thomas, nephew of the poet, i. 229; ii. 349.
- Buik of Universall Kirk, in Sion College, i. 243 note; ii. 387.
- Burgh representatives in the Assembly, i. 293, 294 note.
- Burial, regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, i. 215.
- Burn, Nicol, apostasy of, ii. 35.
- Burnet, bishop, his account of dispensation of the communion in Scotland, i. 394 note—character of James VI. by, ii. 218—character of the ejected ministers by, 322—and of their successors, 323.
- Bursaries in colleges, i. 371; ii. 57, 401, 435, 437, 442.
- Business, order of, in the Assembly, i. 264.
- Buthill, John, i. 336 *et seq.*
- Calder, parish of, complaints of, regarding superintendent, i. 246, 257 *et seq.*
- Calderwood's Church History, i. 2; ii. 97—his account of the Convention at Leith, i. 309—account of Bassandyne's Bible from, ii. 26—trial of, before the High Commission, 195—his account of the Perth Assembly, 199, 205, 210.
- Calvin on Justification, i. 120 note—on the power of the civil magistrate, 133 note—on marriage with a wife's sister, ii. 358.
- Cameron, Richard, ii. 341.
- Cameronians, rise of the, ii. 341.
- Canonical obedience, the oath of, ii. 183.
- Canons of the Scottish Church, i. 59 *et seq.*—the Book of, *see* Book of Canons.
- Carmichael, James, ii. 390, 391, 416, 425.
- Carswell, John, appointed superintendent of Argyll, i. 171—on education in the Highlands in 1567, ii. 430.
- Cartusian monks, the, i. 43.
- Casaubon, Dr M., i. 322.
- Catechism, Hamilton's, i. 43 note, 74, 111 *et seq.*, 136—Calvin's, 193, 210.
- Cathedral churches, what, i. 44.
- Chalmers, Dr, 125 *et seq.*
- Chapel-royal, the, at Stirling, its opulence before the Reformation, i. 47—the English Liturgy introduced into, ii. 237—correspondence regarding this, 238 *et seq.*
- Chaplainries in St Andrews, number of, i. 45—disposed to bursars in colleges, ii. 57.
- Charles I., accession and character of, ii. 220—his resolution to enforce the Articles of Perth, 222—his coronation, and unconstitutional proceedings, 223—Archbishop Laud becomes his adviser, 226—visits Scotland, and his coronation there, 234—his return to England, 237—the English Liturgy introduced by him into the Chapel-royal, 237—trial of Lord Balmerino, and its effect on his cause, 242—proclamation regarding the Liturgy, 249—his answer to the representations against it, 253, 254—proceedings of, on the swearing of the Covenant, 259 *et seq.*—terms offered by him, 262—declares war against the Covenanters, 266—pacification agreed to by him, 270—dissensions with his Parliament, and renewal of hostilities with the Covenanters, 274 *et seq.*—terms agreed to by him, 278 *et seq.*—treaty signed, and his visit to Scotland, 281—his surrender to the Scots, 294—protest by the Church of Scotland against his trial, 296—controversy between, and Alexander Henderson on Episcopacy, 305.
- II., negotiations of the Covenanters with, ii. 308—the restoration of, 314 *et seq.*—death of, 342.
- Chatelherault, the duke of, struggle between him and Regent Murray, i. 300, 301.
- Chemuctius, Mark, ii. 359.
- Chepman and Millar, the first king's printers, i. 34 note.
- Children, Act of Assembly regarding catechising, i. 302.
- Christ, the Scots confession on the incarnation and mediatorship of, i. 110—on his death, passion, and burial, 114—his resurrection and ascension, 118.
- Christison, W., minister at Dundee, i. 185, 223.
- Christmas-day, disregard shown by the Assembly for, i. 248.
- Church, Scottish, its independence, i. 7—its privileges under James I., 20—sketch of the history of its property, constitution, &c., and state of these before the Reformation, 38 *et seq.*—its doctrines and discipline before the Reformation, 57—its long independence of the Papacy, *ib.*—the Provincial councils and their canons, 58 *et seq.*—those of 1242 and 1269, 60—the first confession on, 122, 124—its rents

- and patrimony, the First Book of Discipline on, 201—alleged inexpediency of disturbing its external policy, 219—confiscation of its property by the nobility, 220 *et seq.*, 349 *et seq.*—its consistorial jurisdiction, 247 and note—proceedings of fifth Assembly regarding its jurisdiction, 251—acts of the Parliament of 1567 regarding it, 290 *et seq.*—its dissatisfaction with the episcopal appointments of 1572, ii. 6—office-bearers in it, as described, &c., in the Second Book of Discipline, 42—its prosperity from 1592 to 1596, 119—views of, regarding marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 355—its claims to independent and co-ordinate jurisdiction, 365—state of, from 1643 to 1661, 442.
- Church dues and fees, origin of, i. 40.
- government, disputes regarding, in the Westminster Assembly, ii. 298 *et seq.*
- patronage, *see* Patronage.
- property, regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, i. 162.
- of England, letter from the Assembly to the, in favour of the Puritans, i. 284.
- Prayer-book, the, never authorised by the Scottish Church, i. 161 note.
- Churches, mensal and common, what, i. 39—rise of different kinds of, *ib.*—canons of 1242 regarding, 61—repair of, as regulated in the Book of Discipline, 216—appointment of commissioners to visit the, 265.
- Civil magistrate, jurisdiction of, in relation to the Church, i. 132, 133 note, 203; ii. 365.
- power, its functions, &c., as laid down in the Second Book of Discipline, ii. 40.
- Claim of Right, ii. 382.
- Clement VIII., *Index expurgatorius* published by, i. 35.
- Clergy, numbers and influence of the, under James I., i. 19—their privileges, &c., 20—their manners, &c., under James V., 32—canon of 1242 regarding their lives, &c., 69.
- Clerical costume, canons of 1242 regarding, i. 59, 62.
- Collation, forms of, in 1590, ii. 425.
- Collections, church, ii. 392 *et seq.*
- Colleges, establishment of, in the larger towns proposed in the First Book of Discipline, i. 193.
- Collegiate churches, what, i. 47.
- Collace, William, ii. 76, 349.
- Colless, David, i. 229.
- Collier, Mr., on the Scots Confession of Faith, i. 115, 122.
- Commendators, what, i. 41.
- Commissary Court of Edinburgh, erection of the, i. 247 note, 372.
- Commission of Assembly becomes a constant judicatory, ii. 282—protests against the trial of Charles I., 296—on the period from 1649 to 1661, 341, 447, 448.
- Commissioners, functions, &c., of the, i. 171—appointment of, to visit the churches, 265—new law of Assembly regarding, ii. 15—from Scotland to the Westminster Assembly, 283.
- Common Order, the Book of, *see* Book. "Common Prayers," the Scottish, what, i. 160.
- Communicants, decrease of, under the Articles of Perth, and representations to the king on it, ii. 224 *et seq.*—his answer, 226.
- Communion, dispensation of the, i. 130, 153, 212, 252 *et seq.*; ii. 207, 214 and note, 224, 312.
- Confession of Faith, the Scots, laid before Parliament, i. 107—exposition of it, 109 *et seq.*—ratification of it by parliament, 135—act enforcing subscription of it, ii. 9 note.
- of Helvetia, the latter, i. 286.
- the negative, or king's, *see* Covenantant.
- of 1616, ii. 189.
- Westminster, *see* Westminster.
- Confessions of Faith, origin of, i. 137—harmonies of the, i. 142—controversies regarding their use, *ib.*
- Confirmation, canon of 1242 regarding, i. 67—Millenary petition on, ii. 154.
- Consistorial cases, jurisdiction of the Church in, i. 247, 372.
- Constone or Adamson, Patrick, *see* Adamson.
- Conventicle Act, the, ii. 327.
- Conventicles, rise of, ii. 218—laws against, in 1670, 337.
- Convention at Leith in 1571, the, and its proceedings, i. 308—form of policy, &c., authorised by it, ii. 1—appointments in pursuance of this, 2 *et seq.*
- at Perth, the, 1597, ii. 140.
- Cook's, Dr., History of the Church, i. 75; ii. 34.
- Corporation Act, the, ii. 324.
- Council of 1242, proceedings, &c., of the, i. 58—that of 1549, 72—that of 1551, 74—that of 1558, the last in Scotland, 76.
- Councils, the Scots Confession on, i. 126—Second Book of Discipline on, ii. 60.

- Councils of the Church, the Scottish, canons, &c., of, i. 53 *et seq.*
- Course of Conformity, extracts from the, ii. 174, 192.
- Covenant, National, ii. 30—its object, 35—renewal of, 256—Solemn League and, 288.
- Covenanters, the, ii. 259—mission of the Marquess of Hamilton to them, 259 *et seq.*—their military preparations, 266—their first campaign and military force, 268 *et seq.*—renewal of hostilities, 274 *et seq.*—invade England, 276—terms of pacification, 278 *et seq.*—treaty signed, 281—character of the earlier, 289—Sir Walter Scott's description of them, *ib.* note—rising of the, and their defeat at the Pentlands, 332—cruelties exercised on them, 333 *et seq.*—increased sufferings of, 338 *et seq.*—their rising, and defeat at Bothwell Bridge, 339.
- Cowper, bishop of Galloway, ii. 71.
- Craig, John, i. 280, 281, 293; ii. 13, 30, 36, 109, 356, 420.
- Crail, the grammar school of, i. 49, 334 *et seq.*
- Cranmer, the Articles of the Church of England compiled by, i. 141 note—views of, on church government, 191.
- Cranstoun, David, i. 34.
- Craw or Cwar, Paul, a Hussite, execution of, i. 17.
- Creation, doctrine of the first confession regarding, i. 109.
- Creed, origin of the first, i. 138.
- Crimes, classification of, in the First Book of Discipline, i. 203.
- Cromwell, party favourable to, in Scotland, ii. 311—change of church government by, 376.
- Cudworth, Dr, i. 322.
- Cunningham, Wm. of Caprington, ii. 36.—, Thomas, ii. 354.
- Dalgleish, Nicol, ii. 349.
- Dalrymple, James, Lord Stair, i. 380.
- Dalzel, Ninian, efforts of, in favour of Popery, ii. 36.
- Dalziel, General, ii. 332.
- Daruley, declaration regarding murder of, i. 289—its original deviser, ii. 69 note.
- David I., character of, and his policy toward the Church, i. 8—his munificence to it, 9.
- II., position of the Church under, i. 12.
- Davidson, John, minister of Prestonpans, ii. 66, 123, 130 note, 147, 420.
- Deacons, regulations as to the election of, i. 205—their duties and functions, 208—their functions as defined in Second Book of Discipline, ii. 53.
- Discipline, *see* Book of Discipline and Ecclesiastical Discipline.
- Divine Service in the Reformed Church in Scotland before its establishment, i. 97—regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, 209—order of, as decreed by fifth General Assembly, 251.
- Divorce, jurisdiction of the Church in cases of, i. 186, 247; ii. 372.
- Doctors, functions, &c., of, as defined in Second Book of Discipline, ii. 45 *et seq.*
- Doctrine, system of, before the Reformation, i. 57.
- Douglas, Gawin, the poems of, i. 33.
- , John, Principal of the New College of St Andrews, i. 102, 103—one of the commissioners for compiling the Book of Discipline, 150—appointed archbishop of St Andrews, ii. 2—his character, &c., 3—his inauguration, and Knox's disapproval of it, 4—death of, 11—notice of, i. 333, 343, 348; ii. 346, 349.
- , John, chaplain to the Earl of Argyll, i. 103.
- , Robert, commissioner to Westminster Assembly, ii. 283, 284.
- Dress, clerical, regulations of the Council of 1549 regarding, i. 73.
- Dunbar, Gawin, bishop of Aberdeen, &c., i. 29.
- , William, the poems of, i. 33.
- , the earl of, ii. 180, 182.
- Duncan, the murder of, by Macbeth, i. 6.
- Duncanson, John, ii. 346.
- Dunfermline, the abbey of, endowed by Malcolm III., i. 7.
- Dunkeld, the bishop of, coronation of Edward Baliol by, i. 12.
- Dunkesoun, T., presentation to, ii. 384.
- Dunlop, professor, defence of Confessions of Faith by, i. 144—account of his work, 145—his answer to objections, 146—answers to him, and his defence disclaimed by the General Assembly, 147.
- , Mr Murray, on patronage, ii. 378 *et seq.*
- Dury, John, motion by, in the Assembly on Episcopacy, ii. 13—prosecuted by the court, 80.
- Eadmer, election of, as bishop of St Andrews, i. 8.
- Ecclesiastical Discipline, the system of, before the Reformation, i. 57—the First Book of Discipline on, 202—in relation to the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate, 203; ii. 377—statutes of Lasswade kirk-session regarding, i. 404.

- Ecclesiastical endowments, early advantages of, i. 10.
- patronages, i. 52.
- property, amount of, i. 41.
- Edict, form of, in 1590, ii. 424.
- Edinburgh, wealth of the religious houses of, i. 48—council at, 1551, its enactments, 74—that of 1558, 76—dispensation of communion in, after the Reformation, 389—tumult in, in 1596, and use made of it by the court, ii. 138—resistance to the Perth Articles in, 218—erection of bishopric of, 243—tumult in, on attempt to introduce the Liturgy, 252—poor of, provision for the, ii. 392 *et seq.*
- University, foundation of, ii. 67—Rollock appointed first master, 71—mode of teaching pursued, 73.
- Education, provision in the First Book of Discipline regarding, i. 192—time appointed for each course, 195—means of, in Scotland, in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ii. 428—in the Highlands, 429 note.
- Edward VI., views of, on church government, i. 190—his Liturgy, severities with which enforced, ii. 249 note.
- Elders, regulations as to the election of, i. 205—process of trial of, before Assembly, 241—functions, &c., of, as defined in Second Book of Discipline, ii. 51.
- Eldership, original meaning of, ii. 56 note.
- Election, doctrine of the Scots Confession regarding, i. 110.
- Elphinstone, bishop of Aberdeen, establishment of university there by, i. 28.
- Elwold, John, rector of St Andrews, i. 17.
- Emlyn, opposition of, to religious standards, i. 144.
- “Engagement,” the, and its results, ii. 295, 307.
- English Liturgy, views of the king and Laud as to its introduction, ii. 228—introduced into the Chapel Royal, 237—letters of Laud, &c., regarding this, 238.
- Reformers, views of, as to Church Order, &c., i. 190.
- Episcopacy, tendency of the Church to, in 1571, i. 306—Convention at Leith regarding it, 308—measures of the Convention at Leith for establishing, 308; ii. 1—Andrew Melville as the assailant of, 12—discussion in the Assembly on it, 13 *et seq.*—conclusions agreed on, 14—acts of the Parliament of 1584 in favour of, 81 *et seq.*—successive steps by which established, 196—abolished by the Assembly of 1638, 265—re-establishment of, in Scotland, on the restoration of Charles II., 316 *et seq.*, 319 *et seq.*
- Erastians, the, in the Westminster Assembly, ii. 302, 303.
- Erskine, James (Lord Grange), i. 326.
- , John, of Dun, i. 95—appointed superintendent of Angus, 171—charges against him, and trial before the assembly, 250—moderator of different assemblies, 264, 273, 279, 283—prays to be released from his superintendency, 274, 286—acquiesces in the establishment of Episcopacy, ii. 4.
- Eucharist, canons of 1242 regarding the, i. 68.
- Excommunication, canon regarding, i. 66—the form of, 70—of Archbishop Adamson, ii. 89.
- Extreme Unction, canon of 1242 regarding, i. 69.
- Fairfoul, archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 320.
- Ferguson, David, minister at Dunfermline, i. 185—on the provision for the ministers after the Reformation, 352.
- Fife, resistance to the Articles of Perth in, ii. 213.
- Five Articles of Perth, the, ii. 195, 197.
- Forbes, William, first bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 243.
- Forlorn Son, a comedy, notices of its performance on a Sabbath at St Andrews, i. 4, 313.
- Forman, Andrew, bishop of Moray, career of, i. 28.
- France, Reformed Churches of, on marriage, ii. 357.
- Fothrick, district of, i. 171 and note.
- Fyfe, Thomas, i. 340; ii. 347.
- Galloway, P., his account of the Hampton Court Conference, ii. 157.
- General Assembly, the, Dunlop’s work on Confessions disclaimed by, i. 147—regulations of, regarding readers, 162—meeting of the First, 222—its composition, 223—authority under which it met, 224—its proceedings, *ib.*—the Second, its meeting and proceedings, 232 *et seq.*—the Third, 237 *et seq.*—the Fourth, 240—its proceedings, 241 *et seq.*—the Fifth, 248—meeting of, at Perth, June 1563, and its proceedings, 252 *et seq.*—that of December 1563, 255 *et seq.*—that of June 1564, 259 *et seq.*—that of December 1564, 264 *et seq.*—order of business in it, *ib.*—that of June 1565,

- 267 *et seq.*—that of December, 273 *et seq.*, 277—June 1566, 279—that of December 1566, 283—that of June 1567, 287—that of December 1567, 293—that of July 1568, and act regarding the admission of members, 294—those of March and July 1570, 302 *et seq.*—that of 1572 protests against the Episcopal appointments, ii. 6 *et seq.*—resistance of, to Morton's encroachments, 10—that of 1573 resolves on the preparation of the Second Book of Discipline, 11—discussion on Episcopacy, and decision, 13—of 1576, appointment of visitors by, 15—contest between it and Patrick Adamson, 16—the Second Book of Discipline, its progress, 17—abolishes the Episcopal office, 18—opposition to the court, 19—of 1581, scheme for erection of Presbyteries, redistribution of parishes, &c., 36 *et seq.*—its other proceedings, 39—the Second Book of Discipline, 40 *et seq.*—of October 1581, its proceedings, 63—case of Balcanquel, 64—that of Robert Montgomery, *ib. et seq.*—petitions for repeal of acts of the current parliament, 87—excommunicates Adamson, 89—that of 1586, 90—that of 1587, 94 *et seq.*—mutilation of their registers by Adamson, 96—commissioners appointed to parliament on the king's coming of age, 97—proceedings of that of 1588, 100—the king at that of 1590, 105—requires subscription to Book of Discipline, 106—that of 1591, 107—that of 1592, 108—of 1596, its proceedings for reforming its own members, 123—at Dundee, 1597, meeting and proceedings of, 141, 146—proceedings of its Commissioners, 144—meeting in July 1599, 145—their subservience to the king, 148—indefinite postponement of its meetings, 152—meeting of, at Linlithgow in 1606, and its arbitrary character, 179—in 1608, 181—that of 1610, gives bishops the right of ordination, &c., 182—meeting in 1616, and its proceedings, 188—of 1618, its opposition to the Five Articles, 197—that of Perth, August 1618, 198—the order of procedure at it, 200 *et seq.*—the vote on the Five Articles of Perth, 205—degree in which swayed by royal influence, 211—discontinuance of its meetings, 222—of 1638, meeting and proceedings of, 263 *et seq.*—of 1639, 270 *et seq.*—of 1641, 281—protests against the king's trial, &c., 296.
- General Assemblies, early records of, ii. 387.
 ——— Councils, canon of 1242 regarding, i. 60.
 Geneva, Knox at, i. 96.
 ———, the Order of, i. 152—not composed by Knox, 152 note.
 ——— Bible, the, ii. 21, 23 note, 162, 163 note, 359.
 Gibson, John, license to print the Bible given to, ii. 25 note.
 Giffard, George, i. 318, 320.
 Gillespie, George, i. 134; ii. 56, 283, 287 and note, 300 note, 304.
 Gladstones, George, i. 399; ii. 145—made bishop of Caithness, 151 note—consecration of, as archbishop of St Andrews, 186—his character, *ib.* note.
 Glasgow University, early history of, i. 16, 362—regulations of First Book of Discipline regarding, 196, 198.
 God, doctrine of the original Confession regarding, i. 109.
 Good works, the first Confession on, i. 119.
 Goodman, Christopher, minister of St Andrews, i. 185—a member of the first Assembly, 223—altercation between, and Maitland of Lethington, 255—removed to England, 277.
 Gordon, Alexander, his claim as superintendent of Galloway disallowed by the Assembly, i. 242.
 Gospel, preaching of, the First Book of Discipline on, i. 151.
 Gowrie conspiracy, the, ii. 148.
 Graham, first archbishop of St Andrews, i. 23.
 ———, Andrew, created bishop of Dunblane, ii. 6.
 Grammar schools, law under James IV. regarding, i. 27.
 ——— school of Crail, i. 49 note, 343 *et seq.*
Gratie expectativa, what, i. 53.
 Gray friars, the, i. 43.
 Great Bible, the, ii. 21.
 Gregory XI., increase of Papal supremacy in Scotland under, i. 12.
 Gresone, John, form of recantation of, i. 107 note.
 "Grievances and petitions" of the Presbyterians, the, 1633, ii. 236.
 Guild, David, i. 231, 334, 347; ii. 349.
 Guthrie, James, ii. 291, 311, 314 note, 317, 443.
 Haddington, the earl of, his account of the Parliament of 1621, ii. 215 *et seq.*
 Hailes, lord, his Collections regarding the Scottish Church, i. 58—on the

- Councils of 1242 and 1269, 59, 60—on the Acts of the Council of 1549, 72, 73—on Hamilton's Catechism, 75—additions to his Life of John Hamilton, 345 *et seq.*—his memorials and letters, ii. 210 *et seq.*
- Hall, bishop, ii. 359.
- Hamilton, archbishop, his Catechism, i. 43 note, 74, 75 and note, 325—compared it with the Scots Confession, 109, 111, 115, 117, 121, 136—measures of, to silence Knox, 87—persecutions under, 93—extension of St Andrews University by, and his objects in this, 98—his nepotism in the new appointments, 101—petition of the Assembly against, 285—accused of being privy to the Regent's murder, 302—his execution, 304—his character, 305.
- , bishop of Galloway, ii. 320.
- , marquess of, his mission to the Covenanters, ii. 259 *et seq.*
- , Archd., i. 228, 345 *et seq.*
- , Gavin, bishop of Glasgow, consecration of, ii. 185.
- , James, lord, i. 366, 387.
- , John, additions to Lord Hailes's life of, i. 345 *et seq.*
- , Patrick, i. 30; ii. 345.
- , Robert, i. 228—his plurality of offices in St Andrews, 277, objected to by the Assembly, *ib.*—accused of heresy, 303 and note—alleged violation of the Sabbath in St Andrews, 313—notices of him in university papers of St Andrews, i. 333, 343, 399; ii. 348 *et seq.*—proceedings of Assembly regarding, 302 *et seq.*
- , Robert, minister of Hamilton, process against, i. 245.
- of Bothwellhaugh, the assassination of Regent Murray by, i. 301.
- Hamiltons, pernicious influence of the, i. 305.
- Hampton Court, the conference at, ii. 156.
- Hancock, Dr, i. 322.
- Harding, Robert, defence of Benedict XIII. by, i. 17.
- Harlaw, William, i. 94, 95, 391—a member of the first Assembly, 223.
- Hay, George, ii. 13.
- Henderson, Alexander, ii. 214—one of the authors of the National Covenant, 256—a commissioner to the Westminster Assembly, 280 note, 283—his character and career, *ib.*—his controversy with Charles I. on Episcopacy, and death, 305—school at Leuchars, endowed by, 429.
- Henrietta Maria, marriage of Charles I. to, and her influence, ii. 221.
- Hepburn, George, parson of Hawick, i. 245.
- , James, bishop of Moray, i. 29.
- , John, prior of St Andrews and founder of St Salvador's, i. 28, 29; ii. 347.
- Heresy, first execution for, in Scotland, i. 13—persecutions for, under the Betons, 30 *et seq.*—persecutions for, 1550, &c., 93—Confessions first adopted as a security against, 137.
- Heriot, Adam, minister at Aberdeen, i. 185.
- Hewat, trial of, before the High Commission, ii. 195.
- Heylin, Dr, on the marks of the Catholic faith, i. 124 note—on the Common Prayers of the Book of Discipline, i. 161 note—his Quinquarticular History, ii. 166—work on the Sabbath by, 244.
- High Commission Court, erection of the, ii. 181—its severities against non-conformists, 217—it expires with the king's death, 218—reconstituted under Charles I., and its arbitrary proceedings, 223—re-established by Sharp, and its proceedings, 329.
- Holkot, Robert, i. 316, 325.
- Holland, the poems of, i. 25.
- , Henry, i. 320.
- Home, lord, protest of, against the proclamation regarding the liturgy, ii. 255.
- Honorius IV., bull by, regarding the Scottish Provincial Councils, i. 58.
- Hooker, views of, on bishops and priests, i. 191.
- Hussites, persecution of the, i. 17.
- Hutchinson, bishop, i. 315 *et seq.*
- Idolatry, the First Book of Discipline on, i. 155.
- Immorality, canon of 1242 regarding, i. 63—acts of the council of 1549 regarding, 73.
- Immortality of the soul, the first Confession on the, i. 123.
- Incarnation, doctrine of the first Confession regarding the, i. 110—Hamilton's catechism on, 111.
- Incomes of professional men in sixteenth century, i. 359.
- Independents, the, in the Westminster Assembly, ii. 299—their views, 300.
- Index Expurgatorius*, the, i. 35.
- Indulgence, the declaration of, ii. 328—in Scotland, 336.
- Infant baptism, doctrine of the Scots Confession on, i. 132.
- Investiture, claim of various parties as to the right of, i. 53.

- Ireland, opposition of the Presbyterians in, to confessions, i. 144.
- Jackson, Dr T., i. 322.
- James I., progress of Scotland under, i. 19—his character, &c., 21.
- II., Scotland under, i. 21.
- III., services of bishop Kennedy under, i. 21—degradation of the Church under, 22 *et seq.*
- IV., condition of the Church and kingdom under, i. 27.
- V., position, &c., of the Church under, i. 29—manners of the clergy, 32.
- VI., coronation of, i. 289—his alleged introduction in England of penal laws against witchcraft, 315—his translation of the Bible, *ib.*, and ii. 162—the government assumed by, ii. 17—his dislike to Presbyterianism, 18—the Book of Discipline laid before him, 18 *et seq.*—his objects in the King's Confession, 36—scheme for erection of presbyteries, &c. submitted to Assembly, 37—continued disputes between, and the Assembly, 64—charter to Edinburgh University granted by, 68—grants to it, *ib. et seq.*—his favourites and their influence, *ib.*—the Raid of Ruthven, 73 *et seq.*—his proceedings against the ministers, 80—acts of the current parliament in support of his arbitrary proceedings, 81—persecution of the ministers, 85—his declaration regarding these acts, *ib.*—return of the banished lords and flight of Arran, 86—his reception of the Assembly, 87—his declaration regarding the acts, 88—his conduct with regard to his mother, 91, 93, 94 note—struggle between him and the Assembly, 95 *et seq.*—proceedings of the Assembly on his coming of age, 96—his professions of attachment to Presbyterianism, 105, 106—his abandonment of Adamson, 106—his want of firmness, &c., in executing the laws, 108, 109—Craig's sermon before him, 109—his hatred to Presbyterianism, 118—compelled to abandon the Popish lords, and their rebellion, 120—appointment of the Octavians, 121—again receives the Popish lords, 128—remonstrances of the ministers and his answer, 128—his jurisdiction in spiritual matters declined, 130—further proceedings, 134 *et seq.*—takes advantage of a tumult to urge on his views, 139—Convention called at Perth, 140,—and General Assembly at Dundee, 141—progress of his measures, 143—the Gowrie conspiracy, 148—success of his measures, 150—his accession to the English crown, 151—severities against the Presbyterian ministers, 152—the Millenary petition, 153—the Hampton Court Conference, 156—proclamation to the nonconformists, 166—the Book of Canons, 167—erection of the High Commission Court, 181—directs the consecration of the Scottish bishops, 185—visit to Scotland, 189—his efforts to introduce the English service, 191—his five Articles, 195—his letter to the Perth Assembly, 202 *et seq.*—proclamation for sports and pastimes on Sabbath, 212—procures ratification of the Perth Articles by parliament, 215—his death, 218.
- James II. (or VII.), accession and dethronement of, ii. 342.
- Jewel, bishop, views of, on bishops and priests, i. 191.
- Johnson, Dr Samuel, i. 316.
- Johnstone, Archd. (Lord Warriston), ii. 256, 387.
- Junius, Francis, ii. 359.
- Jus devolutum*, *the*, i. 52.
- Keith's Church History, remarks on, i. 2—his account of the trial of Sir John Borthwick, 31—and of Hamilton's Catechism, 75—description of Wm. Harlaw by, 95—statements by, regarding the Book of Discipline, 220—on the second General Assembly, 232.
- Kennedy, James, bishop of Glasgow, i. 21.
- King's Confession, *the*.—*See* Covenant, National.
- King's supremacy, acknowledgment of, by the Scottish parliament, ii. 171.
- Kingarth school, notices of, in parish records, ii. 437.
- Kirk-of-Field, *the*, granted to Edinburgh University, ii. 69.
- Kirk-session funds, notes on expenditure of, ii. 392.
- Kirk-sessions, regulations as to privy censure of ministers by, i. 205—and of elders and deacons, 209—statutes of, 144.
- Kirkaldie, James, i. 229.
- Kirkton's History, ii. 429, 443, 447.
- Knox, John, on the proceedings of the Council of 1549, i. 73—first public appearance of, and his character, 83—his first sermon in St Andrews, 85—impression made by it, 87—his appearance before Wynram, 89—carried prisoner to France, 93—his return to Scotland, and publication of his Appellation, 95—called to Geneva,

- 96—his letter to the Scottish Protestants, 97—his account of the preparation of the Confession of Faith, 106—account of the Book of Discipline from, 149—one of the commission on it, 150—the chapter of the Book of Discipline on the church patrimony ascribed to, 201—course said to be advocated by, regarding the external polity of the Church, 219—a member of the first Assembly, 223—his account of the second General Assembly, 232—account of the mode of supporting the ministers proposed by the barons, 237—his opinion of it, 238—charges against, at Assembly of Dec. 1563, 256—temporary powers as superintendent conferred on, 276—failing health and last efforts of, 306—description of the penury of the ministers by, 351—stipend of, as minister of Edinburgh, 355—opposes the appointment of Douglas, archbishop of St Andrews, ii. 4, 5—his death, 7.
- Knox's Liturgy, the so-called, i. 152 and note—decree of Assembly regarding, 266.
- Kynpont, Kylpont, or Pont, Robert, i. 230.—*See* Pont.
- Laic patronages, what, i. 52.
- Lamb, bishop, consecration of, ii. 185.
- Lamberton, bishop of St Andrews, patriotism of, i. 11.
- Largo, case of the parish of, 1564, i. 259.
- Lasswade school, notices of, ii. 437.
- Latimer, views of, on bishops and priests, i. 191.
- Latin language, the, its use in the Church service, i. 77—complaint of its disuse in St Leonard's College in 1550, 342.
- Laud, archbishop, the king's chief adviser, his character and first measures, ii. 226—persecution of the Puritans by, 230—at the trial of Leighton, 231—his conduct in Scotland, 235—letters of, regarding the introduction of the Liturgy, 238—his efforts to set aside the Sabbath, 244—additional observances introduced, 245—his influence over the Scottish bishops, 246—the Book of Canons, 247—the Scottish Liturgy, 248—the impeachment of, 279.
- Lauderdale, the earl of, atrocities of, ii. 337, 340.
- Law, the perfection of the, First Confession on, i. 119.
- Lawson, James, i. 255 note, 269 note, 300, 391; ii. 8, 13, 27, 85, 86, 417.
- Learning, sketch of history of, before the Reformation, i. 5—state of, under James I., 20—acts of the Council of 1549 for advancement of, 72 *et seq.*—encouragement of, by the Reformation, 199.
- Leighton, Alexander, persecution of, ii. 230.
- , Robert, new mode of preaching introduced by, ii. 313—appointed bishop of Dunblane, and subsequently archbishop of Glasgow, 320—scheme of accommodation proposed by, 334.
- Lekprevik, R., i. 256; ii. 22, 362.
- Lennox, the duke of, favourite of James VI., i. 77—his banishment and death, 78, 79.
- Lesley, general, the Covenanting leader, ii. 266, 269.
- Leslie, bishop, on the policy of James III., i. 23 and note.
- Library of Glasgow College, history of, i. 382—of Edinburgh College, foundation of, ii. 71—of St Leonard's College, George Buchanan's contributions to, 352.
- Lindoris, Laurence de, condemnation of James Resby by, i. 13—his character and influence, *ib. et seq.*—persecution of the Hussites by, 17.
- Lindsay, David, i. 185, 223, 313, 319; ii. 13, 27, 85, 151 note, 356, 365 note, 371, 417, 420—his account of the Perth Assembly, 199, 205.
- Linlithgow, the Council of 1549 at, i. 72.
- Literature, state of, under James III., i. 25—and under James V., 33 *et seq.*
- Little, Clement, Edinburgh College Library begun by, ii. 71.
- Liturgy, the Scottish, *see* Scottish.
- Lockhart, George, i. 34 note.
- Logierait, school at, ii. 50, 430, 442—communion at, in 1660, i. 403.
- Lollards, the, in Scotland, i. 13.
- Lord's Prayer, controversy regarding its being addressed to the saints, i. 76.
- Lord's Supper, the Scots Confession on the, i. 129—the Order of Geneva on, 153—regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, 212—extracts from burgh and session records relating to its dispensation in Scotland, 389—as regulated by the Articles of Perth, ii. 207, 213, 214—mode of its administration by the protesters, 312.
- Lords of the Congregation, the, i. 104.
- Lothian, superintendent of, form of his election, i. 177.
- Lowman, Moses, his answer to Dunlop on confessions, i. 147.

- Lutheran Church, the, at first retained the sacrament of penance, i. 68.
- Lynd, John, i. 270.
- Lyndsay, Sir David, the poems of, i. 33, 38 note, 262—early demand for his works in Scotland, ii. 361.
- Macbeth, the murder of Duncan by, and his policy towards the Church, i. 6.
- M'Crie's, Dr, life of Knox, ii. 8—life of Melville, i. 98, 168; ii. 425 note, 429, 431.
- Mackail, the execution of, ii. 333.
- Mackenzie, Sir George, i. 75, 320, 323.
- Magistrate, office of the, in the Church, according to the reformers, i. 133 note—as defined in Second Book of Discipline, ii. 53, 54—according to the existing ecclesiastical law of Scotland, 377.
- Mair, or Major, John, i. 33 *et seq.*; ii. 328, 370, 345, 354.
- Maitland of Lethington, attack on Christopher Goodman by, i. 255.
- Malcolm III., policy of, toward the Church, i. 6.
- IV., policy of, toward the Church, i. 10.
- , John, tried before the High Commission Court, ii. 187.
- Man, the first Confession on the creation, fall, &c., of, i. 109.
- Manderston, William, i. 35 note.
- Manses in Roman Catholic times, i. 62—law regarding residence in, 258.
- Margaret, Queen of Malcolm III., character of, i. 7.
- Marriage, canons of the Scottish Church on, i. 69—regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, 214—practice of the Church in solemnising, *ib.* note—decision of the early Assemblies regarding degree of consanguinity in, 224 *et seq.*—earliest forms of, in the Christian Church, 248 note—with a wife's sister, views of the Church of Scotland on, ii. 355.
- Mary of England, persecutions under, i. 94.
- of Guise, opposition of, to the Reformation, i. 104—her death, 105.
- , Queen, death of her husband, Francis II., and her accession, i. 105—her answer to the Assembly of June 1564, 260—articles presented to her by that of December, 265—applications to her from that of June 1565, her reception of these, 275—grant of the third of the benefices to the ministers by, 282, 287—her abdication, 289—this influenced by proceedings of the Church, *ib.*—proceedings of Assembly in connection with her marriage to Bothwell, 293—her flight into England, 294—the alleged refusal of the ministers to pray for, ii. 91, 93.
- Mass, sacrifice of the, opposition of the reformers to, i. 132—proceedings of first Assembly regarding the, 236—petition from the Assembly for its abolition, 269.
- Matrimonial causes, jurisdiction of the Church in, i. 186, 247 and note.
- Matrimony, canon of 1242 regarding, i. 69.—*See* Marriage.
- Maxwell, bishop of Ross, ii. 233, 248, 351.
- Mede, Joseph, i. 323.
- Melville, Andrew, i. 168 note—his arrival in Scotland, character and influence, ii. 12—his speech in the Assembly of 1574 on Episcopacy, 13—removed to University of St Andrews, 60—prosecution of, after the Raid of Ruthven, 80—summoned to London, and detained there, 171.
- , James, on the provision for the ministry, i. 352—his account of his regent at college, ii. 76—and of the preaching of John Knox, 126—summoned to London, 171—his reasons against the restoration of the bishops, 174.
- Members of Assembly, act of 1568 regarding admission of, i. 294.
- Mendicant Friars, the, i. 43.
- Methven Paul, minister at Jedburgh, i. 185—the case of, 252—petition from, to Assembly of 1564, and its answer, 266—process of his being received to repentance, 280.
- Millenary petition, the, ii. 153.
- Milton, John, ii. 298.
- Ministerial settlements, forms relating to, ii. 422.
- Ministers and their election, the First Book of Discipline on, i. 155—on their admission, 156—and regarding provision for them, 162—regulations as to their privy censure, &c., by kirk-sessions, 205—views of the reformers as to their engaging in secular pursuits, 207—mode of supporting proposed by the barons, 237—Knox on it, 238—censure of them decreed to be by the Assembly, 240—regulations as to their admission, 245—complaints against, at Assembly of Dec. 1563, 257—discussion in Assembly of 1564 on their translation, 263—complaints to Assembly of 1565 of want of, 267—petition to the queen re-

- garding their support, &c., 269—questions decided by committee of Assembly as to their leaving their vocation, 277, 278—thirds of benefices assigned to them, 282—act regarding their examination, admission, &c., 292—articles sent to the regent regarding provision for, 298—conduct of Regent Morton towards them, ii. 9, 10—functions, &c., of, as defined in Second Book of Discipline, 44—persecution of, by Arran and the king, 85—their alleged refusal to pray for Queen Mary, 91—their remonstrance against the king's reception of the Popish lords, and his answer, 128—declinature of his jurisdiction in spiritual matters, 130—proceedings in the case of David Black, 134—required to sign acknowledgment of the king's jurisdiction, 139—convention at Perth, 140—act for giving them a vote in Parliament, 145—severe measures against them, 152—their objections to the Liturgy, 250—ejection of, on the introduction of Episcopacy, 322—their characters, *ib.*
- Ministry, persons recommended by the first Assembly for, i. 227—provision for it after the Reformation, 349 *et seq.*—scheme for better provision for, &c., ii. 37—state of, in Scotland, 1630, 233 *et seq.*
- Moderator of Assembly, origin of the office, i. 60—act regarding choosing of, 257 and note—objects of election of, 264.
- Moderators, perpetual, appointment of, in presbyteries and synods, ii. 179.
- Monasteries, the, at first the repositories of learning, i. 9.
- Monastic orders, history of the, in Scotland, i. 41 *et seq.*
- Money, value of Scots, at time of the Reformation, i. 356.
- Montgomery, Robert, case of, ii. 64.
- Morals, acts of the Council of 1549 for improvement of, i. 72 *et seq.*—corruption of, in 1588, ii. 100.
- Moray, bishop of, patriotism of, i. 11.
- More, Dr H., i. 322, 324.
- Morton, the earl of, his efforts in favour of Episcopacy, i. 307—his eulogy on Knox, ii. 9—is appointed regent, *ib.*—his relations to the Church, *ib.*—intrigues of, against Presbyterianism, 18.
- Murray, Earl of, appointed regent, i. 289—articles from the Assembly of 1568, to, regarding stipends, &c., 298—the struggle between, and Chatelherault, 300—his assassination, 301—books of, in university library, St Andrews, ii. 354.
- Muse's welcome to James VI., the, ii. 189 and note.
- Mylv, David, presentation to, ii. 380, 386.
- National Covenant, ii. 30—its object, 35—renewal of it, 1638, 255—extracts from it, 256—its signature, 258—renewed by the Assembly of 1639, 273.
- Neonomianism, what, i. 143.
- Newbattle school, notices of, in parish register, ii. 431.
- Newton, Sir Adam, ii. 70.
- Nicene creed, origin of the, i. 138.
- Nobility, the, seizure of the Church property by, i. 221—mode of supporting the ministers proposed by them, 237—their declaration after Darnley's murder, 289—their opposition to the measures of James VI., ii. 191—the Scottish, alienated from Charles I., 243—renewal of the National Covenant by them, 255.
- Nonconformists, severities against the, ii. 217 *et seq.*—proclamation of Charles I. against, 223—the English, persecution of, 230—under Charles II., 324—penal laws against them, 327.
- Non-communicants, penalties on, i. 204, 393, 404.
- Non-covenanters, the, ii. 259.
- Northampton, lord, i. 318.
- Norton, John, license to import books given to, ii. 24 note.
- Nunneries, number of, in Scotland, i. 48.
- Oath, Burgess, i. 297 note—of canonical obedience, ii. 183.
- Oaths, mode of administering in Scotland, i. 258 note.
- Octavians, appointment of the, ii. 121.
- Office-bearers, the Second Book of Discipline on, ii. 42—their admission to office, &c., 43.
- Ordinances, complaints to Assembly of 1565 of their unfrequent observance, i. 267.
- Ordination, the right of, conferred on the bishops, ii. 182.
- Original sin, doctrine of the first Confession regarding, i. 109.
- Ormiston school, notices of, in session-records, ii. 434.
- Oxford Act, the, ii. 328.
- Papacy, efforts of, to maintain ignorance, i. 35.
- Paræus, David, ii. 359, 360.
- Pardovan, his account of the office of doctor, ii. 49.

- Paris, University of, i. 16, 319.
- Parishes, origin of, i. 39—scheme for redistribution of, 1581, ii. 37.
- Parker, archbishop, ii. 355, 359.
- Parliament, the Scottish, petition of the reformers to, i. 106—Confession of Faith laid before it, 107—the Confession ratified by, 135—abolition of the jurisdiction and prohibition of the worship of the Papal Church, 148—of 1567, acts regarding the Church passed by, 290 *et seq.*—the Current, its proceedings, ii. 81 *et seq.*—commissioners from Assembly to, and its proceedings, 1587, 97 *et seq.*—of 1592, the act establishing Presbyterianism passed by, 110—effects of it, 117—act for giving ministers a vote in, 145—meeting of, 1604, and acknowledgment of the king's supremacy, 171—restoration of the bishops, 173—meeting of, 1617, and opposition of the nobles to the court, 191—its protestation against innovations, 192—ratification of the Articles of Perth by, 215—of 1633, its proceedings, 235—meeting of, 1639, and its prorogation, 274—meeting and proceedings in 1640, 275—protests against the king's trial, 296.
- the English, declaration of, against Arminianism, ii. 227—establishment of Presbyterianism by, 303.
- Parochial schools, regulations of First Book of Discipline regarding, i. 193—notice of, from the Church records, ii. 428.
- Pastors, mode of electing, in the apostolic age, i. 49.
- Paterson, Robert, i. 229.
- Paton, John, bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 6, 7.
- Patronage, system of, prior to the Reformation, i. 49—its origin, 50 *et seq.*—ecclesiastical and laic, 52—laws regulating it, 53 *et seq.*—abuses arising from it, 54—Second Book of Discipline on, ii. 57—complaints of Assembly of 1588 regarding abuse of, 102—notes on, 378—state of Church after its abolition in 1649, 442.
- Peirce, James, i. 143.
- Penance, canon of 1242 regarding, i. 67.
- Penalties, church, i. 204, 404; ii. 392 *et seq.*
- Pentlands, battle of the, ii. 332.
- Perth, the provincial councils of 1242 and 1269 at, i. 58—canons passed by these, 59—synod of, their determined opposition to the court in 1606, ii. 180—assembly in 1618, 177—articles of, 207.
- Perth grammar school, notice of the, i. 261 note.
- Petrie's Church History, i. 2, 233; ii. 97.
- Pilkington, bishop, views of, on bishops and priests, i. 191.
- Pius IV., *Index Expurgatorius* first published by, i. 35.
- Pluralities, i. 253, 263, 277, 310—declaration of the Second Book of Discipline against, ii. 54.
- Policy of the Kirk, the Book of Discipline on the, i. 209.
- Pont, Robert, i. 230, 245, 270, 302, 310, 313, 352; ii. 85, 97, 107, 417, 420.
- Poor, the, the Book of Discipline on provision for, i. 169—petition from Assembly of 1565 regarding, 270—corruption of manners among, 1588, ii. 100, 101—provision for, notes and extracts relating to, 392.
- Poor's houses, ii. 397.
- Pope, the, his authority in Scotland, i. 10, 22.
- Popery, comparative encouragement of learning under it and under the Reformation, i. 199—apostacies to, 1581, ii. 35—Act of Parliament of 1587 against, 99—countenance given to, under Charles, i. 224.
- Popish clergy, repressive measures of, toward the Reformed opinions, i. 80.
- observances, proceedings of first Assembly regarding, i. 226.
- Preaching, regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, i. 212.
- Prebendaries and prebends, origin of, i. 39.
- Presbyterianism, Andrew Melville as the supporter of, ii. 12—dislike of James VI. to it, 18—the Act establishing, 111—its effects, 117—re-established by the Assembly of 1638, 265—establishment of, by the English Parliament, 303—settlement of, by the Revolution, 343.
- Presbyterians, persecution of the, under James VI., ii. 171—increasing influence of, and peers by whom supported, 235—their statement of grievances, *ib.*—controversies between, and the sectaries, 297—proceedings of the, in support of Charles II., 308 *et seq.*—dissensions among them, 309, 311 *et seq.*—the English, resistance of, to the court, 326—penal laws against them, 327—persecutions of, in Scotland, 329.
- Presbyteries, origin of, ii. 16—scheme for erection of, 1581, 36—correspond to the elderships of Second Book of Discipline, 56 and note—first erection

- of, 60—appointment of perpetual moderators in, 179.
- Presentations to benefices, i. 51 ; ii. 384, 422.
- Preston, lord president, ii. 70.
- Prices of provisions at the time of the Reformation, i. 357 ; ii. 364 note.
- Printers in Scotland, the first, i. 34 note—encouragement of, by the Church, 256—in reign of James VI., ii. 362.
- Printing, introduction of, into Scotland, i. 34 *et seq.*—list of early works, *ib.* note.
- Profligacy, general spread of, 1588, ii. 100 *et seq.*
- “Propheying,” regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, i. 213.
- Protest against acts of the Current Parliament, ii. 84—against the restoration of the bishops, the, 173, 174—in 1617 against innovations, 192.
- Provincial councils, *see* Councils.
- Public worship, regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, i. 209, 210.
- Puritans, the English, heterodoxy among, i. 143 note—letter from the Assembly to the Church of England in their favour, 284—the Millenary petition of the, ii. 153—persecution of them, 170—persecutions of the, by Laud, 230.
- Quakers, the, in Scotland, ii. 314.
- Raid of Ruthven, the, ii. 78—its influence on the Church, 79.
- Rainolds, Dr John, i. 319 ; ii. 157, 162, 165, 166 note.
- Ramsay, William, i. 227, 334 ; ii. 348.
- Readers, establishment of, by the First Book of Discipline, i. 160—their duties, 161—subsequent regulations regarding them, 162—provision proposed for them, 167—act of Assembly of 1581 regarding, ii. 39.
- Recantation of John Gresone, i. 107 note.
- Reformatio Legum*, on forbidden degrees in marriage, ii. 357.
- Reformation, the, its intimate connection with politics in Scotland, i. 1—sketch of religion and learning before it, 5 *et seq.*—at first favoured by the Regent Arran, 80—his coalition with Beton against it, 81—its first leaders, 82—its progress, and efforts of the Popish party to arrest it, 98—its rapid progress and establishment, 103—its leaders, *ib.*—encouragement of learning by it, 199.
- Reformers, the Scottish, principles held by them, as distinguished from their predecessors, i. 2—their error in insisting on minor matters, 3—their undue retention of the spirit of Popery, *ib.*—this shown in regard to the Sabbath, *ib.* note—doctrines held by them as laid down in the Confession of Faith, &c., 106 *et seq.*—their conduct with regard to the property of the Church, 220, 221—their alleged intolerance, 149, 226.
- Regeneration, doctrine of the First Confession regarding, i. 109.
- Regent, origin of the term, ii. 71 note.
- Regular clergy, history, &c., of the, i. 41.
- Reid, Dr Thomas, i. 365, 381 ; ii. 77.
- , Robert, bishop of Orkney, ii. 67.
- Religion in Scotland, sketch of history of, before the Reformation, i. 5 *et seq.*
- Remonstrants, ii. 309 *et seq.*
- Resby, James, condemnation and execution of, for heresy, i. 13.
- Resolutioners and Protesters, ii. 309.
- Revolution settlement, the, ii. 343, 383.
- Rhynd, Patrick, i. 261 note.
- , William, i. 228, 261 note.
- Robert Bruce, patriotism of the clergy under, i. 11—excommunication of, *ib.*
- Robertson, principal, his account of the superintendents, i. 190.
- Rollock, Robert, i. 360 ; ii. 22, 71, 141, 362, 420.
- Roman Catholic party, efforts of, to arrest the Reformation, i. 98.
- Romish Church, abolition of the jurisdiction and prohibition of the worship of the, i. 148.
- Rough, John, character of, i. 82—his appearance before Wyram, &c., 89.
- Row, John, originally a churchman, i. 104—one of the commission for compiling the Book of Discipline, 150—appointed commissioner for Dumfries, 171—minister at Perth, 185—a member of the First Assembly, 223—his reply to the queen's answer to the Articles of the Assembly, 275—appointed temporary superintendent, 276—in the Assembly of 1574, ii. 13.
- Royal Burghs, their representation in the General Assembly, i. 295.
- Rutherford, John, principal of St Salvador's, i. 227—appointed minister of Cults, 253 and note—attack on Knox by, ii. 5—notices of, in university papers, i. 333, 346 ; ii. 348, 350, 422.
- , Samuel, on the office of the magistrate, i. 134 note—sermons by, at the communion in St Andrews, 402—commissioner to Westminster Assembly, ii. 283—character of, 284, 291, 311—his account of the Church in 1656, 443.

- Sabbath, principles, &c. of the early reformers regarding the, i. 3 note—performance of a comedy at St Andrews on a, 3 note, 313—proclamation of James VI. regarding sports, &c., on, ii. 214—efforts of Laud to set aside its sanctity, 244.
- Sabbath-breaking, extracts showing administration of the laws against, ii. 406.
- Sacraments, the, canons of 1242 regarding, i. 61, 66 *et seq.*—the First Confession of Faith on, 129—the First Book of Discipline on, 151.
- Sacrilege, Pont's sermons on, i. 353, ii. 107.
- Sage's Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, i. 160, 161 note, 174, 188; ii. 5, 6, 12, 97, 175.
- St Andrews, chaplainries and altarpieces in, i. 45; ii. 57—collegiate churches in, i. 48—castle of, the conspirators against Beton in, 82—Knox's first sermon in, 85—capture of the castle, &c., 93—the archbishop of, tried for saying mass, 1562, 252—pernicious influence of the Hamiltons in, 305—Knox's house in, 361 note—extracts from records regarding dispensation of the communion in, 399 *et seq.*—the Chapter of, as constituted by the Convention at Leith, ii. 2—induction of John Douglas into archbishopric of, 4.
- University, rise of, i. 14—its first professors, &c., *ib. et seq.*—bull establishing its privileges, 15—its rapid advancement, *ib. note*—regulations of First Book of Discipline regarding, 196—professorships, &c., proposed, 197—visitations of, 342—reformation of, ii. 60 *et seq.*—proceedings of the king's commissioners at, 145—in the time of George Buchanan, 345.
- St Columba, the first monastery founded by, i. 41.
- St Giles, Edinburgh, the collegiate church of, i. 47—tumult in, on the introduction of the Liturgy, ii. 252.
- St Leonard's College, ii. 347, &c.—in the time of George Buchanan, 351.
- St Mary's College, extension of, by Archbishop Hamilton, i. 98 *et seq.*: ii. 345—Buchanan's reformation of, 60.
- St Salvador's College, foundation of, i. 16 note, 29.
- Sanctuary, canons regarding the right of, i. 65.
- Schoolmasters, to be tried by the superintendents, i. 269—position of parochial, ii. 49.
- Schools, early grammar, in Scotland, i. 48 note, and 334—enactments of the Book of Discipline regarding, 169—provision in the Book of Discipline for establishment of, 192—attendance at, made compulsory, 194—time appointed for each course, 195—act-giving the control of them to the Church, 291—encouragement to, in time of the Covenanters, ii. 429—notices of, in Church records, 431.
- Scotland, state of religion and learning in, before the Reformation, i. 5 *et seq.*—did the penal laws against witchcraft originate in, 315 *et seq.*
- Scots money, value of, at the Reformation, i. 356.
- Scott, William, i. 229.
- Scott's, Sir Walter, account of the priest Palumbus, i. 324 note—description of Covenanters, ii. 289 note.
- Scottish Liturgy, the, its compilers, &c., ii. 248—objections of the ministers to its imposition, 250—various works against it, 251 note—tumult in Edinburgh occasioned by it, 251—abolished by the Assembly of 1638, 265.
- Scripture, the authority of, the first Confession on, i. 124.
- Scriptures, reading of the, prohibition of, by the Catholic Church, i. 31, 37—regulations of the Book of Discipline regarding, 212, 213.
- Sectaries, controversies between, and the Presbyterians, ii. 297.
- Secular canons, what, i. 39.
- clergy, the, in Scotland, i. 44.
- pursuits, ministers debarred from, i. 64, 207.
- Selden, John, i. 248; ii. 360.
- Sennert, Daniel, i. 320.
- Sharp, James (archbishop), career and character of, ii. 315—his treachery, 316—created archbishop of St Andrews, 320—the act settling Episcopacy framed by him, 321—cruelties of, 332, 334—assassination of, 339.
- Simson, Andrew, i. 261, 262; ii. 430 note.
- , Archibald, trial of, before the High Commission, ii. 195.
- Sion College, Church records in, i. 43 note, ii. 387.
- Skene, William, i. 228, 343; ii. 348, 349.
- , Sir John, i. 228; ii. 121, 349.
- Smeaton, principal, death of, ii. 86.
- Solemn League and Covenant, the, ii. 288 *et seq.*—*See also* National Covenant.
- Spence, David, minister of Caribbee, i. 230.

- Spens, Alexander, minister of Kilconquhar, i. 231.
 ———, Hugh, ii. 346.
- Spotswood, John, superintendent of Lothian, i. 104, 149, 171, 177, 246, 250, 257 note, 274, 313.
 ———, archbishop, remarks on his Church History, i. 2—character of Lamberton, bishop of St Andrews, by, 11—the first professors at St Andrews, as given by, 14 note—his account of the controversy regarding the Lord's Prayer, 76—incompleteness of his account of the Book of Discipline, 150 *et seq.*—on the stipends proposed to the superintendents, 164—statement by, in connection with the proposed changes in the external policy of the Church, 219, 220—his account of the Convention at Leith, 309—contribution to Glasgow College Library, 385—account of the case of David Black by, ii. 137—errors of, regarding Rollock, 142—summoned to London for consecration, 185—appointed to the primacy, 187—efforts of, to introduce the Perth Articles, 197—his account of the Perth Assembly, 199—his proceedings there, 203, 204—his sermon before Parliament, 1621, 215—personal habits of, 234—coronation of the king by, *ib.*—flight of, to England, 259.
- Stamford, Sir William, i. 315.
- Standards of faith, origin of, i. 137—controversies regarding the use of, 142—of the Church of Scotland, ii. 365.
- Star Chamber, persecution of the English Puritans by the, ii. 170, 230.
- Stephanus, Henricus, i. 256.
- Stirling, the Chapel Royal of, i. 47.
- Strafford, the earl of, his impeachment, ii. 279.
- Struthers, William, efforts of, against introducing the English Liturgy, ii. 228.
- Study, course of, in University of Edinburgh, ii. 73 *et seq.*
- Superintendents, the First Book of Discipline on, i. 160—stipends proposed for, 164—their duties, &c., 169, 172—their number and dioceses, 170—to be amenable to discipline, 173—mode of electing them, 174—of Lothian, form of election of the, 177—the censure of, 184—various other regulations regarding them, *ib. et seq.*—functions exercised by them not recognised by the Book of Discipline, 185—answer to Mr Sage regarding them, 189—regulations of fourth Assembly regarding, 241, 242, 245 *et seq.*—trials of the, by the fifth Assembly, 249—charges against, at Assembly of Dec. 1563, 257—their inefficiency, 274—Knox and Row appointed temporary, 276—supported by the Assembly against the bishops, ii. 10, 11.
- Synodal Assemblies, decree of General Assembly authorising, i. 251.
- Synods, commissioners from, i. 297—appointment of perpetual moderators in, ii. 179.
- Tables, the, division of the reformers into, ii. 253.
- Tacitus on the Roman necromancers, i. 316.
- Teinds, decision of Assembly of 1566 on, i. 284.
- Temporalities, act annexing them to the Crown, ii. 98.
- Test Act, passing of the, ii. 329—introduction of, into Scotland, 341.
- Thirds of benefices, i. 237, 282, 293, 298, 350; ii. 10.
- Thirty-nine Articles, the, i. 141 note—dissidents from them, 142.
- Titular benefices, what, i. 41.
- Tonsure, the, objects of, i. 73.
- Translation of ministers, discussion in Assembly of 1564 regarding, i. 263.
- Traquair, the earl of, royal commissioner to Assembly of 1639, ii. 270, 271, 273.
- Tremellius, Immanuel, i. 141 note; ii. 358.
- Turgot, confessor of Queen Margaret and bishop of St Andrews, i. 7.
- Turnbull, William, bishop of Glasgow, i. 22, 363.
- Turner, Sir James, atrocities of, against the Covenanters, ii. 331.
- Tyndale, W., and his Bible, ii. 20.
- Universities, regulations of the First Book of Discipline regarding, i. 196—proposed plan of study in them, *ib. et seq.*—and professorships, 197—regulations regarding students, 198.
- University of Glasgow, early history of, i. 362—St Andrews, i. 14; ii. 60—Edinburgh, ii. 67.
- Vaus, John, i. 35 note.
- Vicars and vicarages, canons of 1242 regarding, i. 61, 62.
- Visitation of the sick, canon of 1242 regarding the, i. 69.
 ——— of University of St Andrews, i. 342—and of Glasgow, 380.
- Visitors, appointment of, and their functions, ii. 15.

- Waldegrave, Robert, ii. 22, 362.
- Wallace, Adam, martyrdom of, i. 93.
- , Robert, arbitrary deposition of, ii. 145.
- Warburton, bishop, i. 324.
- Wardlaw, bishop of Glasgow, created cardinal, i. 13.
- Wedderburn, Dr, of St Andrews, ii. 227.
- Week-day services, i. 210 note, 389 *et seq.*; ii. 148 note.
- Weekly exercise, the, the Book of Discipline on, i. 208, 213—in the time of the Covenanters, ii. 292.
- Wemes, David, i. 229.
- , John i. 323; ii. 359.
- Westminster Assembly of Divines, the, ii. 282—the Scottish commissioners to it, 282—disputes regarding church government in, 298 *et seq.*—on degrees in marriage, 360—its relations to the parliament, 373.
- Confession, dissenters from the, i. 142—to what extent ratified by parliament in 1690, ii. 370.
- White friars, the, i. 43.
- Wickliffe, followers of, in Scotland, i. 13.
- Wilkie, James, principal of St Leonard's College, i. 228, 334, 347, 399; ii. 348 *et seq.*
- , Robert, ii. 354.
- Wilkins, Dr, his *Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ*, i. 58.
- William the Lion, relations of, to the Church, i. 10—his excommunication, &c., *ib.*
- III., settlement of the Church under, ii. 343.
- of Malmesbury, i. 324 note.
- Williams, Dr, views of, i. 143.
- Willock, John, i. 94, 95, 104, 355 note—*one of the Commission for compiling the Book of Discipline, 149—superintendent of Glasgow, 171—at General Assembly of June 1563, 252—chosen moderator of Assembly of December 1563, 257—moderator of Assembly of June 1565, 267.*
- Wills, proceedings of First Assembly regarding, i. 226.
- Wintoun, Andrew, the chronieler, i. 21.
- Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, patriotism of, i. 11.
- , George, martyrdom of, i. 82.
- Witchcraft, executions for, under James III., i. 24—the trials and executions for, 204—the penal laws against, did they originate in Scotland, 315 *et seq.*
- Wodrow, on the opposition to Dunlop's Confessions, i. 148 note—on the Bas-sandyne Bible, ii. 23—correspondence of, 384.
- Wood, James, i. 402.
- , John, i. 229.
- , T., Reader at St Andrews, i. 167.
- Worship and discipline, scheme for uniformity of, in England and Scotland, ii. 281.
- Wynram, John, i. 32 note—policy pursued by, 87—Knox and Rough before him, 89—as a leader of the Reformation, 104—one of the Commission for compiling the Book of Discipline, 149—superintendent of Fife, &c., 171—*notices of, as superintendent of Fife, 186 and note—recommended by the First Assembly for the ministry, 230—trial of, before the Assembly of 1562, 249—renewed complaints against him as superintendent of Fife, 258—charges again brought against, 274—petitions to be relieved of his superintendency, 279—miscellaneous notices of, 340 et seq.—officiates at the inauguration of the Archbishop of St Andrews, ii. 5—his Catechism, 354.*
- York, the duke of (James II.), his atrocities in Scotland, ii. 341.
- Young, Dr, at the meeting of the Perth Assembly, ii. 202.
- Zurich, confession of the Church of, i. 236.

THE END.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

- Page 32, note, *for* "Wodrow's Biographical Collections, printed by the Maitland Club," *read* "the Bannatyne Miscellany."
- ... 33, line 11, *for* "Dunbar and Douglas, two of the Scottish bishops," *read* "Dunbar, and Douglas one of the Scottish bishops."
- ... 93, line 10 from bottom, *for* "1850" *read* "1550."
- ... 320, line 2 from bottom, *for* "Brancroft" *read* "Bancroft."
- ... 324, note, last line, *for* "Montrelet" *read* "Monstrelet."
- ... 391, line 16, *for* "Hailaw" *read* "Harlaw."

VOL. II.

- Page 23, line 5, *for* "1759" *read* "1579."
- ... 299, note, last line, *for* "John" *read* "Job."
- ... 362, line 28, *for* "James IV." *read* "James VI."

BW5360 .L47 v.2
Lectures on the history of the Church of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00035 9465

