ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY

and

RELIGIOUS LIFE IN SCOTLAND

during

THE COMMONWEALTH AND PROTECTORATE.

°O°

Rev. Malcolm B. MacGregor, M.A., (Hons.)

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

C O N T E N T S.

-------oOo-------

AUTHORITIES (Contemporary).

Acts of the General Assembly (1638-1842) Church Law Soc.1843.

Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum (1642-1660) Lond.1911.

Acts and Stat. Parlt. of Scotland. Vols III-VI.

Appointment of Mr. Patrick Strachan to (Nat. Library of Scotland. Carmilly. Charters B. 20.)

BAILLIE: Letters and Journals (ed.Laing) 3 vols. Bann. Club. Edin. 1828-9.

BALFOUR: Historical Works. Vol.IV. Lond. 1825.

BLACKADER: Memoirs (ed.Chrichton). Edin. 1823.

Book of the Universall Kirk of Scotland (Acts and Proceedings 1560-1638). Bann.Club. 3 Vols.1845.

BRODIE: Diary (ed.Laing) Spalding Club. Abdn. 1863.

BURGH RECORDS: Ext. Royal Burgh of Stirling 1124-1705. Glas.1884.

BURNET: History of His Own Time. 2 Vols. Lond. 1838.

CARLYLE: Cromwell - Speeches and Letters.

Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh (1652-1657) (Ed.Stephen) Scot.Hist.Soc. 1921.

Cromwellian Union - Papers 1651-1652 (Ed. Prof. C. Sanford Terry) Scot. Hist. Soc. Edin. 1902.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORDS:-

Records - Commission of General Assembly.
Vol ii (Ed. Mitchell and Christie) Edin. 1896.
" iii(" Christie) " 1909.

Aberdeen - Selections from K.S., Presbytery and Synod. Spalding Club.

Elgin - Kirk Session Records } in Vol.ii (ed.Stephen Ree)
Presbytery Records } Spalding Club. Abdn. 1908.

Fife /

Ecclesiastical Records (contd).

Fife - Synod Records (Ed. Kinloch) Abbotsford Club. (1601-1687). Edin. 1837.

Inverness and Dingwall - Presbytery Records (1643-1688) (Ed.Wm. Mackay) (Scot. Hist. Soc. Edin. 1896.

Kirkcaldy - The Presbytrie Booke of Kirkcaldie (1630-1653) (ed. Stevenson) 1900.

Lanark - Selections from Presbytery Records (1625-1709) (ed. Robertson) Abbotsford Club. Edin. 1839.

St. Andrews and Cupar - Sel. from Presbytery Records. (1641-1698) Abbotsford Club. Edin. 1837.

Strathbogie - Presbytery Book. (1631-1654) (ed.Stuart) Spalding Club. Abdn. 1843.

Also Ross - Pastoral Work in Covenanting Times, giving extracts from K.S. Register of Dalgety. (1644-1682) Lond. 1877.

Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae. (Scott) ed. W.S.Crockett.

GARDINER, S.R. - Charles II. and Scotland 1650. Scot. Hist. Soc. Edin. 1894.

" Constitutional Documents (1628-1660) Oxford 1889.

HARDWICKE - State Papers. Vol. II.

HOPE: - Diary of Sir James, of Hopetoun, in Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.

House of Commons Journal. Vols. VI. and VII. (1648-1659)

JAFFRAY: Diary. Spalding Club. Abdn. 1856.

JOHNSTON: Diary of Sir Arch. of Wariston. Vol.II. (1650-1654) (ed. D. Hay Fleming) Scot. Hist. Soc. 1919.

LAING: Works of Knox. Edin. 1846.

LAMONT: Diary (ed. Geo.R. Kinloch) Maitland Club. Edin. 1830.

LAW /

LAW: Memorialls (ed. C.K. Sharpe) Edin. 1818.

Letters from Roundhead Officers (ed. Akerman) Bann. Club. Edin. 1856.

LIVINGSTONE: Autobiography. In select biographies. (ed. W.K. Tweedie) Wodrow Soc. Edin. 1845.

Munimenta Universitatis Glasguensis. Maitland Club. 3 Vols. Glasgow 1854.

Nicholas Papers (corresp. of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secy. of State) (ed. G.F. Warner) Camden Soc. Vol.1. 1886.
" 11. 1892.

NICOLL: Diary (1650-1657) Bann. Club. Edin. 1836.

NIMMO: Diary 1654-1709) (Ed. Scott-Moncrieff) Scot. Hist. Soc. Edin. 1889.

Ordinance appointing Commissioners for approbation of publique preachers. Clar. Hist. Soc. 1889.

PAMPHLETS:

A Warning and Declaration from the Generall Assembly at Dundie. 1651.

Representation, Propositions and Protestation of divers Ministers.....to the Ministers and Elders met at Edinburgh, July 21, 1652.

Act and Overture of the Generall Assembly for the Peace and Union of the Kirk. 1652.

Reasons why the Ministers, Elders etc. who protested.... cannot agree to the overtures made unto them at the Conference upon the 28 and 29 of July, 1652.

The Nullity of the Pretended Assembly. 1652.

Causes of an Humiliation appointed by the Commission General Assembly. 1653.

The Causes of the Lord's Wrath. 1653.

A Letter from the Protesters with an Answer thereunto.... 1653.

A /

PAMPHLETS (contd.)

A Reply to the late Printed Answer given to the Letter directed by the Protesters to their brethern. 1653.

Some Few Observations about the late differences in the Kirk of Scotland. 1653.

A Declaration of the Brethern etc. 1658.

Protesters no Subverters and Presbytrie no Papacie. 1658.

PETERKIN: Records of the Kirk of Scotland.

Records of Marischal College and University. 3 Vols. Abdn. 1889.

Register of Privy Council of Scotland. 2nd. Series.

ROW: Life of Robert Blair (ed. McCrie) Wodrow Soc.Edin.1848.

History of the Kirk of Scotland. Wodrow Soc.Edin.1842.

Scotland and the Commonwealth (1651-1653) (ed. C.H.Firth) Scot. Hist. Soc. Edin. 1895.

Scotland and the Protectorate (1654-1659) (ed. C.H.Firth) Scot. Hist. Soc. Edin. 1899.

Spottiswoode Miscellany Vol.II. for Diurnal of Occurrences 1652-1654, from the contemporary Mercurius Politicus. Spottiswoode Soc. Edin. 1845.

THURLOE: State Papers 7 Vols. London 1742.

TURNER: Memoirs of His Own Time (1632-1670) Edin. 1829.

WALKER: Historical Discourses. London 1705.

WHITELOCKE: Memorials of the English Affairs. Vols. III.and IV. Oxford 1853.

AUTHORITIES (Modern).

ACTON, LORD: Hist. of Freedom and other Essays. 1907.

BEATTIE: Hist. of the Church of Scotland during the Commonwealth. Edin. 1842.

BOWER: Hist. of University of Edinburgh. Edin. 1817.

BROWN, P. HUME: History of Scotland. Vol. II. Cambridge 1912.
Surveys of Scottish History. Glasgow 1919.

BURTON, J. HILL: Hist. of Scotland. Vol. 7 Edin. 1905.

BULLOCH: Hist. of University of Aberdeen. Lond. 1895.

CUNNINGHAM: Church History of Scotland. 2 Vols. Edin. 1882.

Cambridge Modern History. Vols. III and IV.

COUTTS: History of University of Glasgow. Glasgow 1909.

DODDS: The Scottish Covenanters. 1860.

EDGAR, A: Old Church Life in Scotland. Paisley 1885.

Edinburgh Bibliographical Soc. Vol. XIV. Edin. 1928.

FERGUSON, R.M. Scottish Social Sketches of the 17th Cent.

FIGGIS: J.N. From Gerson to Grotius. Cambridge 1907.
The Divine Right of Kings. Rev. Edit.

FIRTH, C.H. Oliver Cromwell. Lond. 1900.

GARDINER, S.R: Hist. of Commonwealth and Protectorate (1649-1660) 2 vols.
" " Oliver Cromwell's Place in History. 1897.

GEFFCKEN, HEINRICH: Church and State. London, 1877.

GWATKIN, H.M: Church and State in England. Lond. 1917.

HARRIS: Life of Cromwell. 1762.

HETHERINGTON: Hist. of Church of Scotland. Edin. 1852.

AUTHORITIES (Modern) (contd).

HEWISON, J. KING: The Covenanters. 2 vols. Glasgow 1913.

HOBHOUSE, W: The Church and the World in idea and history. London, 1910.

HUNTER, A. MITCHELL: The Teaching of Calvin. Glasgow 1920.

KIRKTON: Hist. of the Church of Scotland (ed. C.K. Sharpe) 1817.

LANG, ANDREW: History of Scotland. 4 Vols. V.D.

LEE: Lect. on Hist. of Ch. of Scotland.Edin.1860.

MORISON, W: Johnston of Warriston. Edin. 1901.

MATHIESON, W.L: Politics and Religion in Scotland 2 vols. Glasgow 1902.

MACGREGOR, JANET G: The Scottish Presbyterian Polity. Edin.1926.

MACKINNON, J: Social and Industrial Hist. of Scotland.1920.

MACPHERSON, H: The Covenanters under Persecution.Edin.1923.

McCRIE, C.G: Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland. Edin. 1892.

PAGAN, J.M: Annals of Ayr 1560-1692. Ayr 1897.

PROVAND, W.S: Puritanism in Scotland. Paisley 1923.

RAINY (ed) Church and State in Scotland. 1878.

RAIT, R.S: History of Scotland. 1911.

RALEIGH: Annals of Church in Scotland, 1921.

REID, H.M.B: The Divinity Principals in the University of Glasgow 1545-1654. Glasgow 1917.
" " The Divinity Professors in the University of Glasgow (1640-1903) Glasgow 1923.

ROGERS, C: Social Life in Scotland. 3 vols. Edin. 1884-6.

ROSS, W: Glimpses of Pastoral Work in Covenanting Times. Lond. 1877.

AUTHORITIES (Modern) (contd).

RAIT, R.S:	Relations between England and Scotland.1901.
" "	The Universities of Aberdeen. Abdn. 1895.
RAIT AND CAMERON:	The King's Secret. Lond. 1927.
SPROTT, G.W:	The Worship of the Church of Scotland. (1638-1661) Lee Lecture. Edin. 1893.
STORY, R.M: (ed)	The Church of Scotland. 5 Vols. Lond.1890.
TREVELYAN, G.M:	England under the Stuarts. Lond. 1904.
WALKER, N.L: (ed)	Religious Life in Scotland from the Reform-ation.
WARRACK, J:	Domestic Life in Scotland 1488-1688.

INTRODUCTION.

*****

It is a fact of history that institutions and organisations are liable to change and that the labels which are attached to them have frequently to be altered or re-interpreted to meet new conditions and new demands. They have their periods of emergence, of continuation, and of transformation, and this fact makes it unsafe to attach to them dogmatic interpretations which in time may become outworn. States change: social and religious institutions change; and the phraseology of a people changes with new conceptions and ideas, thereby necessitat-:ing on the part of the humble student of history, strict interpretation of the institutions and organisations he is describing.

The phrase "ecclesiastical polity" is one which may be narrowly or widely employed. At the beginning of the Christian era the phrase might have signified little else but matters affecting the "ecclesia", used in a restricted sense. When writing of the time of Constantine and later during the Middle Ages, it is necessary for the student of history to seek a wider field of interpretation, for in these days, ecclesiastical polity under the Roman Empire, subject as it so often was /

was to both political and ecclesiastical potentates, could not be easily defined. The problem for the Church as for the State was the reconciliation of the temporal and spiritual sovereignties represented in their government, or the delimitation of their respective spheres. When we come to later ages, and to our own shores, we find the same problem, a relic, no doubt, of ancient thought, but nevertheless - a problem.

Under the Stuarts, no hard and fast line could be drawn in regard to political and ecclesiastical institutions. Politics and religion were closely bound together, and it is impossible at times to separate them. The period before us is one to which this same fact applies. Politics and religion were bound in the same bundle of life. Political affairs were dominated by religious and ecclesiastical (for the two terms are not synonymous) considerations, making differentiation exceedingly difficult.

In speaking, therefore, of "ecclesiastical polity" it is well to remember these facts, as they serve to explain the predominance of religious and ecclesiastical ideas and considerations in the political life of the day.

In regard to the term "religious life" one has to bear in mind that much of the work which is now discharged by parish councils and other local bodies, as well as by the law courts, was in the hands of Kirk Sessions and Presbyteries./

Presbyteries.

The history of the Church of Scotland during the Commonwealth and Protectorate has often been passed over as being outwith the main stream of religious events. These "uneventful years" as they are regarded, are often hurriedly sketched, in an anxiety to pass on to the Restoration period. Yet such treatment seems to be not merely unjust but unhistorical. It may be that the Commonwealth and Protectorate period is an offshoot of Scottish History, but the history of any country or church has its own "uneventful years", its own offshoots, which are nevertheless related, however, indirectly, to the whole. A great deal depends, however, on what is regarded as the true aim and function of history.

It is a moot point, whether, after all, the period from 1649-1660 is so very "uneventful". It was a period of much experimenting and testing: it was also a period when men began to realise more fully the issues which were at stake. Re-adjustment was the order of the day, and we have the spectacle provided for us of political and ecclesiastical institutions undergoing a process of transformation, to emerge greatly changed in certain respects, though not permanently defined in scope and outlook.

The /

The period is also useful as exhibiting the waning influence of sixteenth century Calvinism, and the assertion of ideas of a definitely native character.

It shall be our province to examine the events of these years, and to attempt to demonstrate how far the various forces at work affected the ecclesiastical polity and religious life of the nation, as well as to determine what effects, both temporary and permanent (if any) the Cromwellian regime had upon the nation.

CHAPTER I.

THE AFTERMATH OF REFORMATION.

Although our study proper deals with only a phase of the ecclesiastical policy of the Covenanters, yet it must be recognised that it is impossible to deal fully with this question until it is set out in its historical perspective. To do this means not merely the examining of the events in the preceding reigns to find out what the circumstances were which ultimately determined that policy, but the examining of the political happenings in Scotland since the establishment of Protestantism in the land. Arrived at that point, it is historically unsound to treat Scotland in isolation, for the Scottish Reformation was part of a larger movement on the Continent. Seen in that fuller light the ecclesiastical aims of the Covenanters in their deliberations with Charles II and in their conflict with Cromwell can alone be understood.

The Reformation on the Continent may be described as a protest, primarily religious, against the existing order. Certainly at a very early stage it was complicated with social and economic ideas, but for all that, religion remained in the forefront of the protest. The result of this religious and doctrinal revolt was not apparent

for /

for a long time. Everything was in the melting-pot, so that there ensued a period when change became the order of the day. While religion remained a prominent factor amid all this change, the reformed movement both under Luther and Calvin assumed a political character which can only with difficulty be separated from the religious ideas which dominated it at the beginning. It is indeed doubtful if the Reformation could ever have remained a purely spiritual movement. During the Middle Ages, and even earlier, politics and religion had come to be woven together into the same fabric of thought, and it was hardly possible even at the beginning of the reformed movement to separate them. What bound the two together was interest in the community, in social life, and this common centre of interest made it almost impossible for the two to take divergent or even parallel paths.

What concerns us in the meantime, however, is the fact that the Reformation put an end to the universal nature of Roman Catholic domination. Hitherto there had been (in theory, at anyrate) a spirit of internationalism centring round the Papacy, a sentiment powerful enough to weld the nations in a superficial unity. The Reformation dealt the death-blow to this spirit of internationalism centred round a quasi-spiritual power, and thus paved the way for the rise of a new spirit /

spirit of nationality. "The supreme achievement of the Reformation", says a modern historian, "is the modern state."(1)

With the rise of this spirit of nationality new ideas came in-to being and new forms were required to express them. From being a centralised force religion underwent a decentralising process, due in great measure to the rise of this new spirit. Henceforth religion became centred round individual states, the result being expressed in the principle laid down at the Peace of Augsburg (1555) "cujus regio ejus religio". It is not in our province here to narrate the difficulties attending this principle, nor the consequences that followed it. For us, the importance of this principle lies in the fact that religion now came to be guided by national sentiment, and that, not of the people, but of the monarch. This displacement of an international ideal (however loosely conceived) by an aggressively national ideal resulted in the rise of absolutism in varying forms, not the least important of which was absolutism in matters of religion and conscience. Hence it is that the conflicts witnessed in 17th century Europe are for the most part attempts to readjust the balance in favour of a more equitable system.

In /

---

(1) Figgis - Camb. Med. Hist. iii. 736.

In England from the very beginning the reformed movement was more political than religious in character. Henry VIII's desire, on more than one ground, was more to free himself from the domination of the Papacy than to effect changes in doctrine. His ultimate aim was to strengthen the power of the monarchy, and this meant naturally a break with Rome. For him the accompaniments of the Reformation were mere sidelights to this grand aim. Indeed, as Principal Lindsay contends in his History of the Reformation, the religious change in England was more a separation from Rome than a Reformation.(1) Under Elizabeth, the government of the country became more and more centralised round the person of the ruler, and by the Act of Supremacy (1559)(2) she arrogated to herself complete jurisdiction over ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs. Here again we witness the rise of absolutism, covering both the political and the ecclesiastical spheres.

In Scotland the Reformation had its own distinctive characteristics. It was definitely a religious revolt from the beginning, and although political considerations were never absent, this definitely religious character remained /

---

(1) Vol.2. Bk.IV., Ch.1.

(2) See Medley - Original Illustrations of English Constit. Hist. for the text.

remained dominant. The year 1560 witnessed the final break with Rome and the adoption of a creed similar to the Reformed Churches on the Continent. For us, the importance of this action lies in the fact that it was determined without the consent of the reigning sovereign. This explains the different character of the Reformation in Scotland from that in England. It also explains in some measure the antagonism of succeeding sovereigns to the reformed religion. In their eyes it cut across the path of monarchical government, thus limiting the prerogative of the sovereign.

When James VI assumed the reins of government the reformed church in Scotland through the efforts of Knox and Melville and their colleagues had assumed a fairly strong hold upon the people and upon national sentiment. The reign of James from one point of view is simply the record of a struggle between absolutism on the one hand and ecclesiasticism on the other.

The absolutism of James (as also of his predecessors on the English throne, the Tudors) took particular shape in the theory of the Divine Right of Kings, and with James the theory (as a claim to absolutism) reached its high-:water mark. No doubt James resented during his reign in Scotland the power which the Church had acquired both during the reign of his mother and during his own minority, but at the same time the Church was afraid of the consequences to religion of an unlimited monarchy, especially as the fear of Romanism was still very real.

To /

To preserve a strict historical sense something must be said on both sides.

A further reason for James's adherence to this theory of Divine Right is well expressed by a leading authority on the subject. "There are many reasons why James I. should hold the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings in its strictest form. His claim to the throne of England rested upon descent alone; barred by two Acts of Parliament it could only be successfully maintained by means of the legitimist principle. Further, it was disputed by the Roman controversialists who had not sufficient hope of converting James to make them love his title."(1) For James, influenced as he was by the example of the Tudors, there was no other course so profitable open to him as that of following out in strict detail the absolutism which was expounded and fostered in the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. In his work on the subject "The Trew Law of Free Monarchies", published in the year in which he ascended the English throne, his position is stated with logical precision.

The prospect of succeeding Elizabeth on the English throne was also a determining factor in shaping James's ecclesiastical policy.(2) Apart altogether from his convictions regarding/

---

(1) Figgis-Divine Right of Kings, p.137.

(2) See Rait & Cameron - The King's Secret, 1927, giving further proof of James's anxiety to succeed Elizebeth.

regarding the nature of the kingly office, he had to consider also the state of religion in the country whose throne he hoped to ascend. As Prof.Hume Brown says, "He had to win the support not only of the English Episcopalians but of the English Catholics, who still composed at least a third of the English people. But to conciliate the English Catholics he had to prove that he was no enemy to the Catholics of his own kingdom, who were relatively as numerous as their brethren in England. Had he consented to become a Presbyterian king, all this would have been impossible."(1) Everything therefore combined to commit James to a definite policy of antagonism to Presbyterianism as a religious system and as a political rival. By a series of Acts of Parliament passed in 1584 - the "Black Acts" - James became the supreme head of the Church as well as of the State.(2) It was further enacted that no assemblies of the Church should be called without his sanction; that bishops were to be appointed, the appointing of them being in his hands; and that ministers were to express no opinions on public affairs under pain of treason. In essence, this was the beginning of a modified Episcopacy, a step in the direction of a complete Episcopal system. Three years later, by an Act of 1587,(3) almost the whole of the ecclesiastical property

of/

(1) Surveys of Scottish History, p.56
(2) Acts & Stat, Parl. Scot., iii. pp.290 et seq.
(3) do. do. iii. pp.431-7.

of the Pre-Reformation Church passed to the Crown, provision being made for the maintenance of the ministry. By making gifts of lands to the nobles James ensured their support to his ecclesiastical policy, and their antagonism or indifference to the aims of Presbyterianism. In the year 1612 the Episcopo-Presbyterial system which had been established gave place to a full Episcopal system of polity based on the model of the Church of England, this being effected by means of a packed General Assembly and a packed meeting of the Estates.(1) So far James had succeeded in his schemes. He had won over the nobility to his side and thus had been enabled to overcome the opposition of the Church, but his path in the future was not to be so peaceful. The changes in worship which James proposed in the Five Articles of Perth although sanctioned by a General Assembly in 1618 and by the Estates in 1621, gave great offence to the people,(2) and for practical purposes remained a dead-letter. James had gone too far, but it was left to his son to reap the disadvantages of his ecclesiastical policy. So long as James had confined himself to questions of polity and organisations, dissent had been confined to ecclesiastics. The result of the passing of the Five Articles of Perth was the widening of the field of dissent so as to make/

---

(1) Acts & Stat.Parl.Scot., IV., pp.469,470. Acts - Gen.Ass. 1560-1618.pp.1104-1108.

(2) Row - Hist., 121. 127.

make it a popular movement. Episcopacy as a system of religion and ecclesiastical polity was in reality prejudiced when Charles I. came to the throne. If it was a fact of James's experience that Presbytery "agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil" so it was beginning to be doubted whether Episcopacy would preserve the liberty of the people, not to speak of the Church which was already fettered. It was this fear which kept the fires of opposition smouldering, to burst out into flame as provocation deepened.

Entering as he did into a very questionable heritage so far as ecclesiastical matters were concerned, Charles was called to a really herculean task. James had succeeded in bolstering up the authority of the Crown at the expense of the Church by his lavish grants of confiscated property to the nobility. By the Act of Revocation in the second year of his reign Charles only succeeded in reversing the old order.(1) By that act he revoked all the church lands which had been granted since the beginning of Mary's reign, at the same time pledging himself to pay such a sum as should be deemed just and fair. While the Act of Revocation benefited the Church since it put the stipends of the clergy upon a more secure basis, it only succeeded in alienating the nobles. /

---

(1) P.C. Reg. (2nd Series) i. 81-82. Also Masson Int.XX.XXI. Row - Hist. 133. The Act of Revocation was formally passed by Parl. in 1633.

nobles, and drove some of them, at least, in later days, into common cause with the Church. One is inclined to question their defection from the ranks of the Crown to those of the clergy. James had purchased their support by his grants of ecclesiastical lands. His son lost that support by his Act of Revocation. But were the clergy the gainers? Prof.Hume Brown, who treats this period admirably in his published works, makes a very sweeping claim for the Scottish nobility of this period and later. "It was they who gave Scotland its limited monarchy; the Reformation and the Covenants were largely their work, and but for them the Revolution and the Union might have had no place in our history."(1) In a sense these things are true. As a middle party between the Crown and the Church they could easily succeed in shifting the balance as necessity arose, but it is questionable if the Covenanting movement, particularly in its later stages, benefited greatly by their presence. One cannot deny, however, that they wielded a very great influence upon national affairs.

Events reached a climax in 1637 with the appearance of Laud's Liturgy. Charles had already taken up the matter with the bishops in Scotland in the year 1629, and in 1636 the Privy Council, acting under instructions from Charles, sanctioned/

---

(1). Surveys of Scottish History - p.49.

sanctioned its use, and instructed every minister to procure two copies for his parish under pain of outlawry.(1)

The "Popish-English-Scottish-Masse-Service Book",(2) as Row calls it, was detested from the very first. In St. Giles Church, Edinburgh, the service was violently interrupted, and had to be abandoned. This was typical of the reception accorded to the new Service Book all over the country. Supplications were repeatedly made to the Privy Council in Scotland, but that body was impotent to move, and had to await the commands of the king. Charles would not, however, withdraw the Liturgy and insisted upon the punishment of the leaders of the riots. The details of the struggle do not concern us here. Suffice it to say that a Band of Covenant was drafted which became known as the National Covenant (1638) and into which practically the whole of the nation entered.(3) Proceeding further in their opposition the demand was made for a free Parliament and for a free General Assembly. The attempts of Charles at conciliation were not successful. He was willing to grant a free Parliament and a free General Assembly, but not to recognise the National Covenant which limited his authority. In place of this he sought recognition for

a/

---

(1) Register of Privy Council VI.pp.336. 352.3.
Row - Hist. pp.188.-9.
(2) Ibid. p.500.
(3) Ibid. p.271.

a Covenant of his own, called the "King's Covenant" which completely cancelled and condemned the other. The nation by now was thoroughly roused, and a General Assembly met towards the end of the year 1638. The work of this Assembly was deliberate and thoroughgoing, even revolutionary. The Book of Canons, the new Service Book and the Five Articles of Perth were all swept away, and the High Court of Commission abolished.(1) Not content with that the Covenanters proceeded to arm themselves for active resistance. Charles, faced with difficulties on both sides of the border, agreed in the Pacification of Berwick (1639) to allow a General Assembly and a free Parliament to meet.(2) At this meeting of Assembly, on 12th Aug. 1639, Episcopacy was definitely displaced by Presbytery as the ecclesiastical polity of Scotland.(3) The Assembly proceeded further and requested the Privy Council to pass an Act whereby the signing of the Covenant was made compulsory.(4) The Privy Council acceded to the request, and thus was passed an Act whereby the Covenanting party in Church and State arrogated/

---

(1) Acts Gen.Ass. 1638-1842. pp. 5-21.
(2) Hardwicke - Misc. State Papers, ii. pp.130-141.
(3) Acts.Gen.Ass. 1638-1842. pp.36-37.
(4) P.C.Reg. 2nd Series, Vol.vii. pp.131.2. Acts Gen.Ass.p.40

arrogated to themselves powers which they were determined to deny to the King. (1) Opposition continued to grow and in 1643 the alliance of the Scots and the English in the Solemn League and Covenant completed the forces of opposition.

The defeat of Charles at the Battle of Naseby (June 14, 1645) brought with it disillusionment to the Scottish Presbyterians. The Solemn League and Covenant had been entered into by them with the ultimate hope of seeing Presbyterianism established throughout the British Isles, but now that the Royalist forces had been defeated these prospects were sadly diminished, for the Independents were now in a position to dictate their own policy.

Charles, realising that his cause was doomed, now chose what he considered to be the lesser of two evils, and surrended himself to the Scottish Army at Southwell, near Newark, on May 5th, 1646. But to all the entreaties of the Scottish Presbyterians to accept the Covenants he turned a deaf ear, and finally, with regret, they handed him over to the English.

We are not concerned with the details of these quarrels, but with the general principles underlying. For us the history of our period begins with the tragic fate that befell Charles, for with his death a new phase of the general struggle is entered upon.

---

(1) P.C. Reg. 2nd Series. Vol.vii. pp.131-2.
Acts Gen.Ass. (1638-1842) p.41

CHAPTER II.

INDEPENDENCY and REPUBLICANISM versus PRESBYTERIANISM and MONARCHY.

On the 30th January, 1649, Charles I. was executed in front of the Banqueting House at Whitehall. Whether this act was justifiable or not is outwith our immediate province, but there is no denying the fact that it completely altered the existing state of affairs in both Scotland and England. The Scots as a whole, though they had violently disagreed with the political rule and the ecclesiastical policy of Charles were nevertheless shocked and indignant at this act. To them it was nothing more or less than regicide, and though indirectly they had contributed to the circumstances attending this act; they had no thought of proceeding so far. Indeed they had delivered Charles to the English on the understanding that no harm should be done to him.(1) Their displeasure was shown by their immediate recognition of Charles's son as King. On the 5th of February, six days after the execution of Charles I, the Scottish Estates met and proclaimed his son King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, in accordance with the ancient form. (2)

The recognition of Charles II. was in a sense courageous,/

(1) Acts & Stat. Parl.,Scot., VI. part 1. p.658.
(2) do. do. VI. part II. p.157.-Baillie iii.66

courageous, for it showed that the Scots claimed independence of judgment, and were not inclined to subordinate their interests to those of the English. At the same time this act was fraught with danger for it inevitably meant cleavage between Scottish and English interests. Not only so, but the Scots had undoubtedly rebelled like their neighbours, against Charles, and had resisted his rule when it seemed arbitrary and unjust. Now they had proclaimed his son King in a hasty moment, headless of the consequences which might follow such an act.

In point of fact their recognition of Charles's son was a challenge to the English. It signified in essence the severance of the alliance between Scotland and England in regard to the late controversies, both political and ecclesiastical, with Charles, and the adoption of a definitely Scottish policy for the future.

This proclamation of Charles, however, was by no means a purely political action, but was governed also by ecclesiastical considerations. The Estates could not lightly push aside the Solemn League and Covenant, for any course taken by them without consideration of this all-important document would have been against national sentiment. The Covenants had been the measure of the recent acts of the Nation, the very centre of its religious life and ecclesiastical/

ecclesiastical polity. Men had sworn by them and had died for their principles, and the nation, it seemed, was prepared to cover the same ground over again if need be. Hence the proclamation of the young King was limited by this reservation reiterated two days after his proclamation, that he should not be permitted to exercise his prerogative as sovereign unless he subscribed the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant.(1) For Charles as King, this meant that henceforth though civil matters could be debated and governed by Parliament, the affairs of the Church were to be vested solely in the General Assembly as the supreme court of the Church. Until therefore he subscribed to the Covenants there was no possibility of his acceptance by the nation. To bring matters to a conclusion, a body of commissioners was appointed to negotiate with Charles who was then domiciled at the Hague, and receive his signature to the Covenants. The commissioners appointed were the Earl of Cassilis, the Laird of Brodie, Alexander Jaffray, provost of Aberdeen, and Sir Geo. Winram, Laird of Libberton, representing the Estates, along with James Wood and Robert Baillie, representing the Church.(2) Among the instructions given/

---

(1) Acts & Stat. Parl.Scot., VI. Part ii. p. 157-161.

(2) Ibid. VI. Part ii. p.232. Lamont's Diary p.1. Nicoll's Diary - p.4. (Nicoll misses out Baillie).

given to the commissioners were the following. They were to "show him (Charles) how Presbyterial government is not only consistent with but helpful to monarchy." They were also to "labour to . . . . persuade him to subscribe to these Covenants and to enjoy the fame and advance the work of uniformity and establish Presbyterian government, the Directory of Worship, and Confession of Faith and Catechism in all His Majesty's dominions."(1) Apparently even the Commissioners were under no delusions as to the character and intentions of Charles. Alexander Jaffray describes in his diary how he proceeded to Holland with the others to negotiate with the young king "making him sign and swear a covenant, which we knew, from clear and demonstrable reasons, that he hated in his heart."(2)

The first overture of the Estates was met by a blank refusal on the part of the King to subscribe to any covenant, Charles was by no means ready to submit to the dictation of any party in Scotland. Still less was he willing to subscribe to a document which limited his prerogative as King. His father had gone to the scaffold for a principle and Charles, though perhaps not prepared to risk his person overmuch was determined to make a bid for the throne, so that/

---

(1) Baillie, iii. p.460.
Acts & Stat.Parl.Scot., VI. Part ii. p.211.2.
See also Baillie iii. 86-8, with details of the work of Commission.

(2) Jaffray's Diary - p.32.

that he might be King not merely in name but in power. His signature so far as Scotland was concerned would have closed in theory the constitutional struggle between despotic and democratic ideas. It meant the abandonment of the theory of the Divine Right of Kings so dear to the heart of James VI, and as a corollary of this, the restriction of his kingship in favour of the people. The Commissioners, being unable to get any satisfaction from Charles returned in June to give in their reports to the Estates and to the Church.(1)

In the beginning of July the first meeting of the General Assembly after the execution of the King was convened,(2) Robert Douglas being chosen moderator. Wielding as it did a great power in the land, political as well as ecclesiastical, its deliberations excited considerable interest. The report of the Commissioners from the Hague was received and approved, but it was generally deemed to be unsatisfactory.(3) The chief business before the Assembly concerned the Engagement which had been entered into by Loudon, Lanark and Lauderdale with Charles I. In this Assembly as Cunningham finely expresses it "we have a strange mixture of the darkest fanaticism with the truest appreciation of constitutional freedom." An act was passed "concerning the receiving of engagers in the late unlawful war against England, to public satisfaction/

---

(1) Acts & Stat. VI. Part ii. pp.727-8. signed by Cassilis, Brodie & Winram.
Row's Blair - p.219.
(2) Ibid. p.220.
(3) Ibid. p.219,220.

satisfaction, together with the declaration and acknowledgment to be subscribed by them."(1) It declares how offensive the late invasion of England must be to God, and scandalous to His church, from its opposition to solemn engagements. Accordingly none were to be admitted "but such as after exact trial shall be found for some competent time before or after the offer of repentance, according to the discretion of the respective judicatories, to have in their ordinary conversations given real testimony of their dislike of the late unlawful engagement, and of the course and ways of malignants, and of their sorrow for accession to the same; and to live soberly, righteously and godly."(2) The declaration to be subscribed concluded with a promise to adhere "to the national covenant of the kingdom, and to the solemn league and covenant betwixt the kingdoms." In taking this action the Church was following the lead already given by the Estates, for in January of 1649 had been passed the famous Act of Classes which was aimed at every form of malignancy.(3) This in turn was followed by an Act of Parliament passed in June for the purging of the army, this being in a sense an enlargement of the Act of Classes.(4) The anomaly of the whole situation was the tentative offer of the Crown to Charles "the greatest malignant of all."

It/

---

(1) Acts Gen.Ass., 1638-1842. ii.201.
(2) do. do. 201.203.
(3) Acts & Stats.Parl.Scot. VI. ii. 143-148.
(4) Ibid. 446-7.

It is evident from these acts of the Estates and the Church that for the time being, at any rate, they were determined to pursue a common policy. Row says "There was a sweet harmony betwixt this Parliament and General Assembly, which was conformable to both in this time of sad troubles and distress to both."(1)

Another measure put forth by this General Assembly had as its object the stabilising of public opinion at a time when defection from the ranks of those bound together by the covenants would have proved fatal to the cause. It was entitled "A seasonable and necessary warning and declaration, concerning present and imminent dangers, and concerning duties relative thereto, from the General Assembly of this kirk unto the members thereof."(2) The chief danger which the Assembly feared was that arising out of malignancy, a very loose term employed for everything that was not strictly in line with the Covenants. The latter part of this document is really an excursus into the realm of political thought. It re-echoes the Knoxian dictum that the civil magistrate's power is derived from God, and that he should exercise his power for the welfare of the people. There is also a mutual obligation between the King and his people, and/

---

(1) Row's Blair. p.221.

(2) Acts.Gen.Ass., ii. 203-11.

and the king is bound to act according to the word of God and the laws of the country.(1) Proceeding further this document emphasises that the keeping of the Solemn League and Covenant, being as it is for the preservation of true religion and the liberties of the kingdom, comes before even the defence of the king's person.(2) The aim of the Covenants is shown clearly to be the imposing of restraints upon unlimited power, exercised by either king or government, and since the king apparently is opposed to reformation, it has been left "to all impartial men" to decide whether, if invested with unlimited power, he would not endeavour to reduce everything respecting religion and liberty.

This declaration is important for the light it sheds on the principles that lay behind the antagonism of the Church to the King. So far as the Church was concerned, it was unwilling to go back to the despotism of a previous age, but willing to recognise the King so long as the cause of religion and liberty were not imperilled. Exercising as it did a powerful political influence, these sentiments of the Church were more likely to be faithfully re-echoed than despised.

Another paper drawn up by the Assembly shows the chasm that was felt to exist between the Scots and the English. It is entitled "A Brotherly Exhortation from the General

Assembly/

(1) Acts.Gen.Ass. 1638-1842. ii. 206.
(2) Ibid. ii. 207.

Assembly of the Church of Scotland to their Brethren in England."[1] As in the previous declaration the chief emphasis is put upon the Solemn League and Covenant, which they hold to be binding upon the two nations. "The covenant being intended and entered into as the best means of steadfastness for guarding against declining times, it were strange to say that the backsliding of any should absolve others, from the tie thereof, especially seeing our engagement is not only national, but personal also, every one, with uplifted hands, swearing by himselfe, as is evident from the tennor of the covenant."[2] The doctrine of toleration was another stumbling-block which was deplored. "It is no small grief to us that the gospel and government of Jesus Christ are so despised in that land, that faithful preachers are persecuted and cryed down, that toleration is established by pretext of law, and maintained by military power, and that the covenant is abolished and buried in oblivion."[3]

The remaining deliberations of the Assembly may be passed over with the exception of two which are worthy of attention. The first of these concerned education, and showed that the Church was still seeking in some measure, despite the troubled times, to realise the ideals of Knox. A recommendation/

---

(1) Acts - Gen.Ass., 1638-1842. ii. 213-6.
(2) Ibid. 215.
(3) Ibid. 214.

recommendation was made to Parliament that what had been given by parishes for the support of teachers, readers, or precentors previous to the establishment of the Directory for Public Worship, should still be applied for the upkeep of sufficient schoolmasters and precentors who would be approved by the respective presbyteries.(1) A collection was also ordered to be taken in all parishes for the maintenance of Highland boys at school, in lieu of forty shillings given by each parish for the same purpose. The Assembly further ordained in regard to entrants for the ministry that "none be admitted as bursars of divinity, but pious youths, and such as are known to be of good expectation and approven abilities."(2)

The remaining action of the Assembly was the appointing of several committees to visit different parts of the country in order to purge the ministry, an action which was differently conceived by the various commentators on the events of the day. Baillie for one was not enamoured with this inquisitorial visitation, and apparently suffered for being outspoken. "There had been diverse commissions, east, west, south, and north, who had deposed many ministers, to the pitie and griefe of my heart; for sundry of them I thought might have been for more advantage every way, with a rebuke keeped in their places; but there were few durst professe /

---

(1) Ibid. 217.
(2) Ibid. 217.

professe so much; and I for my ingenuous freedom lost much of my reputation as one who was inclyning to malignancy." (1)

It is evident from these declarations that meantime the General Assembly did not entertain any ideas that the affairs of the Church or the State in Scotland would be interfered with. The one drawback in their scheme of resettlement was the refusal of Charles to sign the Covenants, but they had hopes that pressure of circumstances would yet compel Charles to come to an agreement. After that, it was felt that matters would soon readjust themselves. One thing they did not seem to have perceived clearly and that was the logical consequence of their recognition of Charles as King. They still cherished the idea that recognition of Charles by the English would in time follow.

After Charles's refusal to sign the Covenants, his Court was transferred for various reasons to Paris, thence to the Channel Islands and finally to Breda. The Scottish Estates were still anxious to treat with Charles, and this anxiety was shared by the Church. To obtain his signature was the easiest course open to them meantime, for they felt that if once the King were committed their whole position would be consolidated. The alternatives to this course had not apparently been fully thought out. One thing was certain,/

---

(1) Baillie. iii. 91.2.

certain, the breach between them and England was very great, and threatened to become greater, and a break with Charles would only have complicated matters further. Failure to obtain Charles's signature meant the adoption of an altogether new policy. One course open to them was to rescind their proclamation in favour of Charles. This would inevitably have meant the readjustment of their attitude towards England. A new alliance would have to be made (a humiliating prospect at present for the Scots) or else they would have to be prepared to proceed without their King. What this would imply, whether an oligarchy or a democracy, was apparently outwith their thoughts on the matter. The truth seems to be that they were so bent on securing Charles's signature at all costs that the alternatives had not really been faced by them. Besides all this, the loyalist feeling among the Scots and the old love for the Stuarts was still fairly strong. Charles, too, was beginning to climb down a little. When the first commission had treated with him there had been a possibility of the Duke of Ormonde preparing the way for him in Ireland, but the defeat of Ormonde by Cromwell was a distinct blow to his hopes.(1) Before the news of this defeat came, Sir George Winram, Laird of Liberton, had/

---

(1) Baillie. iii. 100.

had been commissioned by the Estates to treat with him again.(1) Charles temporised with Winram until he received the news of Ormonde's defeat, and finally sent Winram back with a message to the Committee of Estates that he would be prepared to receive the commissioners at Breda.(2) He also wrote to the Commission of the General Assembly to send commissioners. It was evident, therefore, that with the collapse of the Irish royalist forces, the work of the second commission would be easier than that of the first. Ireland had failed Charles and his thoughts were turning to Scotland. But he knew full well that this involved the Covenants.

The Commission of the General Assembly met on the 13th of February, when some of their number were appointed to consult with the Committee of the Estates regarding the appointment of commissioners to Breda.(3) The commissioners chosen were as follows:- For the Estates, the Earl of Cassilis, the Earl of Lothian, the Laird of Brodie, Sir George Winram of Liberton, Sir John Smith, and Alexander Jaffray.(4) For the Church, John Livingstone, James Wood and George Hutcheson were chosen from the ranks of the ministry, the Earl of Cassilis and the Laird of Brodie representing the eldership. The terms of the offer to Charles were, if anything, stronger. Not only was the

King/

(1) Acts & Stat. VI. ii. p.538.
Row's Blair - p.221. Balfour - Annales. p.5.
(2) Ibid. pp.221.222.
(3) Balfour - Annales. p.6. Row's Blair - p.222.
(4) Acts & Stat. VI. II. 557.8. Instructions 559.560.

King required to establish Presbyterian government throughout his dominions, but he was also required to accept the Act of Classes, to enforce the penal laws against Romanists, to cancel all treaties contrary to such laws (this being in reference to the Duke of Ormonde's treaty with the Irish Catholics), and to cancel all commissions which were harmful to the Covenants (this with reference to his commission to Montrose).(1) There is no doubt that the demands made by the Estates and the Church were very stiff. To a very great degree they limited his prerogative as a king, both in regard to civil government and ecclesiastical polity, and it is indeed questionable if Charles would ever have entertained them had he not been so hard pressed in other quarters. Again it must be emphasised that these demands are only to be understood, in the light of the late revolution. They are an experiment in limited monarchy, and can only be regarded as a logical consequence of the late rebellion. It is a mistake which some historians make to ascribe this policy to the Covenanters, and to speak of it as if it were purely an ecclesiastical measure. It was an attempt to limit the prerogative of the king in civil government as well as in ecclesiastical polity. Religion figured in it/

---

(1) Clar. State Papers. ii. 752-3.

it prominently because it was in the sphere of religion that the late king had most of all extended his prerogative. But, of course, this all-important fact must not be lost sight of, that religion and politics are hard to separate in the 17th century. Political thought was governed, as it had been, since the Reformation, by ecclesiastical and religious considerations, and vice versa, for the legacy of John Calvin was by no means exhausted.

One at least of the commissioners had his scruples about serving on the commission. John Livingstone, minister of Ancrum, was not at all sure that ministers should be employed in matters that were more of a civil than of an ecclesiastical nature. "When I considered the commissioners sent by the state, I was very unwilling to embark in any business with them. Cassilis, Brodie, and Jaffray, I had no exception against; the other three I suspected would be more ready to an agreement upon unsafe terms. Lothian, I found, two years before in harvest 1648, when the rest rose against the engagers returning home from England, that he was very dissatisfied with their rising . . . Libberton had been long with the king at Jersey, and brought the overture of the treaty, and in all his discourses gave evidence of a most earnest desire, upon any terms, to have the king brought home, wherein it is like he thought he would have

a/

a chief share of the thanks. Sir John Smith had tampered with James Graham 1645, and was a man of no great ability, and what ability he had I suspected would not be well employed."(1) Whether we accept Livingstone's verdict upon the others or not, one thing is evident that the commissioners did not present a solid front in regard to the proposals on hand. The nature of their instructions from the Estates and the Church, however, prevented any serious alteration in the terms to be offered, and preserved among them to a great extent, a spirit of unity.

On the other hand, negotiations were protracted by the fact that the young king could receive no settled counsel from his advisers.(2) On the one hand, his mother counselled him to accept the crown, without prejudicing his prerogative, except in so far as appearances went. Her idea was that once he secured the crown, even though he had to sign the Covenants beforehand, he would soon assert his kingly prerogative.(3) On the other hand Montrose and Prince Rupert headed a faction which advised him to leave the Covenants alone, and to make a bold resort to arms to secure his kingdom. Charles's own attitude was one of temporising. He had no wish to prejudice his cause by appearing/

---

(1) Livingstone's Life (Wodrow) pp.170-1. Beattie in his "Hist. of the Church of Scotland during the Commonwealth" destroys the sense of this statement by misquotation.p.65.
(2) Row's Blair. p.226.
(3) Gardiner Chas. II. & Scot. pp.19.25.

appearing surly to the commissioners, but sought rather to impress them by his apparent anxiety to reconcile everything. The secretary Nicholas says "The king is about a summary answer upon the whole, and yet there is a great care used to parte with the Commissioners as fairely as maybe." (1) (italicised). From the same source we learn too, that Charles was also anxious not to injure his own affairs under Ormonde or Montrose.

Thirty days had been allowed for the effecting of the treaty, but in order to allow of an agreement being reached, an extension of time was granted. After five weeks of debate, the king agreed to sign the draft agreement which had been prepared, with the exception of the terms relating to the Irish treaty. This was dealt with in a separate paper handed over to the Earl of Cassilis, which he promised to sign if the Estates should insist. Parliament did insist on this, for on the 18th of May further instructions were forwarded to the commissioners at Breda, requesting them to see that the Irish treaty was cancelled. (2) They were also to see that Charles accepted both Covenants in toto, either before or at his landing in Scotland. The commissioners were divided as to the course they should take, (3) but ultimately they agreed to press these points upon Charles before he should land in Scotland. In this they were

aided/

(1) The Nicholas Papers. i. p.127.
(2) Gardiner Chas.II. and Scot. pp.145-6.
(3) Livingstone's Life. p.180

aided indirectly by Charles's own friends, some of whom were pressing him to complete the whole business. On the 11th of June he put his signature to the draft treaty as it had been drawn up by the Scottish Estates, and when he landed at the mouth of the Spey on the 23rd of the month he confirmed this by an oath that he would observe both Covenants, and endeavour to establish Presbytery throughout his dominions.(1)

While Charles was in negotiation with the Commissioners at Breda, a final attempt was made by the adventurous Montrose in the interests of the Royalist cause. In this Montrose was secretly encouraged by the king,(2) who was determined to secure his own ends even if he had to violate his treaty with the Scots. Accompanied by Sir James Hurrie, Captain John Spottiswood, and others, he landed at Kirkwall in Orkney, proceeding later through Caithness and Ross, at the head of a comparatively small force. At Carbisdale, he was met by a force under Lieutenant-Colonel Strachan, and severely defeated. Montrose himself escaped, but was captured four days later, and conveyed to Edinburgh, to the Watergate, and from there "he was", according to Row, "in too ignominious a way, drawn up the street in a cart to the Tolbooth."(3) On the 20th of May he was brought before Parliament, and sentenced to be hanged the next day at the Cross of Edinburgh/

---

(1) Livingstone's Life. p.183. Row's Blair, p.230. Thurloe, State Papers, i.148.
(2) Wigton Papers, pp.112. et.seq. quoted Hume Brown - Hist. ii. 351. Row's Blair, p.222.
(3) Row's Blair, p.224.

Edinburgh, his body being quartered and displayed publicly at Glasgow, Stirling, Perth and Aberdeen. His execution spelt the collapse of Charles's hopes in this direction, though from the start such an expedition seemed doomed to failure. No one can deny the bravery of Montrose in championing such a hopeless cause, and such a hopeless master.

Now that Charles had signed the Covenants, the Estates and the Church were determined to keep him to his obligations. On the 6th of July, the Committee of Estates and the Commission of the General Assembly sent commissioners to the King at Falkland, requesting him "to remove from his family and service all against whom Kirk or Estate had any just exception; which after some dealing with him, was granted."(1) The Duke of Buckingham and several others, however, were permitted to remain, until the next session of Parliament.(2)

On the 10th of July, the General Assembly met at Edinburgh, Mr. Andrew Cant being chosen as Moderator.(3) The Assembly was primarily concerned with the report of the Commissioners who had been sent to Breda, and accordingly Livingstone and Hutchison were asked to give an account of the negotiations towards the treaty. Livingstone in his memoirs relates how they communicated privately with some of the chief ministers, regarding the treaty, and especially regarding the king's kneeling at

a/

(1) Acts & Stat. VI. ii. p.603
(3) Row's Blair. p.231. (2) Ibid. VI. ii. 603.4.

a communion service and their protest. "But they desired us to forbear mentioning at the assembly of that paper, or any thing which might make the king or his way odious in the entry of his government, and we at their desire did forbear."(1) The result was that the treaty with the king was simply presented to the Assembly, and approved by them. After this, the Commissioners sent from the Commission of the preceding General Assembly submitted their report, declaring "what good hopes they had of the King's sincerity in subscribing and swearing the Covenant."(2) Charles had written a friendly letter to the Assembly, and in return, Commissioners were appointed to Charles "to congratulate his homecoming, and to mention his renewing of the Covenant."(3)

The humiliation of the king was made complete when on the 11th of August he was asked to sign a declaration submitted by the Committee of the Estates and Kirk in which it was stated that he desired "to be deeply humbled and afflicted in spirit before God," for his father's opposition to the Solemn League and Covenant, for the idolatry of his mother, and the sin incurred by its toleration in the king's house, as well as by his own former misconduct.(4) Not unnaturally, the king refused to subscribe such a document, whereupon another declaration was prepared, the sum of which according to Row was "We disclaim all the sin and guilt of the King and his house, both old and late, and declare that we cannot own him

or/

(1) Livingstone's Life. p.184. (2) Row's Blair. p.231.
(3) Row's Blair. pp.231.2. (4) Row's Blair. p.235. Records of Comm.of Gen.Ass. iii.33.34. (complete decln.)

or his interest in the state of the quarrel betwixt us and the enemy that has invaded the kingdom."(1) A great many of the moderate ministers and elders were displeased with this declaration, known as "The Act at the West Kirk", but those who were for it caused a copy of it to be sent to Cromwell, "which made some of them, especially Estatesmen, to be suspected to favour the sectarian party."(2) Finally, a conference was arranged with the king, who, driven by sheer necessity, if he were to fulfil his own objects, signed this disreputable document, after some of its expressions had been "smoothed and mollified."(3)

The king's arrival brought matters to a head in regard to the relations of England and Scotland. The English Parliament had made it known to the Scots that they would regard the acceptance of Charles as king as tantamount to a declaration of war. War, indeed, was inevitable, for the English knew that Charles would never rest content until he had solved the issues as to the kingdoms over which his father had ruled. "They cannot prevent an Invasion from Scotland, but by the marching of an army into that kingdom."(4) The Irish expedition had been a miserable failure, but Charles had hopes that being now on the field himself, he might still lead the Scots to victory. The Scottish Estates under Loudon and Argyle realised the difficulties of the situation, especially in regard to Charles's own following. They therefore ordered the leading Royalists who had accompanied him or flocked to him, to leave Scotland.

(1) Row's Blair.p.236. Reg.of Comm.of Gen.Ass. iii.26.
(2) Ibid. p.236. Warriston's Diary. ii.17.18.
(3) Ibid. 236. Reg.of Comm.of Gen.Ass.iii.41. Warriston's Diary.ii.20
(4) House of Commons Journal. Vol.VI. p.431.

Proclamations were then issued for a levy of troops for the English invasion which was directly imminent. So far the Estates could proceed; their remaining course was to await events.

They were not left long in doubt. The victorious Cromwell, now appointed "captain-general and commander-in-chief of all the forces raised and to be raised by authority of parliament within the commonwealth of England," (1) was commissioned to proceed to Scotland and on the 22nd of July, he made his appearance there. By the 29th of the same month he was at Leith where a Scottish force awaited him under Leslie. Cromwell did not anticipate a very long campaign, as Baillie sombrely remarks. (2) Yet his task was prolonged by the skilful tactics of Leslie and it is doubtful if success would have attended his arms, but for an unfortunate cleavage in the ranks of the Scots. It was held by those who considered themselves most zealous in the cause of the Covenant, that the army, composed as it was of all sorts and conditions of men, should be purified from anything that savoured of malignancy. The result of this desire was that the Estates were constrained to appoint a commission to purge the Army. The result of this purging was disastrous to the army. Eighty officers and upwards of three thousand men were dismissed from the ranks. (3) Sir Edward Walker in his

journal/

(1) House of Commons Journal Vol.VI. p.432. Whitelocks. iii. 211. (2) Baillie - Letters.iii.100.3.
(3) Balfour, iv. p.89.

journal says that those left in command were for the most part "ministers' sons, clerks and other sanctified creatures, who hardly ever saw or heard of any sword but that of the Spirit, and with this their chosen crew made themselves sure of victory."(1) Certain it is, however, that this drastic purging compromised the whole cause.

Meanwhile, Cromwell had addressed a letter to the Commissioners of the Church, in which he asked them to reconsider the whole situation. "Your own guilt is too much for you to bear; bring not therefore upon yourselves the blood of innocent men; - deceived with pretences of King and Covenant; from whose eyes you hide a better knowledge. I am persuaded that divers of you, who lead the People, have laboured to build yourselves in these things; wherein you have censured others, and established yourselves 'upon the Word of God.' Is it therefore infallibly agreeable to the Word of God, all that <u>you</u> say? I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken." And then, with a shrewd thrust at the Covenants "There may be a Covenant with Death and Hell . . . I will not say yours was so . . . . I pray you read the Twentyeighth of Isaiah, from the fifth to the fifteenth verse. And do not scorn to know that it is the Spirit that quickens and giveth life."(2)

From/

(1) Walker - Journal. p.162.
(Nicoll in his diary, dated 25th July, 1650, says that the purging of the army commenced earlier, and that almost half were weeded out - p.20.)

(2) Carlyle - Cromwell's Letters & Speeches - Letter cxxxvi.
Records of Commission of Gen.Ass, iii. 14,15.
Warriston's Diary, ii.10.

From the beginning Cromwell's army was faced with difficulties. The nature of the country around Edinburgh, made doubly difficult by the fine strategy of Leslie, rendered it impossible for Cromwell to force the conflict. Besides, Cromwell's supplies were only to be had from the ships co-operating along the coast. So stormy was the weather that provisions could not be landed at Musselburgh, the result being that Cromwell had to march back to Dunbar to re-provision his army. Leslie followed in his tracks, finally taking up a very strong position on Doon Hill, a ridge of the Lammermoors. It was a position of great strategic value, for the alternatives of escape or fight offered to Cromwell were slight. Behind him was the sea, in front of him David Leslie on Doon Hill, while on his left the defile at Cockburnspath (the Copperspath of Cromwell) had been blocked by Leslie's troops. Cromwell realised the seriousness of his position, Writing to Sir Arthur Haselrig, Governor of Newcastle, he says "We are upon an Engagement very difficult. The enemy hath blocked up our way at the pass at Copperspath, through which we cannot get without almost a miracle. He lieth so upon the hills that we know not how to come that way without great difficulty; and our lying here daily consumeth our men, who fall sick beyond imagination . . . . Indeed do you get what forces you can against them. Send to friends in the South to help with more . . . . (1)

On the other hand the Scots had their own difficulties to/

(1) Carlyle - Letter cxxxix. Acts.& Stat.VI.ii.p.886

to face. The miserable state of the weather and their exposed position on the hill were not conducive to high spirits. Lack of provisions also began to tell upon their forces, and this may have been a factor in promoting the de-cision come to on the second day of their encampment to abandon the eminence on which they were situated, and take up a new position on much lower ground, where it was more difficult to manoeuvre. The responsibility for this action has been variously placed by historians. Row in his Life of Blair says that there was "a committee, called a Council of War, that ordered all the affairs of the army, giving orders even to the General, when to fight, when to forbear."(1) According to Bishop Burnet, it was the Committee of the Church which forced matters. (2) Carlyle, however, discounts this source, maintaining that "the poor Scotch clergy have enough of their own to answer for in this business, let every back bear the burden that belongs to it."(3)

This much is evident, however, that the Parliamentary Committee was divided in its counsel. Leslie complained later to the Estates that he "had not absolute command," and his complaint appears both just and reasonable.(4)

Cromwell, /

---

(1) Row's Blair - p.235.
(2) Burnet's History of His Own Time. i.36.
(3) Carlyle - Intro. to Letter cxl. et. seq.
(4) See W.L.Mathieson - Politics & Religion. Vol.ii.Footnote to p.124.

Cromwell, writing to the Lord President Bradshaw, says that there was confusion in the Scottish Camp. "I hear when the enemy marched last up to us, the Ministers pressed their army to interpose between us and home; the chief officers desiring rather that we might have way made, though it was by a golden bridge. But the Clergy's counsel prevailed, - to their no great comfort, through the goodness of God."(1)

The fact remains, however, that the Scots suffered a severe defeat at the hands of Cromwell,(2) and the effect of this defeat upon the nation and upon the church was very great. Cromwell immediately gained access to Edinburgh and the port of Leith, and the demoralising effect of this surrender of the capital upon the nation can hardly be underestimated. The government of the country was now hopelessly confused and national sentiment for the time being shattered. In the Church the cleavage between those who upheld the return of the malignants and those who were bitterly opposed to them became even more marked. Indeed, from Dunbar we may date the beginning of the ecclesiastical controversy which assumed its final shape in the Remonstrance presented to the Committee of Estates in October.(3)

Meanwhile, Cromwell made good his victory by proceeding from Edinburgh through Linlithgow and Kilsyth to Glasgow, where, on his approach, the ministers and magistrates fled. Baillie remarks/

(1) Carlyle; - Letter cxlii.
(2) House of Commons Journal. Vol.VI. p.464.
(3) Rec. Comm. Gen.Ass. iii.95-106; Balfour IV. 141-160.

remarks on Cromwell's gentleness in his dealings with the Scots. "He took such a course with his sojourns that they did less displeasure at Glasgow, nor if they had been at London, though Mr. Zachary Boyd railed on them all to their face in the High Kirk."(1) It is evident, at any rate, that Cromwell was no ruthless conqueror, sweeping all before him relentlessly. Certainly he was determined to conquer Scotland for the Commonwealth if possible, but he did not lack humanity in his dealings with the people.(2)

==========

(1) Baillie. iii. 119,120; Whitelocke, iii. 255.

(2) An interesting commentary on the methods of Cromwell and his army is provided by the Presbytery of Peebles in a letter to the Commission of the General Assembly, dated at a later date, 26th May, 1651. "They have in many parties disturbed divyne worshippe, impeding our coming together, scattering us when we were mett, contradicting us in performing of the worshippe of God; and some of us have been assaulted by them with chargèd pistolls and uther weapons when we were in pulpit and at our houses, and others of us have been carried away in our persons and detained for a time."
Assembly Commission Records, iii. p.469.

CHAPTER III.

THE TRIUMPH OF INDEPENDENCY.

After Dunbar, some of the more zealous of the ministers who had been with the army met st Stirling, and there issued a document showing certain reasons why a public fast should be observed throughout the country.(1) In this document, they set forth under thirteen heads certain national offences which they regarded as hindrances to the cause of the Covenant, at the same time counselling the people to lay these things strictly to heart. Among the causes of humiliation were "The unstraight dealings of our Commissioners with the King in the treaty of Breda", the closing of the treaty with the King, and the invitation which the Commissioners had extended to him to come to Scotland and assume the government of the country, especially as it was known he had given a commission to Montrose. For this they had no authority except what they assumed, and although it was approved of three days later by the Commission of the General Assembly,(2) many ministers, particularly those of the province of Fife, refused to intimate it to their congregations.(3) Baillie for one was greatly exercised about the whole matter, and was very glad to escape any responsibility in the affair. "The Lord in a very sensible way to me carried it so, that neither the Synod was troubled with me, nor the peace of my mind by them."(4)

(1) Rec. Comm. Gen. Ass. iii. 48.
(2) Ibid. 48. (3) Balfour-Memorialls, iv.107.
(4) Baillie - Letters, iii. 116.

The "sensible way" being that he was called out on business and on his returning, found that the matter had been disposed of. The extreme party of the Church who had been mainly responsible for the purging of the army, and the further purging of the king's household, and who were also mainly responsible for this proclamation, now asked and obtained leave from the Estates who were met at Stirling to raise an army of their own.(1) It was felt that this army, to be composed of those who were in no way tainted with malignancy, would prove of great assistance to the nation. Colonel Strachan was appointed commander, but he was not anxious to try his skill against Cromwell, under whom he had fought at Preston. Charles, who had been at Dunfermline, was now at Perth, very tired of the whole course of events, of the restrictions imposed upon him, and of the repeated purging of his household. He was led to believe that Strachan intended to kidnap him and deliver him up to Cromwell, and in this belief, however well-founded or otherwise, we have the origin of what is known as "The Start". The king had also been led to believe that the Royalists in the north would rally round his standard, so on the 4th of October he quitted Perth to put himself at the head of this rising. Chase was immediately given when his flight was discovered, and he was found in the wilds of Angus, where he was to have met an array of Highland chiefs. The plot had been/

(1) Rec. Comm. Gen. Assem. iii. 61.

been misarranged, Charles being too early on the scene, and by this time the Young King was thoroughly discomfited. He was urged by his friends to return to Perth, where the Committee of Estates was now sitting.(1) The "Start" was instrumental in bringing matters to a head. It was felt by many that the king should have more freedom than had hitherto been allowed him, and to further this, arrangements were now made for his coronation.

In regard to ecclesiastical matters, events were working towards a definite split. The extreme party of the Church, principally those from the west country, presented on the 30th of October a Remonstrance to the Committee of Estates, protesting against the whole policy of the government, and rejecting Charles as their king until they were convinced "of the reality of his profession."(2) The Committee of Estates deferred giving their answer to this Remonstrance, but the granting of an indemnity, within the limits of the Act of Classes, to General Middleton and others who were in the north, showed the feeling which they entertained towards this protest. In regard to Middleton, James Guthrie, minister at Stirling, who was one of the leading Remonstrants, had received the authority of the Commission of the General Assembly to excommunicate Middleton.(3) This he insisted on doing, despite the authority of the Estates, and even of the Moderator of the Commission who had acquiesced in this/

(1) Balfour-Memorialls.IV.113-115. Baillie-Letters III.117.Rec.Comm.Gen. Ass.iii.74 - gives the King's apology for withdrawing from the Comm. of Estates. See also Balfour-Memorialls.IV.118.

(2) Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass.III.95-106. Balfour-Memorialls.IV. 141-160

(3) Ibid.

this indemnity.(1) Finally, before dissolving their meeting, the Committee of Estates recorded their condemnation of the Remonstrance as "scandalous and injurious" to the king's person and authority. The Committee also held it to be dishonourable to the kingdom, being a breach of the public treaties.(2) The Commission of the General Assembly who had also been approached while acknowledging that there were many sad truths in the Remonstrance, regarded it as "entrenching upon some conclusions and determinations of the General Assembly," and also as liable to breed divisions in the church.(3) /

The Remonstrants or Protesters, as they were later called, had felt their position strengthened by the fact that Colonel Strachan was still at the head of a considerable body of troops, this "westland army" representing nominally at least, the protesting side. Their position was weakened, however, when this army, under Colonel Ker, (Strachan having resigned) was defeated at Hamilton by a section of the Puritan army.(4) The Protesters, despite this rebuff, were still to prove a formidable force.

It is significant to note that the Moderate section of/

(1) Baillie - Letters, iii. 118. (2) Balfour-Memorials.IV.176-8 giving the complete declaration.
(3) Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass.iii.131-2. (4) Balfour-Memorials.IV.195.
/ A further petition had been received by the Commission of the General Assembly, from those concurring in the Remonstrance. This was answered immediately, the Commission stating "they are presentlie to fall upon a generall consideration of the matter of the Remonstrance." On their proceeding to give their "sense" of the Remonstrance, a verbal protestation was made by certain of the Commissioners. (See Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass.iii.pp.126-8; 130-2.)

of the Church, later known as the Resolutioners, being those who adhered to the Public Resolutions, and the Royalist supporters of Charles were now drawing together, partly through force of circumstances, and partly because there were many in Scotland who sought to combine loyalist feeling with religious zeal. It was felt by those who were of this mind that something must be done if Scotland was to be saved. The Act of Classes was considered now to be both obnoxious and detrimental to recruiting as well. There was a strong desire for its repeal, which culminated in the matter being brought before the Committee of Estates. The Church was invited to express an opinion on the matter, and for this purpose a meeting of the Commission of the General Assembly was summoned to Perth.(1) The Commission met on the 14th of December, when in answer to the query of the Parliament as to who were to be admitted to defend the country against the common enemy the answer was given, after serious deliberation "In this case of so great and ardent necessity we cannot be against the raising of all fencible persons in the land, and permitting them to fight against the enemy for defence of the kingdom; excepting such as are excommunicated, forfeited, notoriously profane, flagitious, or such as have from the/

---

(1) Balfour-Memorialls. iv.197. Baillie-Letters. iii.121.

the beginning, or continue still, and are at this time obstinate, and professed enemies and opposers of the Covenant and cause of God."(1)

The result of these resolutions of the Commission of the General Assembly was that many now flocked back to the church, making a form of penitence in order to be restored to the army. Among those who did penance were the Lord Chancellor Loudon, the Duke of Hamilton, and the Earl of Crawford. Baillie, who was inclined to a moderate course, though he seems to have been of too timid a temperament to press his opinions, expresses his satisfaction at the course adopted, but his tone changes when the consequences of this attained fruition. "My joy for this was soon tempered when I saw the consequences - the ugging (loathing) of sundrie good people to see numbers of grievous bloodshedders ready to come in, and so many malignant noblemen as were not lyke to lay down armes till they were put into some places of trust, and restored to their vote in Parliament."(2)

The Commission of the General Assembly also passed an "Act for censuring such as act or comply with the sectarian army now infesting this kingdome", and instructed a letter to be sent to Presbyteries enclosing a copy of the act, and explaining that "the King's Majestie and Parliament are about to call forth the bodie of the people throughout the partes of this Kingdome which are yet free from the oppression of/

(1) Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass. iii.159.160. (2) Baillie-Letters. iii.126.

of the enemie, in a more generall way than has been heretofore, for defence and deliverance of the Kingdome from the publick enemie."(1)

This form of absolution was not given, however, without protest being made. Several presbyteries refused to join in the course taken, maintaining that it was a lowering of their Covenanting ideals. The Church, indeed, was seriously divided on the whole question, as is seen from the voluminous correspondence with which the Commission of the General Assembly had to deal following upon the adoption of these resolutions. Many presbyteries dissented strongly at the first, but their policy seems to have been modified a little later, for when the provincial assemblies came on, most of them at their deliberations approved of the policy of the Commission. The Universities of Glasgow and St. Andrews were among those who favoured the measures adopted.(2) The seal was set to the action of the Commission by the cordial approval of the General Assembly at Dundee in July, 1651. No doubt the presence of Cromwell's forces in the country was sufficient to make many agree to the measures that had been promulgated.

In the midst of this clash of opinion, Charles was crowned at Scone with much pomp and display on the 1st of January, 1651. The Marquis of Argyle placed the crown on the/

---

(1) See Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass. iii. 164.5.
(2) Ibid. iii. 466-8. 412-4.

the king's head, and a sermon was preached by Robert Douglas, as Moderator of the General Assembly. The sermon is interesting as embodying certain political theories which were now beginning to be entertained at this time and even earlier, for Douglas declared that the royal power was limited by contract

One part omitted in the ceremony was the anointing of the King with oil, this being supposed to savour too much of Popery and prelacy. An addition to the ceremony, symptomatic of the events then occurring and of the ecclesiastical polity of the Covenanters, was the inclusion of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant in the coronation oath. The King swore that he and his successors "shall consent and agree to all acts of Parliament enjoining the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant, and fully establishing Presbyterian government, the Directory of Worship, the Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms of the kingdom of Scotland, as they are approven by the General Assemblies and Parliament of this kingdom." The young king, at any rate, was not allowed to entertain any doubts as to the course prescribed for him.

A further step was now taken by Parliament, a logical one in view of the recent concessions. The Commission of the Church was asked whether they might now admit to the Committee of Estates any who had been excluded from it for malignancy, provided they made adequate satisfaction to the Church for any such offences.(1) The answer given by the Commission was/

(1) Acts & Stat.Parl.Scot.vi.ii.647. Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass.iii.345.

was very cautious. They felt inclined to yield to the request, but they were by no means anxious to bear full responsibility for any action taken. With certain imposed restrictions they said that such a course might be taken.(1)

The fullest interpretation was put upon this answer by Parliament. On the 30th of May an act was passed "for secureing of religione and the wark of reformatione."(2) This act ratified in a general way those acts which had hitherto been passed in favour of religion. On the 2nd of June the obnoxious Act of Classes was rescinded.(3)

With the sweeping away of these restrictions, the way was now cleared for action against Cromwell. The country was still in a divided condition in regard both to political and ecclesiastical government. The authority of the state was always in danger of being questioned by the church, which in turn was divided against itself. Nicoll, when he enumerates "Covenanters, Anti-Covenanters, Cross-Covenanters, Puritans, Babarterers, Roundheads, Auldhornes, Newhornes, Cross-Petitioners, Brownists, Separatists, Malignants, Sectaries, Royalists, Quakers, Anabaptists,"(4) brings out the/

---

(1) Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass.,iii. 357.
(2) Acts & Stat.Parl.Scot.,VI. ii.672. Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass.iii.452
(3) Acts & Stat.Parl.Scot.,VI. ii.676. Balfour-Memorialls IV. 301-6.
Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass. iii. 458.
Nicoll - Diary pp.51.3.
(4) Nicoll - Diary p.39.

the ridiculous nature of much of this controversy in face of national danger. He mentions that there are four armies in Scotland, all divided, to face the united force which Cromwell commanded.(1) From now onwards, the two opposing religious factions took definite shape. Those who favoured the public resolutions of the Commission of Assembly and the Assembly were called Resolutioners. Those who protested against them were called Protesters. Of their quarrels and differences of opinion we shall hear later when this controversy is discussed. Meanwhile it is sufficient to note the leaders of opinion on either side. Chief among the Resolutioners were Robert Baillie, whose letters form a most illuminating commentary upon the whole period, and who afterwards became Principal of Glasgow University; Robert Douglas, minister at Edinburgh, and Moderator of the General Assembly of 1651, and David Dickson, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh University. The Protesters were led by such men as Patrick Gillespie, afterwards Principal of Glasgow University under Cromwell; James Guthrie, minister at Stirling, and the author of "Protesters ne Subverters" and other vigorous pamphlets; and Samuel Rutherford, author of "Lex Rex" and Principal of New College, St. Andrews.

At/

---

(1) Nicoll - Diary, p.39.

At the first meeting of the General Assembly it was very evident that the cleavage in the church was a serious one. At the outset Prof.Menzies of Aberdeen proposed that the members of the Commission of the previous Assembly should be excluded from the deliberations of the Assembly, as their conduct of affairs was scandalous, being contrary to the Covenant.(1) In this proposal he was seconded by James Guthrie, who had already been obliged by the Commission of the Church to leave Stirling because of the unpatriotic nature of his sermons. The reply was given that their conduct had never been challenged or debated, nor for that matter had the conduct of those who were preaching and writing against the Resolutions of the Church.(2) At last, after debate, a conference was permitted with those who were dissatisfied with the Public Resolutions, although some desired that the proceedings of the Commission should be tried first. While the Conference was proceeding news came of the defeat of a Scottish Army at Inverkeithing, and accordingly the Assembly was adjourned to meet at Dundee.(3) Before the adjournment a protest against the Assembly was lodged by Andrew Cant and twenty-seven others,(4) this being followed by their withdrawal from the deliberations.(5) The Protestation declared the unlawfulness of/

---

(1) Row's Blair - p.274.
(2) Ibid. p.275.
(3) Ibid. p.276.
(4) Warriston's Diary. p.93. note by Dr. Hay Fleming.
(5) Row's Blair - p.275.

of the General Assembly on the following grounds.

(1) It was a prelimited Assembly, because the choosing of commissioners was restricted by the letter of the Commission of the Church to Presbyteries to cite all, who after conference, were still dissatisfied with the Public Resolutions.

(2) The king's letter was of a coercive character.

(3) The speech of the King's Commissioner tended to the prelimiting of the members of the Assembly.

(4) The members of the preceding Commission were members of this Assembly, which should not be, because their conduct of affairs was a defection from the standards of the Covenant.

The adjourned meeting of the Assembly held at Dundee, purged as it was of the protesting faction, performed its work with greater freedom. It is only fair to say, however, that this Assembly was very thinly attended, but it does not therefore follow that it was unrepresentative of the mind of the Church. The previous proceedings of the Commission of the Assembly were approved, with the exception of the Act of Aug. 13.,1650, against the king, which was held to be unpatriotic. Three of the leading Protesters, namely, James Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie, and James Simson were deposed, and James Naismith suspended.(1) The Assembly then put forth a Warning and Declaration against the courses adopted by the Protesters, at the same time passing a series of acts against any who were

opposed/

(1) Nicoll - p.54.

opposed to the Public Resolutions.[1]

Events in Scotland were now hastening to a crisis. By reason of his victories Cromwell had strengthened his position and stabilised his forces. On the other hand, the constant contentions and wrangling among the Resolutioners, Protesters and Royalists, and others of varying opinions, only served to increase the division of the Scottish forces. More than that, the remnant of the Scottish army which had survived Dunbar was lying at Stirling in a very poor condition.[2] Something required to be done with the army if even defensive measures were to be taken. Accordingly, in June after a complaint had been made by Leslie, Parliament instituted a voluntary contribution for the relief of the army.[3] The addition of other forces at the beginning of July strengthened Leslie's army and something of their lost prestige was restored to them. Cromwell had tried several times to force a conflict, but without success. At last he determined to oppose the Scottish army from the other side. Crossing the Forth at Queensferry, his troops under Lambert defeated a force at Inverkeithing (already mentioned) which had been sent to check his advance, and subsequently they arrived at and occupied Perth. But the Scottish army did not wait to be drawn into battle. Instead of preparing to meet

Cromwell's/

(1) See "A Warning and Declaration from the General Assembly at Dundee, the 30th of July, 1651."
(2) Rec.Comm.Gen.Ass. iii. 338.
(3) Row's Blair, p.272. Balfour-Memorialls, iv. 309.

Cromwell's forces, they set off for England in the hope that they would gain considerable access to their numbers. It was further hoped to reach London when something decisive and spectacular might be attempted. The accession of English Royalists to their ranks was not considerable and the strategy of Cromwell as well as the indecision of the Scots themselves, prevented their move being successful in other directions. Worcester had been reached by the Scottish army, and the question had to be settled whether to march on to London or retire into Wales. The delay in their movements was sufficient to allow Cromwell's army to gain upon them, and on the 3rd day of September (the anniversary of Dunbar, and later the date of Cromwell's death) was fought the decisive battle of Worcester.(1) Although the Scots were outnumbered and inferior in other respects, they put up a brave though futile fight, Charles himself being conspicuous for his gallantry. The Scottish casualties were particularly heavy, and many were taken prisoner, among whom were Leslie and Middleton. Charles escaped to France after six weeks' hiding as a fugitive in his own country.

Cromwell's "crowning mercy" put an end to the Royalists' hopes. It also put an end to the hopes once entertained by the Covenanters that with the accession of Charles as a covenanted King to the throne, the establishment of Presby-:terianism throughout his dominions would speedily follow.

Presbyterianism/

(1) Balfour - Memorialls. IV. p.316. Row's Blair. p.284 Whitelocke, iii. 345.6.7.

Presbyterianism in Scotland was now split into factions, powerless to impress others by its efficacy, and still more powerless to force its demands upon others.

General Monk was left with the practically minor task of completing Oliver's conquest of Scotland, and for the remaining years of Cromwell's rule, Scotland's position was that of a dependent province of England.

==========

CHAPTER IV.

CROMWELL'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY.

Before considering Cromwell's ecclesiastical policy in Scotland, we may digress for a little to ascertain how matters fared with the Church and nation after Worcester. Monk had already before Worcester, obtained possession of Stirling Castle, had broken up the Committee of Estates which had gone north to Alyth, and had sacked Dundee.(1) Dumbarton Castle held out for a time, being surrendered in January, 1652.(2) Four months later, on the 26th May, the last of the fortresses, Dunottar Castle, fell, though by a piece of strategy on the part of two women, the "honours" of Scotland were safely got away. With the fall of Dunottar, the subjugation of Scotland may be said to have been completed, though there remained still the work of consolidation.

It is impossible wholly to separate Cromwell's civil and domestic policy from his ecclesiastical policy, the two being closely intertwined, so that an account of the affairs which concern the English dealings with Scotland may be narrated here, as best setting out the details of his ecclesiastical measures.

So protracted had been the campaign in Scotland that it was felt that the only effective way of dealing with the country/

---

(1) See Nicoll - Diary, p.57.

(2) Ibid. p.79. Whitelocke iii. 349.

country would be to annex her as a conquered country, with no claims to privileges. Happily, this course was not adopted, it being decided to recognise Scotland as a separate province under Cromwell's rule.

On the 9th September, 1651, the English Parliament appointed a Commission "to bring in an Act for asserting the right of this Commonwealth, to so much of Scotland as is now under the forces of this Commonwealth."(1) Following this an Act "asserting the title of England to Scotland" was read a first time on 30th September.(2) Ultimately, a more conciliatory spirit was displayed, and it was decided to adopt measures for uniting the two countries. On the 23rd October, 1651, eight Commissioners were appointed to proceed to Scotland, with the double object of establishing the civil government of the country, and making preparations for this project of union. The Commissioners were Monk, Deane, Lambert, Sir Harry Vane, Richard Salway, Colonel Fenwick, Alderman Tichborne, and the Chief Justice of England, Oliver St.John, and in January, 1652, they landed in Scotland to take over the reins of government, making their headquarters at Dalkeith.(3)

The Declaration of the English Parliament, called the "Tender", was put before representatives from the burghs and shires, there being no government in the land. These

representatives/

(1) See Firth - Scot. and Comm. Int. xxiii.
(2) Ibid. xxiii.
(3) House of Commons Journal Vol.VII.p.30. Several changes in the personnel were afterwards made. VII. 338.341.3. Whitelocke. iii. 360.

representatives were to have power to negotiate the terms of union, and give assent to it. On the surface, the English proposals seemed very generous, but in actual fact the representatives of the burghs and shires had little or no real power. Had they dissented strongly to the terms of union between the two countries, they would only have placed their country in an awkward position. The situation, indeed, was analogous to that of Charles signing the Covenants. As he had been "compelled to sign them voluntarily", so their free assent to the terms of the union was given under complusion. As Prof.Hume Brown says "As things now stood, it was the least evil alternative to accept conditions which could not make worse the existing situation."(1)

Another factor which probably weighed with the constituencies was that in January a levy had been enforced upon every county for the maintenance of the English army, and this levy was to be exacted so long as a policy of resistance was maintained. In view of this an early settlement was both necessary and desirable, and accordingly commissioners were sent from the majority of the burghs and shires to confer with the English commissioners regarding the proposed union.

As early as February, 1652, the religious policy of Cromwell had been set forth by the Commissioners of the English Parliament, probably with a view to conciliating the Church/

(1) Hist. of Scotland. ii. 367.

Church party which though divided was sufficiently strong to merit a certain amount of attention. Indeed, religion is in the forefront of the many declarations issued by the representa-:tives of the Commonwealth. In the declaration which was now issued, it was stated "We declare that for promoting of holiness and advancing the power of godliness, all possible care shall be taken for the publishing of the Gospel of Christ in all parts of this land, and provision of maintenance made and allowed to the faithful dispensers thereof, together with such other encouragements as the magistrate may give, and may be expected by them, who demean themselves peaceably and becomingly to the government and authority by which they receive the same."(1) The tenour of this document is very tolerant, but it was easily seen by the leaders of both parties in the Church that their power was now on the decline. In regard to the proposed union, both sections of the Church were against it. Robert Blair declared "As for the embodying of Scotland with England, it will be when the poor bird is embodied into the hawk that hath eaten it up", a very fit summing-up of the negotiations.

Our concern is not with the proposed union of England and Scotland, the details of which are to be found in the work of Prof. C.S.Terry "Negotiations for the Union of England and Scotland, 1651-1653." It is sufficient to note here that after protracted negotiations during the years 1652 and 1653, the union became an accomplished fact, in the "Instrument/

(1) See Firth - Scot. and Comm. xxxvi and xxxvii.

"Instrument of Government" in December, 1653. We shall notice later the place of religion in that very interesting document.

Meanwhile, the English commissioners proceeded to address themselves to the problem of ecclesiastical government in detail. The Universities had been intimately connected with the Church since their various foundations, under the Reformed Church no less than under the Church of Rome. Accordingly a Commission of nine Commissioners was appointed for visiting the schools and Universities, with power to remove ministers whose lives were not in keeping with true religion. The Commission had also powers regarding the maintenance of the ministry.(1) They also declared their willingness "to receive all Complaints and to hear and determine all Causes concerning the Premisses."(2)

So far, although there had been dislocation in the meetings of the courts of the Church, owing to the presence of the English, and other disturbing factors, yet the work of the Church had proceeded on the usual lines. The Commission of the Church had retreated to the north, there to carry out its deliberations as far as was possible. The Protesters still continued their protestations within the Church, but at an "extra-judicial" meeting in Edinburgh in October, 1651, a month after Worcester, they decided not to recognise the existing Commission of the Church,

(1) Baillie - Letters. iii. 199.passim.
(2) Firth - Scot. & Comm. pp.44.5.

Church, since its authority came from what they considered the illegal Assembly at St. Andrews and Dundee, 1651. The General Assembly was allowed to meet in July, 1652, without any restrictions being imposed.(1) Once again the Protesters lodged a vehement protest against its authority and constitution. This was afterwards printed and appeared as "The Representation, Propositions and Protestation of divers Ministers, Elders and Professors for themselves etc." and was addressed to the "Ministers and Elders met at Edinburgh, July 21, 1652."

The Protesters had already asked for a conference to discuss the points at issue. The reply of the Resolutioners which took the form of an "Act and Overture of the General Assembly for the Peace and Union of the Kirk" was put aside by the Protesters because it involved for them the withdrawing of the Protestation of 1651. Their views were accordingly published in a pamphlet entitled "Reasons Why the Ministers, Elders, etc.....cannot agree to the Overtures made to them at the Conference upon the 28 and 29 of July, 1652." This was followed early in 1653 by a further pamphlet "The Nullity of the Pretended Assembly at St. Andrews and Dundee." The argument contained in this pamphlet proceeds upon the same lines as the previous protestations, viz., that the action of the Commission of the Assembly had prelimited the Assembly and that therefore it was "not a lawfull free

Generall/

(1) Nicoll - Diary. pp.97.99.

Generall Assembly."

The Resolutioners having replied in a document entitled "Causes of an Humiliation appointed by the Commission Generall Assembly" there appeared from the press of the Protesters the well-known "Causes of the Lord's Wrath against Scotland", giving the general "heads" of the causes, with further "steps", these including "The Publick Resolutions of Kirk and State, for bringing in the Malignant party, first to the Army, and then to the Judicatories". (p.7; pp.62.3.) and "the authorizing of the Commissioners to close a Treaty with the King". (p.53.)

Following this there was issued by the Resolutioners "A Letter from the Protesters with an Answer thereunto". The letter from the Protesters is a pious plea to the Resolutioners to amend their evil courses beginning with the sinful Treaty in Holland, and continues "We also greatly stumbled at the Fasts and Humiliations which you do appoint from time to time, the Causes are Generall, and ambiguous expressions used, which no doubt is a sin before the Lord". (p.8.) The tone of the Resolutioners answer is far healthier, if less pious, and shows the broad-minded attitude adopted towards a very vexed problem.

The principles involved in this controversy as well as the later developments of it will be examined later, but these details of the early phase of this struggle up to 1653 are important as illustrating the maze which Cromwell and his Council in Scotland had to tread.

The dissolution of the General Assembly in 1653 marks the beginning of a stricter ecclesiastical policy on the part of the English.(1) Apparently this action of Colonel Lilburne's was carried through without any definite orders from his superiors. Eight days previous to the dissolution he had written Cromwell, as he was in doubt what course to take. "The General Assembly of the Ministers being to meete the next weeke att Edinburgh, in regard of the ficklenesse of the times, and present designes that are amongst many, I would humbly intreate your Lordshippes direccions whether I should prevent that meeting or nott; because the late Councell seem'd to take offence att the nott hindering their former meeting."(2)

There was little enough time to receive a reply, but Lilburne writing to Cromwell later, justifies his action. "Having some intimation that the present Meeting of the Ministers of the Generall Assembly att Edinburgh tended to a further correspondence with those mett in the Highlands, I thought itt my duty, for the prevention of any thinge that might be to the disturbance of the publique peace, to dissolve their Assembly; for which purpose I ordered Lt.Colonel Cotterell and Capt.Hope to repaire to Edinburgh with directions for dismissing them, which they did yesterday."(3)

Lilburne/

(1) Baillie - Letters iii. 225.
(2) Firth - Scot. and Comm. p.161.
(3) Ibid. p.162.3.

Lilburne goes on to describe the details of the suppression of the Assembly, adding that "The Remonstratours seem very joyfull at the dissolution of the Assembly."(1) Baillie, who was an eye-witness, and suffered the same ignominy as the others has also left a very full account of these proceedings.(2)

So ended the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and for thirty-seven years no meeting of that venerable body took place. Although Lilburne alone seems responsible for this act, his policy was fully endorsed by his superiors. Wodrow, in his private diary, says "I find some that favour the memory of Oliver Cromwell excuse the acting of Cromwell in this Church, and say they were out of kindness. That he would not suffer any more General Assemblies to sit after 1652, because they would have deposed one another, and the rent would still have increased. That he indicted fasts and thanksgivings himself and prescribed the days and causes, out of a regard for the peace of the Church, because, as he thought, the Protesters and Resolutioners would make each other causes of their fasting."(3)

It is apparent, however, that there was a deeper motive behind Lilburne's action. So long as the General Assembly continued to meet, it contained potential elements of revolution.

---

(1) Firth. Scot. & Comm. p.163.
(2) Letters iii.225. See also Nicoll - Diary. p.110. Brodie - Diary, p.30 and Lamont - Diary, p.56.
(3) Analecta. i. 274

revolution. There was no saying when national sentiment might be roused through its agency and the people flock to the standard again, perhaps at some time when Cromwell was experiencing difficulties elsewhere. So long indeed as this last organisation of a national character existed, so long did there exist a possible source of danger. As a matter of fact, at the time the General Assembly was dissolved, the English were engaged in a naval conflict with the Dutch, and a rising in the Highlands was premeditated. Lilburne was afraid of the spirit of revolt spreading, hence his anxiety to anticipate possible trouble.

Synods, Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions continued to meet, though, as we shall see later there are not a few cases of interference with these courts, but, as channels of national sentiment they were practically useless. The ordinary work of the Church might proceed through their agency, but the political power of the Church received a great blow at the dissolution. Lilburne did indeed con-:template the dissolution of Synods, but hesitated, for he felt that already he had violated national sentiment far enough. "Though the General Assembly was rooted (routed?) yet they have their provinciall assemblyes, and whether I should allsoe discharge those I should be glad of your Lordshipps commands, for I doubt the people are not well able to beare any more against their ministers."(1)

The/

(1) Scot. and Comm. pp.191.192.

The "Instrument of Government" of December, 1653, witnessed the establishment of a definite religious policy for the whole Commonwealth. By it Cromwell was made "Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging, for life." (1) Articles 35, 36 and 37 describe the place that religion was to occupy in the Commonwealth, the Christian religion being "held forth and recommended as the public profession of these nations," and provision to be made "for the encouragement of able and painful preachers, for the instructing the people, and for the discovery and confutation of error."

The policy described in Articles 36 and 37 is that of religious toleration. "That to the public profession held forth none shall be compelled by penalties or otherwise; but that endeavour be used to win them by sound doctrine and the example of a good conversation." (2) Also "That such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship or discipline publicly held forth) shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion; so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and

to/

(1) Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum ii. 813-822.
(2) Ibid. pp. 821.2.

to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts; provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as, under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practice licentiousness." (1)

The policy of religious toleration had all along been favoured by Cromwell. In part that was due to his training as an Independent, as well as to his own liberal opinions. For the Independents, the Church was conceived as a body of Christians, each congregation being in essence a Church, entitled to exercise its own jurisdiction, irrespective of the methods of other congregations. While they allowed the utility of larger bodies such as synods, they denied their authority as binding. Catholicism was excluded from Cromwell's policy of toleration, because, to use the words of a German historian, "he recognised in that religion a political foe, ever on the watch to re-impose the yoke of civil and spiritual domination, which he had scarcely and with difficulty shaken off."(2) Geffcken does not mention Prelacy, but Prelacy also was anathema to Cromwell, for very convincing reasons. Prelacy and monarchy had too long been associated together to admit of the recognition of a prelatical system of ecclesiastical polity. Cromwell, however tolerant he was in religious matters generally, was not /

(1) Acts and Ordinancies of the Interregnum - ii.822.
(2) See Geffcken - Church and State, p.439.

not anxious to leave any loophole open to the Royalists. His scheme of toleration must not be confused with the toleration that prevails to-day, for it was influenced to a great extent by his own political opinions and those of his contemporaries, and because of the condition of things prevailing, was bound to be limited in its scope and application. The reason why Presbytery did not come under the ban is not far to seek. Apart from that the fact that the Presbyterians in England were by no means a negligible factor, there is the further political reason that Presbytery was very much akin to Independency, at least, more so than any other religious system, being democratic in character. It is plainly evident that Cromwell's ecclesiastical policy was determined by the trend of his political ideas. Independency fitted more closely into his political ideas and aspirations than any other system of ecclesiastical polity, for it was almost republican in character. On the other hand, political necessity demanded that his ecclesiastical policy should be comprehensive enough to include certain other religious elements that were not too widely divergent from Independency. Hence the plea put forward for religious toleration to all, with the exceptions of Popery and Prelacy.

At /

At the same time, between Scottish Presbyterianism and Independency there was little affinity. The democracy of Independency tended to become, indeed, became, republican in character. On the other hand, the democracy of Scottish Presbyterianism was wide enough (one might say "tolerant" enough) to admit of a limited monarchy. That alone was sufficient to make Cromwell suspicious of the power of Presbytery in Scotland, and of the real intentions of the Presbyterians. On the ecclesiastical side, the Scottish Presbyterians abhorred toleration. To them it was Erastian in character (in the worst sense of a much-abused term), and could only be regarded in their eyes as the forerunner of spiritual collapse and disintegration. The impartial student of history can see faults on both sides, but it is a common error to see the limitations only on the Presbyterian side. The drawback of Scottish Presbyterianism was the desire, (general at first, but limited afterwards), to impose a theocratic state-system, a Civitas Dei, after the manner of Calvin, not only in Scotland, but throughout England and Ireland. This was a serious weakness of the Covenants, and a stumbling-block to both Cromwell and Charles II. The disadvantage of Cromwell's policy of religious toleration was that it was backed up by military force. This remained a permanent blemish in what was otherwise an enlightened policy, and was a constant source of weakness in Cromwell's rule, both in England and Scotland.

In /

In the one case the Church sought to impose a political system upon the State (so far as the beginnings of the movement are concerned). In the other the State did impose (certainly within limits) a system upon the Church, in harmony with the existing and ruling political ideas. It is futile to be too dogmatic in such a discussion. With revolution so recent, and the prospect of it never far away and always feared, extreme policies on either side were always bound to find favour. The seventeenth century generally was a period of readjustment of political and ecclesiastical ideas and policies, but particularly in this decade.

It must be said in all fairness to Cromwell that in his policy of toleration and comprehension, he was in advance of his times, but it was his misfortune to be dependent on what moral force militarism could supply. In various directions his tolerance is evident as, for example, in his attitude to George Fox and the Quakers, as well as to the Jews,(1) but in his dealings with sects other than those comprehended by the Instrument of Government, he was hampered by the illiberal views of some of his compatriots.

Even in regard to Catholicism, while Cromwell saw in it a political foe, he was yet averse to ruthless persecution, and if we judge from his answer to Cardinal Mazarin in 1656, who was urging him to grant toleration to the Catholics, it appears /

(1) See Firth - Oliver Cromwell ə pp.362.3.

appears he might not have stopped short there. To Mazarin he wrote "But although I have this set home upon my spirit, yet I may not (shall I tell you I cannot?) at this juncture of time, and as the face of my affaires now stand, answer to your call for toleration. I say, I cannot, as to a publicke declaration of my sense in that point, although I believe, that under my government, your eminency, in the belief of Catholics, has lesse reason for complaint as to rigour upon men's consciences, than under the parliament . . . . . and herein it is my purpose, as soon as I can remove impediments, and some weights that presse me down, to make a further progresse and discharge my promise to your eminence in relation to that."(1)

The Humble Petition and Advice which was presented to Cromwell in 1657, and accepted by him after alteration, followed the same lines regarding religion as the Intrument of Government, and serves merely to show the continuation of the policy of toleration. Article XI. in the former differs little from Articles 35, 36 and 37 in the latter, except that it is more doctrinal in character. The same exceptions to the general principle of toleration are again put forward, it being expressly stated "that this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy." (2)

In /

---

(1) Thurloe - State Papers V. pp. 735.6.
(2) Acts & Ordinances of the Interregnum, ii.1053 (Art.XI.)

In the case of the Universities, the policy of Cromwell, while not unenlightened, reveals him specially as a political strategist of no mean order. The ordinance already referred to (p. 60) was put into strict application by the Commissioners to the Universities, the result of this being that a change in all four Universities in Scotland was effected. In Glasgow, a vacancy had occurred through the death of Robert Ramsay,(1) and Patrick Gillespie was appointed by the English Commissioners as Principal. Baillie took a decided stand against this appointment, but was forced to acquiesce in it.(2)

At Edinburgh Colville was elected but was not inducted to office, the choice of Cromwell's Commissioners falling upon Robert Leighton.(3) Aberdeen was visited by a Commission consisting of Colonels Fenwick and Desborough, and Judges Moseley, Owen and Smith. This Commission had just come from St. Andrews where they had acted in a similar manner. In Aberdeen Dr. Guild was deposed, and John Row, one of the ministers of Aberdeen, was appointed in his stead.(4)

---

(1) See Baillie-Letters iii. 154. 207.
(2) Letters - iii. 207-211; 244.
(3) Baillie - Letters iii. 244; Bower - Hist. of Univ. of Edin. i. 262.
(4) Baillie - Letters iii. 244. Row's Blair, pp.300-1. Rait - The Universities of Aberdeen, pp.157.8. and Bulloch - Hist. of Univ. of Abdn., p.122.

As in the case of the suppression of the General Assembly there were political considerations at the back of this move, for Cromwell rightly perceived, and in this was faithfully followed by his lieutenants, that the Universities possessed political powers and potentialities which might have national effects. The Universities, in short, under the old regime, constituted a potential source of political danger. Bower, in his History of the University of Edinburgh, has recognised this, for he says "The Universities were, during the whole of Cromwell's government, the objects of peculiar care and jealousy. He knew that the greater number of the members were disaffected to his usurpation, and as the education of youth was entrusted to them, it became in his eyes a matter of great political importance to deprive such Principals and Professors of their offices as did not heartily comply with his measures."(1)

To his nominees Cromwell was fairly generous in granting benefactions. Apart from political considerations he appears to have been genuinely interested in learning and the improvement of higher education in the Commonwealth, and in England he fostered a liberal University programme.(2)

So far as Scotland was concerned this same liberal policy was observed. To Glasgow University, by an Ordinance of 8th Aug.1654, he repeated the grants given earlier by Charles /

(1) Vol.i. p.261.
(2) See Firth - Oliver Cromwell pp.353-357.

Charles I, viz., the superiorities of the Bishopric of Galloway and other lands, at the same time adding "the sum of 200 merks yearly from the customs of Glasgow."(1)

Gillespie apparently had pressed the claims of his University, for in an Act of the Moderators (14th Jan. 1656) we find them recording their indebtedness to him for these grants, while at the same time they desire him "that he would actively bestir himselfe to render the same practicable and effectuall."(2)

By a further charter of 8th July, 1657 these gifts were confirmed and others added, viz., the Deanery and Subdeanery of Glasgow, with the churches belonging to the Dean and Chapter." (3)

The other Universities received similar benefactions under the same liberal policy. Speaking of Aberdeen, J.M. Bulloch says "Cromwell, indeed, acted well by the University, for he not only confirmed the grant of the bishopric revenues made by Charles I, but also augmented it by annexing 200 marks yearly from the customs of Aberdeen."(4)

Edinburgh /

---

(1) Munimenta Universitatis Glasquensis. Vol.i.pp.319,320; 321;5.
Baillie - Letters, iii. 282.
Coutts - Hist. of Univ. of Glasgow. p. 134.
(2) Minimenta. i. 350-1.
(3) Ibid. i. 336-343.
(4) Hist. p. 125. See Records of Marischal College & University, i. pp. 276.7. Also Baillie iii.282.

Edinburgh also received a grant of £200 per annum, largely through the efforts of Robert Leighton.(1)

In Aberdeen additions were made to the college buildings, these being made possible because of certain contributions received from Eton, Oxford and Cambridge." (2)

These facts speak well for the liberal and enlightened policy of the Cromwellian government, and show that, apart from the political reasons which undoubtedly directed his initial policy, Cromwell and his colleagues were not indifferent to the claims of higher education. Apart from these things, however, there is no record of any great activity, nor of progress made. The scope of University education was confined, for the trammels of mediaevalism still hampered the progress of the Universities, and the times were too troublous to admit of advance. Baillie, indeed, complains in 1655 "our schollars were few, the laureation private, and tryells superficiarie." (3)

The ecclesiastical policy of Cromwell in Scotland is to a great extent bound upwith the religious controversy which unsettled the Church during the whole of his rule. This /

---

(1) Bower - Hist. i. 268.

(2) Bulloch - Hist. p. 125; Rait - Universities - p.160.

(3) Letters - iii. 285.

This made it impossible for him to deal with the Church as a whole, or to formulate an ecclesiastical system had he so desired, for each faction claimed to be the true Church. So far as a strictly ecclesiastical policy is concerned, Cromwell's interests were centred in England, and in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, the Protector had to rely upon the information given him by those who ruled there.

This information, as we shall see, varied according to his informant, and to the changing attitude of both Resolutioners and Protesters. In the treatment of that controversy the details of Cromwell's later policy will be better distinguished.

It may be of interest to effect a comparison between the ecclesiastical policy of the Cromwellian regime in Scotland and that in England. The word "policy" employed in a strict sense can hardly be applied to ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland. A half-hearted attempt at effecting a reconcil-:iation of religious sects and of formulating a definite relationship between Church and State can hardly be termed a policy.

In England ecclesiastical conditions differed greatly from those in Scotland with the inevitable result that the policy /

policy of the Commonwealth and Protectorate assumed a different complexion. The details of the ecclesiastical settlement have been admirably and thoroughly worked out by Dr. W.A.Shaw in his "History of the English Church 1640-1660". Cromwell's general policy here as elsewhere was, as we have seen, one of toleration to all, with the exception of Roman Catholics and Jews. For this purpose he appointed a Commission of Triers and Ejectors whose aim was to accommodate all the Protestant sects in England. (1) It appears that the Commission performed their work on the whole fairly. (2) Speaking of Cromwell's policy in England, G.M. Trevelyan remarks "His Church system, while it maintained establishment and endowment, was at once comprehensive within and tolerant without. The endowed parsons represented the three largest sects - Presbyterian, Independent /

---

(1) Acts & Ordinances of the Interrignum ii. 855-858; 922; 968-990.

(2) Gwatkin "Church & State in England" p. 333.
Trevelyan "England under the Stuarts" p. 311.

Independent and Baptist - into which Puritan religion was in those years divided. But around the consumers of tithe were scattered innumerable free congregations, either supporting their own ministers, or dispensing with ministers altogether. Provided the Prayer-Book was not used, any form of Protestant worship was openly practised. Cromwell's was in fact a congregational system, partly endowed and partly unendowed. Scandal and anarchy were prevented by his Commission of Triers and Ejectors, whose business it was to weed the Established Church of disorderly and unlearned servants." (1)

Regarding the difference between the attitude adopted by the Cromwellian government in England from that adopted in Scotland two points at least must be noted.

(1) Cromwell was familiar with the state of religion in England, and was thus able to estimate the worth of the work effected by the Commission of Triers and Ejectors, whereas Scotland and the Scottish type of Presbyterianism were utterly foreign to him.

(2) In England a loose confederation of sects was possible, because of the fact that toleration as conceived by Cromwell was /

---

(1) Trevelyan "England under the Stuarts" p. 311.

was an idea that was not wholly unknown to or disliked by the various Protestant sects. Indeed the numerical strength of each of these sects rendered any other policy almost impossible. In Scotland the number and strength of sectarian bodies during the Commonwealth and Protectorate was practically negligible. The bulk of the people were confirmed Presbyterians, and although they came to be divided into Resolutioners and Protesters, Presbyterian usages were followed by both parties. It was a mistake on Cromwell's part to give a charter to Patrick Gillespie and the Protesters, especially as they were in the minority, and when this ill-instructed attempt to formulate a policy failed, Cromwell ceased personally to interest himself in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs, leaving their settlement to his Scottish Council.

CHAPTER V.

THE COVENANTERS: ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY.

In dealing with the Covenanters the mistake is often made of speaking about their ecclesiastical policy as if it were a unity. Nothing indeed could be further from the truth. There were different phases of this policy determined by the events and circumstances occurring from time to time. At least three clearly-marked stages are noticeable, each in many respects differing from the other.

(1) First of all there is the initial stage which may be summed up as that of general revolt against the innovations of James VI. and Charles I. It may indeed be said to be a revolt against the episcopal system of church government as savouring too much of Romanism. It must constantly be borne in mind that this period of history is not far removed from Reformation times, and that the fear of Romanism to a great extent still prevailed. Charles's marriage with the Catholic princess, Henrietta Maria, only served to deepen this fear. So far as these things are concerned, the revolt was of a religious nature. At the same time there was an element in the revolt of a constitutional character. In England this was distinctly recognised but in Scotland this side of the revolt was subordinated to the religious. It was this /

this mingling of interests which hampered the Covenanters' policy as a purely religious policy, and made division inevitable at a very early stage. The assimilating of the noble class in the Covenanting party, on grounds that were more constitutional than religious, while it strengthened the Covenanters and to a certain extent widened the scope of the revolt, at the same time confused the issues. The same thing is true of the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643 between Scotland and England. With the latter it was a constitutional expedient, for the principal quarrel with the king was the question of taxation. With the former, it was designed to be of a religious nature, though that aim was negatived to some extent by the advent of the nobles to the Covenanting side.

The root cause of this dualism in the Covenanters' policy is to be found in the absolutist policy of James VI and Charles I, founded as it was on the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. It was only natural that while to some this absolutist policy should be construed in constitutional terms, to others its chief significance was religious. Thus in England and with the Scottish nobility the constitutional side of the question remained uppermost. With the leaders of the Church in Scotland, however, the effect of this despotic theory upon religion was of paramount /

paramount importance.

Viewed as a religious policy, therefore, the policy of the Covenanters at the outset was simply a reaction to the theory of the Divine Right of Kings as it affected the Church in Scotland. Thus that extreme theory as put into practice by James VI. and Charles I. was met with the extreme theory of the Divine Right of Presbytery, put forward as a defensive measure. As J.N.Figgis cogently puts it "It was the struggle for existence of the Reformation sects that compelled them to put forward a general theory of government which imposed checks upon absolutism, and to investigate and revive all ancient institutions which were, or might be, the means of controlling it. Further than this the system of Calvinism was what neither Lutheranism nor Anglicanism[1] nor Romanism was, a republican, if not a democratic system." As to the merits and demerits of both theories, the same writer in his treatise on the Divine Right of Kings states the case admirably when he says "With the Divine Right of Kings in its developed form few will now sympathise. Yet we may see in it one of the most potent factors in the development of the modern world, if we regard its true objective, that of asserting, as against ecclesiastical pretensions, the divine and inherent

---

(1) From Gerson to Grotius. pp. 136,137.

rights of the civil power, and the natural necessity of political society. Nor is there any danger to the freedom of the Churches in this, provided the civil power makes no attempt at enforcing any single system of religion. On the other hand the Presbyterians and the Papalists were right in asserting the positive limits set to all state autocracy by the claims of religion. No Christian can logically believe in the entire supremacy of the civil power in the same way as a member of the Pagan Empire could hold to it. The doctrine of the two kingdoms carried the Presbyterians to a higher point than the papalists of the preceding age, for it enabled them to assert what was in theory a claim to complete independence, without denying the rights of the civil power or asserting that its authority existed only by grace of the hierarchy." (1)

It is easy to assert that a mutual recognition of rights, both civil and religious, by the contending parties, was the only solution of the quarrel, but it was this very recognition that was difficult to attain. The theory of the Divine Right of Kings precluded any such conciliatory measure being adopted by Charles I. On the other hand, the stricter exponents of Presbyterianism adduced/

---

(1) Divine Right of Kings, pp. 287-288.

adduced the same weighty reasons. So long as a divine origin was sought for and found by opposing theorists, so long was conflict bound to ensue. There is much to be said for both sides. The watchword of the 17th century was readjustment, the logical outcome of the sweeping away of mediaeval institutions and ideas in the previous century. Reaction was bound to follow the absolutist claims put forward by monarchs who had become possessed of new powers. The nature of that reaction, whether civil and constitutional, or religious, depended greatly upon the history and traditions of different countries.

(2) The second stage which we shall now consider shows a modification of policy brought about largely by the manner of the King's death. A strong feeling of repugnance swept over the Scottish people, resulting in the shaking of the Anglo-Scottish Alliance and finally in the severing of that ill-formed union. The policy of the extreme Independents became subject to severe strictures at the hands of the Scots who were now rapidly coming to the conclusion that the temporary union with the English was a mesalliance. This was followed by a curious result. The Presbyterians in Scotland had never been unpatriotic in their dealings with the king, and they were not antagonistic to the Stuart monarchy simply because it was a monarchy. They would /

would have been prepared to acknowledge Charles I. as their king had he been sympathetic towards Presbyterian government as the polity of the Church in Scotland. The "Engagement" of Loudon, Lanark and Lauderdale goes a long way to prove this. So also does the acknowledgement by the Covenanters of Charles II. as king on the understanding that he would subscribe the Covenants. Political aims entered very slightly into their calculations. It was Presbyterianism as a system of church government that mattered most to them.

The result of this provisional acknowledgement of the king was a temporary alliance between the Presbyterians and the Royalists in Scotland, the former being the more numerous of the two. This alliance was based first of all on a mutual recognition of monarchical government (modified in the case of the Presbyterians), and secondly on a common antaganism to Independency and Republicanism.

The tendency was, of course, for the Presbyterians to subject the Royalists to ecclesiastical rule and uniformity. This was seen later in the repeated requests for the purging of the army and of the King's household. Nevertheless it may be emphatically stated that there was no claim put forward for a pure theocracy. This is evident from the relations which existed between the Church and Parliament before /

before the final subjugation of Scotland by Cromwell. In the "Answer of the Commission of the Generall Assembly to the paper sent to them from the King and Parliament concerning Mr. James Guthrie and Mr. David Bennet" who had been commanded to remain at Perth or Dundee pending a fuller enquiry by the Committee of Estates into their attitude towards the public resolutions, the following proposition was stated: "That they do not find that the King's majestie and Committee of Estates in requyring the foirsaid brethern to compeir befor them, or the Committee of Estates in ordering them to stay at Perth or Dundie until a fuller meeting of the Committee, have trinched or encroached upon the liberties and priviledges of the Kirk, or wronged the same any wayes . . . . . This is so far from evidencing any encrouchment made by the King and Committee on the priviledges of the Kirk that, on the contrare, as thus layd down, without any qualification, it importeth a great wronging of the just right of the Civile Magistrate, as if it were not propper to him in any case to judge of these matters; which is contrair to the doctrine of the whole Reformed Kirk in generall, and particularlie of the Kirk of Scotland, to witt, that the Civile Magistrate has power and authoritie, and is obliged in his Civile and coercive way to censure and punish idolatrie, schisms, unsound doctrine, ministers neglect or perversions in /

in doing their ministeriall duties and functions."[1]

The same point of view regarding the relations of the Covenanters of this period and the State is insisted upon by Lord Guthrie who says "The General Assembly and its Commission, the result indirectly of popular election, were always more truly representative of the people of Scotland than the Scotch Parliament. This must be kept in view; and further, that the action of Assembly and Commission was often, as these Minutes show, due to a direct appeal to them by the king, by Parliament and its Committees, by municipal authorities and by the Universities."[2] Of particular moment are the questions regarding admissions into the Army, and the rescinding of the Act of Classes.[3]

It is impossible, of course, to speak of the Covenanters of this second period, as a unity. The seeds of division were early recognisable in their councils and debates, and the split into Resolutioners and Protesters which came about, was not unlooked-for. At the beginning of this period, those who eventually became the Protesters controlled the policy of the Church, but were forced to give way to the Resolutioners who were numerically stronger. We /

(1) Rec.Comm.of Gen.Ass. III. p. 329.
(2) Introd. to Rec. Comm. of Gen.Ass. III.xxi. xxii.,with substantive quotations.
(3) Rec.Comm. of Gen.Ass. III. pp.159, 440.

We shall examine later the dominant ideas of these parties. It is sufficient here to record this lack of unity and policy.

(3) The third stage in the policy of the Covenanters, after the restoration of Charles II. and under James VII. need not concern us, unless for purposes of definition, and to round off the whole. Division, the result of earlier conflicts, still remained in the ranks of the Churchmen, but the political events of the day brought about radical changes in their policy. This third stage, while it approximates more closely to the first than to the second stage, has yet characteristics all its own, due to the political happenings of the times. Here, indeed, the fear of Romanism was no empty fear, but, particularly in the later years, a reality.

Enough has been said, however, to show that it is impossible to treat the policy of the Covenanters as a homogeneous unity. While for clearness we have differentiated three phases of that policy, nevertheless, in each of the three, modifications and changes of policy are evident.

With regard to the dominating ideas of Church and State behind the Covenanters' policy during the first and second stages indicated, it is universally recognised that the teaching /

teaching of Calvin exercised a profound and far-reaching influ-
-ence upon the Church of Scotland ever since the Reformation.
It can scarcely be admitted that the system of ecclesiastical
polity promulgated by Calvin in his "Institutes" is what Lord
Acton has termed a "pure theocracy."(1) Indeed, a recent
exponent of the doctrines of Calvin, Dr. A. Mitchell Hunter,
affirms the opposing theory that "Calvin demanded that the
Church should exercise its purely spiritual function, un-
-hindered, unhampered, and uncensured by the State."(2)
This is certainly nearer the truth, but the relation of
Church and State is by no means definite in Calvin's
system of ecclesiastical polity, for while he urged the
intervention of the "Civil Magistrate" in ecclesiastical
affairs, he was never definite in his views regarding the
extent of his power in actual practice. As we have already
noticed the Church at this period put forward no claim for
a "pure"theocracy", though (following Calvin) the inter-
-vention of the "Civil Magistrate" was not only deemed
permissible, but was held to be necessary.(3)

At the same time, while the ideal of a "Civitas
Dei" upon earth dominated the thinking of Calvin, and
was put into practical effect by him and his co-religion-
-ists, yet Calvinism in its entirety as a system of

(1) Hist. of Freedom p. 178.
(2) Teaching of Calvin. p. 189.
(3) See Rec. Comm. Gen. Ass. iii. pp. 329-333 (18th Mar.1651)

ecclesiastical polity was not fully endorsed by Scottish reformers, for there were also other influences at work. Dr. Janet MacGregor in a recent work, has pointed out the debt of the reformed Church in Scotland to Calvinism, Lutheranism, and also in a marked degree to the French Reformed Church.(1)

Speaking of the 16th century she remarks "The most prominent influence from Geneva - through the example of the Genevan relations between Church and State - constituted a menace to Scottish Presbyterianism, in so far as it led the Scottish reformers to make demands on the State for support and protection, which were impracticable in the political circumatances of the sixteenth century in Scotland. Only if the Presbyterian form of the Scottish polity were sacrificed by the adoption of Episcopacy, could the Scottish executive have agreed to fulfil the demands of the reformers." (2) What she affirms of the influence of Calvinism upon the ecclesiastical polity of the reformers is well founded. It is also worthy of note that some of the tenets of Calvinism held by them (though not all) formed a useful foil to counter--act the theory of the Divine Right of Kings in the form adopted by James VI. for the one theory was as extreme in/

(1) Scottish Presbyterian Polity - p.105; See also Figgis - Gerson to Grotius - p.137. Lindsay: Hist. of the Reformation ii. p. 305.
(2) Scot. Pres. Polity pp. 133-4.

in many points as the other. By the time the seventeenth century is reached, however, particularly in the period under review, it must be recognised that Calvinism in Scotland was beginning to undergo certain modifications due to the political happenings of the day. Scottish

political and ecclesiastical affairs were in the melting--pot, and it was a long time before any coin came forth with a distinct stamp. This much may be maintained after an examination of the political and ecclesiastical struggles and controversies of this period, that Calvinism did not remain the sustaining force it was in the 16th century. Native influences were at work changing its texture, and ecclesiastical controversy served but to deepen the change. The weakness of the Scottish Estates certainly brought the Church into prominence, and made it possible for experiments of a theocratic nature to take place, but the defeat of the Scots by Cromwell brought these to a close. The split of the Church into Resolutioners and Protesters in a sense put Calvinism on its trial. For purposes of definition it may be said that Calvinism in its extreme form became henceforth confined to the Protesters. The Resolutioners on the other hand showed decided leanings towards a comprehensive policy, which in essence may be described as a working compromise between Church and State. Their policy marks a breakaway /

breakaway from the extreme Calvinism of the sixteenth century, and particularly from the extremities of that system so far as the relations of Church and State are concerned.

The rule of Cromwell, of course, broke into what might have been an interesting experiment, for the Church, rendered nationally impotent through the suppression of its most characteristic Presbyterian court, the General Assembly, could not formulate a revised system of ecclesiastical polity. The Restoration brought unforeseen factors into play, and thus prevented any development of a moderate nature.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RESOLUTIONER-PROTESTER CONTROVERSY.

At first sight it may appear as if an examination of this controversy were a fruitless quest. To some it is merely a quarrel among churchmen without any great bearing upon the opinions or events of the day; to others its chief interest is its disintegrating effects upon religious life. It is true that the principal result of this controversy was to weaken the Church's influence as a politico-ecclesiastical force in the country, and thus to make Cromwell's conquest easier. Nevertheless an examination of the details of the conflict is not without value, for only thus can an effective idea be had of the state of mind of the ecclesiastical leaders in the country. In addition, we are better able to gather what were the controlling ideas which dominated the policy of each party, for it is evident that the leaders of each faction were serious-minded men, and in face of national danger (as at the beginning of the controversy) only serious differences should have kept them apart.

It is easy from the point of view of our own comparatively enlightened age to condemn this controversy as a foolish ecclesiastical squabble, but that would be to lose our historical perspective. It is not so easy to face the problems /

problems which they had to face, and find a ready-made solution. The aims and ideals of each party can only be understood by a sympathetic examination of the fine points of the controversy as they appeared to them.

Our first task, therefore, is to go back to the stage when the ecclesiastical policy of the Church was undivided. For practical purposes such a point is found at the time Charles I. was executed. Then the Church was one, and the nation also, in protesting against this act of regicide. On all hands this act was regarded with unmitigated horror. The further acknowledging of Charles's son as king on condition that he subscribed the Covenants was also acquiesced in by all parties, and had he put his signature quickly and willingly to these documents, the course of the Scottish Church might have run more smoothly. As it is we can date the beginning of this controversy from this time, for the very apparent unwillingness of Charles to subscribe the Covenants raised the suspicion in not a few minds that he was lacking in good faith, and while some were willing to temporise with Charles, others were fully prepared to withdraw their temporary recognition of him as king. The centre of controversy was thus the Covenants, and the varying interpretations put upon them. It was held by the very strictest that a covenant was a bond to be entered on freely, not a political expedient to be dropped as /

as soon as it had served its purpose. On the other hand there were many prepared in the interests of the nation and the Church to put a milder interpretation upon the bond.

Of one thing we are certain, and that is that Charles was not anxious to sign the Covenants. To him they were obnoxious documents, bearing witness to a power which he was determined to possess alone. They imposed a limit upon the royal prerogative which he greatly resented, and he was not anxious to yield that power without a struggle. We have already seen how he temporised for a long time with two separate bodies of Commissioners, (see Chap.II), and how that the failure of the Duke of Ormonde in Ireland finally moved him to a decision. There is certainly truth in the statement of one of Cromwell's biographers that Charles was compelled to sign the Covenants voluntarily, but when all is said and done he need not have subscribed the Covenants. What forced him was his own desire to regain his father's kingdoms for himself, as much as the desire of the Scottish people to have him as king. The Covenants were nothing more or less to him than "scraps of paper", and the signing of them a political expedient to gain his own ends.

After the return of the Commissioners from Breda, there were some who questioned the king's good faith, and when /

when the king arrived later they determined to hold him strictly to his bond. To conciliate this party within the Church a policy of purgation was begun. The army was purged before Dunbar, and the king's household was repeatedly purged so that the king should be surrounded only by "the godly". It is only fair to say that these frequent purgings were questioned by many earnest churchmen who favoured a more moderate course in view of the circumstances around. From this moderate party sprang the Resolutioners; from the other the Protesters.

The final and definitive split in the ranks of the Church party took place after the battle of Dunbar. The purging of the army must have had a serious effect upon the strength and morale of the Scottish forces, but the extreme party within the Church were convinced that the cause of defeat lay in the nature of the Scottish forces which had been employed against the English. For them there were far too many malignants among the troops, despite the drastic purgings which had taken place.

Accordingly, after Dunbar, a Remonstrance was presented by this party on the 30th October to the Committee of Estates which was then sitting at Perth, rejecting Charles as king until they had sufficient evidence "of the reality of his profession" (see Chap.III). From this time onwards

h. 43.

they /

they began to assume shape as a separate ecclesiast-
-ical party, being known first as Remonstrants, and later more familiarly as Protesters.

The causes of this cleavage have already been examined and commented upon (see Chap.III). It remains for us to examine the various phases of this controversy after the dissolution of the General Assembly in 1653. While it may be said that the movements towards reconciliation were totally and finally abortive, they yet serve to demonstrate the religious and political opinions of each faction. They also show how difficult it must have been for Cromwell or his representatives in Scotland to formulate a religious settlement which would embrace the dissentient bodies. Further than that, this controversy had a distinct bearing upon future ideas, and upon ideas of Church and State. It was at this time that there were sown the seeds of future religious controversy which has persisted down to the present day.

It was exceedingly difficult for Cromwell to understand the religious situation in Scotland, but at the beginning his leanings were decidedly towards the Protesters. In March, 1654 he sent for three of the leading Protesters, viz., Patrick Gillespie (who was now Principal /

Principal of Glasgow University), John Livingstone and John Menzies "to give their advyce in matters of high concernment". (1)

Lilburne, writing to Cromwell hopes "there may bee a good providence calling them to attend your Highnesse, and they seem to bee somewhat sensible heerof themselves." (2) The three leaders of the Protesting party responded to Cromwell's request and repaired to London, though Baillie maintains "without much access to the Protestor". (3) Cromwell followed this by requesting two of the leaders of the opposing faction, Robert Blair and Robert Douglas with James Guthrie, a Protester, "to repair hither to London with all convenient speed". (4) "Mr.Blair excused his health; Mr. Guthrie, by a fair letter, declared his peremtoriness not to go; Mr. Douglas, by Monk's friendlie letter, gott himself also excused." (5)

There /

---

(1) See Baillie iii. 243.; Firth - Scot. and Prot.p.57.

(2) See Scot. and Prot. p. 57.

(3) Letters iii. 253.

(4) Scot. and Prot. p.102; Reg. Cons. Min. of Edin. p. 70; Row's Blair - pp. 315-6.

(5) Baillie - iii. 253, see also Row's Blair - p.316. Reg. Cons. Min. of Edin. p. 71.

There is no doubt that the action of these leading Resolutioners in refusing to go to London prejudiced their cause in favour of the Protesters. The practical outcome of the conference between the Protesters and Cromwell was the drawing-up of an ordinance "For the better support of the Universities in Scotland and encouragement of Public Preachers there" (1) The Ordinance provided for the visitation of the Universities and the presentation of ministers to vacant livings. In regard to the latter respect was to be had "to the choice of the more sober and godly part of the people, although the same should not prove the greater part." Certain ministers and elders were nominated (mostly Protesters), to deal with candidates, the country being divided into five districts. (2) This ordinance which became popularly known as "Mr.Gillespie's Charter" was not favourably received by either Resolutioners or Protesters. Monk in a letter to the Protester writes, "Your Highnesse may hereby perceive the present temper of the Ministers here, most of whom, (as well Remonstrators as others) are very much dissatisfied with the instructions brought doune by Mr. Galeaspe, and very few (if any) will act in it, but I perceive they do rather incline to declare against it." (3)

(1) Acts & Ordinances of the Interregnum iii.App.Cxii-Cxv. Baillie iii 282; Scot. and Prot. 211 ff.; 219. 220.
(2) Acts and Stat. Parl. VI. ii p. 761. Scot.Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum iii App. Cxiv - CXV. ~~VI. ii p. 761.~~
(3) Scot. and Prot. p. 211.

A month later in a letter enclosing a list prepared by Gillespie, containing the names of those who were likely to act under the ordinance, Monk writes, "I dare not bee soe bould as to give my advise what is best to bee don in it, though it may bee (I conceive) a meanes to unite the Ministers, because whether it may be a means to carry on your interest I cannot tell." (1)

Blair records that Patrick Gillespie and John Menzies had been instrumental in procuring this ordinance, and that they had inserted "the names of many honest ministers that were averse from that kind of Prelacy or supremacy that was given to them by that ordinance." (2) Among the names included were Robert Blair, Samuel Rutherford, Alexander Moncrieff, John Nevay, and William Guthrie of Fenwick, "but none did more abhor and detest it than Mr. Blair." (3) Several synods and presbyteries prepared declarations against the ordinance, among them being the Presbytery of Edinburgh, the Synod of Lothian, the Synod of Fife, and the Synod of Merse. (4). It was /

---

(1) Ibid. p. 220.
(2) Row's Blair - p. 318.
(3) Ibid. p. 318.
(4) See Row's Blair - p. 318; Baillie - iii p.283.

was held by them that this ordinance was contrary "to the established order and government of the Kirk of Scotland and contrary to our solemn covenants." (1) At a meeting of the Protesters Warriston was for condemning it, but in order not to split the party, the motion was dropped. (2) The Protesters, however, embodied their protests in a series of "Considerations of the Order of Duties of Ministers," the gist of which was that the ordinance was "arbitrarie and prelaticall." They held also that the right to admit entrants to the ministry lay with the presbytery, and that any other course was both "sinful and unlawfull." (3)

The remedy which the Protesters suggest is that "if those who doe cordially mynd the right planting of Congregations, wold meet and take counsell together amongst themselves in ordour to that thing, who knows what the Lord might lead them upon concerning the same?" (4). Even at this stage the lack of uniformity in policy between Resolutioners /

---

(1) Row's Blair - p. 319.

(2) See Baillie iii. p. 283.

(3) See Reg. Cons. Ministers of Edin. pp.57-69. Further illustrations of the antipathy shown towards the measure are to be seen in Nicoll - Diary pp. 137,163 and Letters from Roundhead Officers - pp 101.105.

(4) See Reg. Cons. Min. of Edin. p. 69.

Resolutioners and Protesters is evident, but the pious wish of the latter found no counterpart in actual practice when Resolutioners and Protesters met.

"Mr. Gillespie's Charter" did not bear much fruit, and in 1656 the Council in Scotland was instructed to admit such ministers as seemed to be qualified in terms of the ordinance." (1) "It's but the other week", wrote Baillie to Spang in 1656 in reference to the rapid demise of the ordinance, "that Mr. P. Gillespie's absurd order for stipends was gotten away; he puts us in hopes of more favours." (2)

In the summer of 1655 Cromwell appointed a Council of State of eight members, with Lord Broghill (third son of the Earl of Cork) as President (3). Broghill has been described as both amiable and accomplished, and the description suitably delineates his character as President. (4) He was inclined to be tolerant, but his letters to the Secretary Thurloe and to the Protector show that his chief design throughout his tenure of office was to act as mediator between the contesting factions in the Church without yielding to them any real power whatever (5)

---

(1) Acts. and Stat. Parl. Scot. VI.ii.p.832.
(2) Baillie - Letters iii 316.
(3) See Row's Blair - p. 320.
(4) See Law Mathieson - ii. 17a.
(5) See Thurloe - State Papers.

He was trusted and esteemed, however, by both parties because of the competence and common sense he displayed in his dealing with all classes.

One of his first Acts as President was to cancel an assessment which had been made on ministers' stipends by the Protector, in order to repair the English fleet which had suffered at the hands of the Spaniards. (1) Another matter which he disposed of in a quiet way was the thorny question of praying for the exiled king. Time and again this action of the Resolutioners brought trouble in its wake, leading in several instances to the imprisonment of offending ministers. (2) At first Broghill was inclined to take severe action against the offenders as is shown in a letter he sent to Thurloe, which reveals also his state of mind regarding religious controversy in the land. "I begin now to have some little light in affaires, and finde accordinge to the best thereof, that ther is much difference, at lest to us, between publicke resolutioners and the remonstrators; tho' I must confess I esteeme the latter the better sort of people; the former love Charles Stuart and hate us: the latter love neither him nor us. Their /

---

(1) See Row's Blair - p. 324.

(2) See Baillie - Letters iii 253.

Their anymosities are soe great, that I am persuaded they are hardly reconcilable to each other, and possibly both of them are the like unto us. Our honest general had a beliefe, that the remonstrators would have owned and closed with the present government, if the Lord Warriston and som others had not hindered it, as beleevinge it might have ruin'd theire interests. As I now stand informed, I thinke indeed, if you would put the power therefrom into their hands to suppress the others; upon which they are believed to be invettratly bent, that to accomplish that end, they would think noe thinge too deare. "Tis not impossible, but from this division som outward good may be wrought; but for a real closure, I doubt it never will be effected." (1) ✓

This policy of Broghill's was modified a little later in such a way as to take the severity out of the previous proclamation. The Council were ready, he wrote to Thurloe, to receive those "who shall evidence a desire of living peaceably and submissively" under the present government, and the penalties and restraints were taken off "against such as prayed for the pretended king /

---

(1) See Thurloe - State Papers. IV pp. 48,49.
✓ In a later despatch, Broghill reverses his judgment.

king and will patiently expect till the fifth of November next what good effects his tenderness will produce." (1)

Praying for the king, however, was still continued "not only in families and in secret, but in public, being involved in some general that did clearly enough design him to all intelligent hearers." (2)

The pamphlet war between Resolutioners and Protesters still continued. The latter indeed collected money for the printing of their works. (3) While, on the one hand, many of the Resolutioners accepted the measure put forward by Broghill, the extreme section of the Protesters would not tolerate it. Coupled with this measure anent the praying for the king was the one previously noted, whereby the stipends of ministers were not to be subjected to the provincial certifiers but to presbyteries. The Resolutioners, in accepting these provisions, were thus freed from the unwelcome attentions of the Protesters who formed the greater part of the certifiers in the various districts into which Scotland had been divided.

---

(1) See Thurloe - State Papers IV. p. 58.
See also Row's Blair - pp 324-5 and Firth - Scot. and Prot. pp. 321.2.3.
(2) Row's Blair - p.325. See also Firth - Scot.and Prot.p.322.
(3) See Row's Blair, p.325, note by McCrie.

Efforts had previously been made prior to the dissolving of the General Assembly to reconcile the differences which existed between the Resolutioners and the Protesters, but these had proved abortive. In June, 1655, overtures were again made by the Resolutioners, but no answer was received to these, and the question was not raised again until the November meeting was arranged, (1) Through the efforts of Robert Blair and James Durham a conference was finally arranged in November, 1655. (2) Baillie was by no means charmed at the idea of a conference for he "feared for the consequence of it." Accordingly he wrote a letter to David Dickson putting him on his guard anent the proposed deliberations. (3) Baillie's fears, however, were put at rest when the meeting did take place for "the Remonstrators had as little mind to unite with us as we with them. Mr. Patrick Gillespie indeed and Mr.John Carstares and a few others, were for capitulating; but Warristone Mr. James Guthrie and others, were as rigid as ever; yea whether by their contriveing or otherwayes, it wes so, that we could have no conference." (4)

---

(1) See Reg. Cons. Min. of Edin. p. 90.
(2) Row's Blair p. 325; Baillie - Letters iii pp. 278,9.
(3) Letters - iii 279.
(4) Letters - iii -. 279.

The conference lasted for over twenty days, and various papers were exchanged between them. (1) It would be tedious to describe the details of this unsuccessful meeting, but the salient points may be noticed in order to exhibit the attitude of mind displayed by the two factions. The overture made by the Resolutioners, dated 1st June, 1655, which was taken as a starting-point for the discussion displays an earnest desire for a reconciliation upon lines laid down in strict accordance with the government and forms of the Church of Scotland, and made as it was "to shun confusion and prevent a totall subversion of Presbyteriall Government" there was much in it to commend it to thoughtful minds. (2) The Protesters ignored in their reply the efforts of the Resolutioners to base the proposed union upon the principles that had in the past guided the polity of the Church, and fastened upon the vexed question of the controverted Assemblies of Dundee and Edinburgh. The shifting of the basis of discussion at once brought other considerations into the field of enquiry. The Protesters further ignored the proposal of the Resolutioners in the first overture that the /

---

(1) See Reg. Cons. Min. of Edin. pp. 92 to 184.

(2) See Reg. Cons. 91.

the purging of the Kirk should be in the hands of the Presbytery, with appeal to the Synod if necessary, but demanded that the Commission of the General Assembly of 1650 should be appointed for this purpose, failing which a visitation committee be appointed to consist "of an equall number of persons of both judgements, of knowne integrity and approven godliness and zeal for the work of Reformation."(1) This latter proposal, it may be pointed out, was not in keeping with the constitutional procedure established in the Church. The former, that of the Resolutioners, to make the Presbytery the purging body was more in keeping with the life, traditions and polity of the Church.

The subsequent replies and counter-replies centre largely round the interpretation to be put upon these previous declarations, and are merely an evidence of the circumlocutery methods which were devised, apparently to prevent any yielding of the positions assumed.

On the whole, the Resolutioners were prepared to yield more than their protesting brethern. At a later stage of the discussion they stated in a very concise manner regarding the controverted assemblies, "That we intend and /

---

(1) See Reg. Cons. Min. of Edin. 91-93.

and purpose that all Acts of either of these two late General Assemblies against any members of the Kirk for declineing of and protesting against the said Assemblies, shall be abrogated in order to peace as is mentioned in our overture; and for the same end that all declarations, warnings, and Acts of any judicatorie resulting upon the publict resolutions, be rendered of none effect as to censure." (1) The Protesters, however, looked upon this proposal "as concessions of meere grace and favour", and maintained that "it yields no security to the cause and people of God." (2) They continued to adhere to their proposition that Committees and Visitations for trial and censure should consist of an equal number of both judgments. (3) To the Resolutioners this demand for equality in numbers coming from a numerically inferior party, appeared merely as evidence of their desire for power. (4) Had this demand been conceded, it would only have succeeded in perpetuating their differences in Presbyteries and Synods, and would in essence have been no settlement at all. As the Resolutioners urged in a further reply, it only meant the /

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 126.

(2) Ibid. - 143.

(3) " - 145.

(4) " - 147-8. 152.

the "setting up of a new way formerly not heard of in this Kirk, of guyding all things by Committees of equall numbers of different judgements." (1) In closing this reply the Resolutioners point out again how their divisions had weakened the authority of church government, how that scandal and error was on the increase, and that Popery was becoming very prevalent. And in words that admirably described the situation as it appeared to outsiders, they remark, "Oh that they would consider that a famous Kirk is near already destroyed, and how we are made a lauchin stock unto all who are round about, while we byt and devour one another and spende the flowre and edge of our spirits one against another." (2) The reply to this from the Protesters was not delivered until nineteen days later, on the 17th December. The conference, however, recognising the futility of further discussion had dissolved itself on the 28th November. In this reply the Protesters notice that "our brethern are come a greater length than heretofore," but apparently they had not yet come far enough in their concessions in the eyes of the "godly party." (3)

It is interesting to notice how this conference for /

---

(1) Ibid. - 152.

(2) " - 158-9.

(3) " - 161.

for union appeared in the eyes of outside observers. Writing to Thurloe, Lord Broghill gives his verdict upon these courts in a way that shows that the prevailing disunion was more advantageous to the Commonwealth than union. "What you mention in your last of the 13th instant of the neare ripenes of the designs, shall make us as diligent as possible we can be, and make us minde the kirkemen, who have bin neer this fortnight in towne to see if they can agree; I mean General Assembly men and remonstrators, and tho they have com nearer a close than ever, yet Mr. Gillespy and others, who bring in dayly account of all is ther done, thinke there is but little hope thereof. But if they should close, it must make us the more eye them." (1)

The conference between the Resolutioners and Protesters had only one result, if it may be so called. It went far to prove that reconciliation between the two parties by a process of argumentation in order to settle their differences was a futile method. The only other course left open was to appeal to the reigning powers to step in and adjust the balance. That this was ultimately in the interests of the Commonwealth was recognised by Lord /

---

(1) Thurloe - State Papers IV - 223.

Lord Broghill in a despatch written a few months after the first appeal was made to his council. (1)

The Protesters were first in the field with their petition to the Council, but they do not seem to have recognised that an appeal to the reigning power was virtually an acknowledgement of the authority of the Commonwealth to settle ecclesiastical and religious differences. In their supplication they ask that a Commission drawn equally from both sides be appointed to purge the Church, or, failing that the Commission of the General Assembly of 1650, adding "that ye would be pleased to give countenance and give encouragement and assurance unto them in their endeavours for purging out of insufficient and scandalous ministers, and for planting of such, who are qualified according to the Word of God, and the acts and discipline of this kirk, for promoting the work of the gospel, and the power of godliness." (2)

This action of the Protesters in appealing to the Council in Scotland forced the Resolutioners to make similar supplications. Accordingly on the 30th January, 1656, they addressed a letter to Lord Broghill, with an accompanying /

---

(1) See Thurloe - State Papers V. 323.

(2) Thurloe - State Papers IV. 255.

accompanying statement of the reasons "why the power of the Commission 1650 cannot now stand in force." (1) Their letter to Broghill shows that they were apparently unaware of the full designs of the Protesters, for they mention nothing of a Commission drawn equally from both parties, but content themselves with setting forth from a constitutional point of view their reasons against the Commission of 1650.

Briefly, they maintained that the powers of a Commission expired at the constitution of a new General Assembly; that accordingly the powers of the Commission 1650 had expired in 1651, and could not logically be held to be in operation at this late date.(2) In a further petition compiled by certain ministers meeting in Edinburgh, and presented to the Council in February,1656,they ask "that you would be pleased to take off what restraints are putt upon the exercise of our kirk discipline and government, and permitt the ordinary judicatures to meet and act freely without interruption in matters ecclesiastick, as they have been in the use to doe, and are established by warrant of God's Holy Word, and the lawes of the land /

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 184-7. 187-190.

(2) Reg. Cons. 187-190.

land," (1) also beseeching them "that you would not grant the assistance of your power to these pretended publick Committees for which you have been petitioned of late." (2) With this petition they also included a list of previous Acts of Parliament bearing upon the government, discipline and liberties of the Church. The President in answer to these supplications said that "the Councill was to take some course for remedieing the forementioned evills." (3)

So far as the immediate future of the Church of Scotland was concerned, the issues now lay in Broghill's hands, and he had the further satisfaction of knowing that he had been approached by both factions to act as mediator in the controversy. His own policy is revealed in his letters to the Protector and Thurloe. To the former he sends a description of both parties, which shows how deep his knowledge was of the rival parties. Of the Resolutioners he says that they are not inclined towards the established government, but that they are a "strongly-cemented party", although having "too many amongst them not fitt for the callinge of a minister of the gospell." His indictment of /

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 192.

(2) Reg. Cons. 192-3.

(3) Reg. Cons. 197.

of the Protesters is no less strong. They are stricter than the others but given to flattering the established government, "and as much divided within themselves as from public resolutioners." (1) He then proceeds to outline his scheme, which was, to win over the public resolutioners after they had been purged, and if they were joined to the faction led by Gillespie and Livingstone, a model party might be formed. The Resolutioners had promised him to begin the purging of their party, hence his anxiety to create a new alliance. Broghill was apparently in receipt of information from both sections of the Church for he writes, "Mr. Douglas (who I may truly say is the leading/est man of all the Church of Scotland) was so ingenious as to tell me in private, that they were not yet fit for a general assembly, should we allow them to call one." (2)

To Thurloe he writes a short time afterwards, "I hope, if we manadge thinges well, the two partyes of Scotland, viz., remonstrators and publick resolutioners shall both courte us, as too long we have courted them. For the remonstrators haveingegot notice of what the rest of ther ministry have lately agreed unto with me (viz., that every presbytery /

---

(1) Thurloe - State Papers IV. 557 - to the Protector.

(2) Thurloe - IV. 557-8.

presbytery shall certify to the council heer the fitness in all respects of him, who within their limits is to have a benefice, and that the ministry certifyed for shall voluntary engage to live peaceably and inoffensively under the present government) they have called a meetinge, and, as my Lord Warreston is com to inform me, are resolved to employ some commissioners to his highnes, and to goe a length, which never yet they went, nor, as som thought, never would doe; the particulars I shall speedily know, and then I shall thrust on the others, who also are employing another to his highness, to give him the requisit assurance of their obedience and quiet deportment." (1)

Three days later he writes again to Thurloe asking him to speak to the Protector to take into account what he writes, before any arrangements be made, assuring him that those who are making solicitations to the Protector (i.e., the Protesters) "are the bitterest enemies against the government in all Scotland, as theyr writinges will show, which I bringe up alonge with me. Mr. Gillespy and the sober sort of remonstrators are free to signe. 'Tis Mr. Guttery (Guthrie) and those fierce men are against it, who in their writings call his highness's government usurped and unlawful." (2)

---

(1) Thurloe - V. 323.

(2) Thurloe - V. 336.

Broghill's correspondence is a most illuminating commentary upon the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland, particularly at this juncture. That he did succeed in making both factions "court" him, to use his own expression, was no small tribute to his insight and sagacity, considering also that his tenure of office lasted but a year. With all his amiability he did not undermine the Protector's influence in Scotland, but rather strengthened it, as the further moves of both Resolutioners and Protesters proved. It is interesting to note that while Broghill at first inclined towards the Protesters, he changed his opinions later and favoured the Resolutioners. In this he differed from Monk who rested his confidence in the protesting party. Indeed, after Broghill had quitted Scotland, we find Monk writing to the Protector in favour of the Protesters, affirming that "they are better to be trusted than the other partie which are called the General Resolucion men." (1)

It is exceedingly doubtful whether, once he had analysed the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland, Broghill was desirous that the leaders of the rival parties should come to terms. His letters point to the fact that he desired that an appeal be made to the reigning government. In /

---

(1) Firth - Scot. and Prot. 345.

In this policy Broghill was unwittingly aided by the intense rivalry of the two factions, and he had little to do but await events. During his tenure of office (Aug. 1655 to Aug. 1656) the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland altered considerably. After the dissolution of the General Assembly in 1653 the protesting party had been more favourable to the reigning government, and had received more favours at their hands than had the Resolutioners. In great measure due to Broghill's diplomacy, the latter had gradually veered round until the positions of the two parties became almost reversed. Many of the Resolutioners accepted the proposition laid down by Broghill to live "peaceably and inoffensively under the present government." This decision on their part helped to force the Protesters to assume a position that became gradually antagonistic to the English rule.

The Presidency of Broghill drawing near a close and appeals having been made to him by both factions, there was little he could do in the short time at his disposal to settle the religious controversy in Scotland. Twice in his despatches to London he had offered to send a minister to confer with the Protector with a view to reaching an amicable settlement. (1) Now this policy was adopted by the Resolutioners /

(1) Thurloe - IV. 597 - 700.

Resolutioners who had received word that the Protecters desired to take such a course.(1) The Protector was not averse to this for he seems to have recognised that the differences between the two parties were so fundamental as to demand arbitration. Besides, as in the case of the supplications to Broghill, this appeal to Cromwell amounted virtually to a recognition of the reigning government. For the Resolutioners, James Sharp, minister of Crail, was selected as a fit representative to plead their cause, principally on the recommendation of James Wood of St. Andrews and Frederick Carmichael of Markinch.(2) Blair, according to his biographer, "did not approve the sending of Mr. James Sharp to the Protector," and Baillie, writing to his friend Spang at Middleburgh, calls him "our professed friend."(3) Even at this early stage, it would seem as though some doubted the integrity of "Sharp of that Ilk", as the Protector so aptly called him.

Sharp was given explicit instructions what he was to say and do.(4) These related to the conflict between the Resolutioners and Protesters. and also included constructive /

---

(1) Row's Blair - 328.

(2) Row's Blair - p.328.

(3) Letters - iii 324.

(4) See Reg. Cons. 204-210.

constructive suggestions towards the settlement of religious affairs in Scotland. It is noteworthy that Sharp was instructed to "represent the inexpediency thereof for the time" of calling a General Assembly.(1) The short preamble calling upon Sharp "to give a right impression of the disposition of the ministers of this nation who stand for the publict judicatures of the Kirk, to live peaceably and inoffensively under the present Government" shows how the Resolutioners had been won over by Broghill's Leniency.(2) Indeed, in a letter despatched to Broghill at the same time they make mention of his goodness to them, and of their confidence in him, mentioning also that they owe to Broghill this favour of being allowed to send a representative to London.(3) Further communications were also sent to Broghill after he had gone to London, all having relation to the negotiations now begun by Sharp.(4) The Resolutioners also sought to strengthen their position by writing to certain members of the Council in Scotland, viz., Mr. Desborough, Colonel Wetham and /

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 204-5.

(2) Reg. Cons. 204: Baillie iii 368.

(3) Reg. Cons. 210-1-2.

(4) Reg. Cons. 218.224.240.262.

and Colonel Lockhart. In these they point out the unhappy plight of the Church through internal division and strife, and ask that they "may have the free exercise of their power in matters ecclesiastick."(1)
The assistance of certain prominent Presbyterian divines in London was also sought, viz., Edmund Calamy, Simeon Ash, and Thomas Manton.(2) (3) Samuel Rutherford had already written to Mr. Ash (though that gentleman was not unduly impressed) and the Resolutioners now sought to lay the facts of their case before these influential divines by giving them a history of the whole controversy, and inviting their assurance "to draw them yet to union and an accommodation, if it be possible."(4)

This policy of the Resolutioners in appealing to Cromwell was quickly followed by the Protesters, who, in October of the same year, 1656, sent James Simpson, minister of Airth, to represent their cause.(5)

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 246.
(2) " " 232-239.
(3) " " 340-348.
(4) " " 239.
(5) Baillie iii 353.

Simpson had been deposed by the General Assembly in 1651, but had continued in office, since he held that Assembly to be unlawful. In the beginning of the next year, 1657, Simpson was joined by James Guthrie and Patrick Gillespie, who, with the three elders, Inglestoun, Greenhead and Warriston (the last-named now in office under the Protectorate Government) constituted a formidable enough party in the Protesters' cause.(1) The proposals of the Protesters to the Protector were identical with those previously submitted to the Council in September, viz., to give a Commission "to such persons of abilitie and soundness who understand the affairs of the Kirk, as your Highness shall think fit;" to appoint a visitation committee for purging, composed of an equal number of both parties; and to make provision for a General Assembly of the Church, composed of delegates of equal numbers drawn from Synods.

In London the representatives of both parties busied themselves in courting the favour of influential people. Further instructions had been sent to Sharp towards the end of 1656, largely a repetition of previous instructions, but insisting that he should not discuss the affairs of the Church "with men deposed by the Generall Assembly," /

---

(1) Row's Blair - p. 330.

Assembly," who could only act as private persons and not speak for the Church. In January, 1657, the Resolutioners issued a detailed statement of the controversy entitled, "A True Representation of the Rise, Progress and State of the Present Division in the Church of Scotland."(1) This document sets forth in chronological sequence the various stages in the dispute, already well-known. In addition it gives an account of the courses adopted by the Protesters for the strengthening of their party, particularly the re-constitution of the Commission of the General Assembly of 1650; the holding of extraordinary Communions with six or seven celebrants; the intruding of ministers upon congregations; and the powers which they had acquired or arrogated to themselves under the ordinance received by the hands of Patrick Gillespie, whereby candidates of the opposing faction (i.e., the Resolutioners) were placed at a disadvantage. This latter ordinance, however, though mentioned in this document, had previous to this become a dead letter.

It is extremely doubtful whether the business of the ecclesiastic of either side had any tangible result, beyond bringing the fact of their subservience to the Protectorate more into prominence. Cromwell did summon the representatives /

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 292-340.

representatives of both parties to state their cases, and appointed a council of twelve to hear them. Whether he intended or not to grant either of their supplications is a moot point. As matters stood concerning the Church of Scotland, and concerning its influence upon national life, Cromwell had now nothing to fear. The Church as a vehicle of national expression was woefully impotent, and it was well from Cromwell's point of view to leave the situation as it stood. In essence that is what happaned. As Dr. King Hewison aptly describes the result "In the spirit of Felix, Cromwell said he would hear them at a more convenient season, and bade them go home and live in peace."(1)

Baillie has described for us how the overtures of the Protesters failed, excepting the one for the renewal of the Act of Classes, but through the intrigues of Sharp, even his sop was of no account, for he received "private assureances that it should doe no harm."(2)

There remained nothing for the controversialists to do but to return home, since nothing had been conceded to either side. Row very shrewdly sums up the Protector's policy in receiving them and dismissing them as empty as they came. "So did the Protector, as a feeder of the flame, fox-like carry himself, that neither of the factions should run down or ruin the /

---

(1) The Covenanters ii. 54.

(2) Baillie iii 353-4-5.

the other, but that they should still continue contending."(1)

The controversy continued to drag out its weary length at home. A Declaration of the Resolutioners issued in 1658 accused the Protesters of subverting "the present government of the Kirk."(2) It was answered by the opposing side in Guthrie's "Protesters no Subverters and Presbytery no Papacy." in which he asserts that the proposals laid down by the Resolutioners would mean the submission of his party and their ultimate absorption in a Church in which they had no guarantee that their principles would be followed out.(3) "So that contests wax bigger," say Row, "and by nothing so much as their printed papers."(4)

The death of Cromwell on 3rd. September, 1658, made no immediate change in government, his son Richard being appointed to succeed him. Nor did it alter the state of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland. The deposition of Richard, and the assumption of the reins of government by General Monk placed the affairs of the whole realm in the melting-pot. Beside the new situation thus created, the religious controversy of the Church in Scotland paled into insignificance. Monk had received encouragement from the Resolutioners, and principally from Robert Douglas, and had arranged that Sharp be sent to him

to /

(1) Row's Blair - 334.
(2) "A Declaration of the Brethern" 1658. Nat.Lib.of Scot.
(3) Protesters no Subverters".pp 99-118.
(4) Row's Blair - 334. See also Baillie iii 375-381,giving his strictures on Rutherford's "Survey of the Survey of that Summe of Church Discipline penned by Mr.Thomas Hooker."

to London.(1) The Scots were led to believe that Monk would work with a view to their well-being in religious matters, but it was not easy for him to guarantee anything definite, nor for them to place great reliance upon his words.

A final attempt at reconciliation was made, early in 1660, at the instigation of the moderate Blair.(2) To this meeting a number of representatives from both factions came, with others more moderately inclined. But although "there was a first some appearance of better accord and agreement," no union was achieved.(3)

The restoration of Charles II. a few months later completely altered the whole complexion of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland.

It is not our province to discuss the new situation which arose. Suffice it to say that the legis-lation of Charles brought new factors into ecclesiastical and religious life in Scotland. The Covenanters in name continued, but the political and religious considerations which entered into the new controversy were not the same. It is because of this fact (see Chapter V.) that we cannot speak of the policy of the Covenanters as a whole.

In /

---

(1) Row's Blair - 340. 344.

(2) Row's Blair - 343.

(3) Ibid. - 343.

In reviewing this deplorable condition of affairs in the Church of Scotland, one is tempted to ask, what were the fundamental differences separating the Resolutioners and Protesters? Were they political, ecclesiastical or religious? To the query prepounded no categorical yea or nay in either of these departments would suffice. It is no evasion of the question to answer that all these considerations at one time or another entered into the controversy. As has been remarked before in these pages it is impossible to separate politics and religion in Scotland during the 17th Century. They overlapped to such an extent as to make analysis difficult, if not impossible.

The Protesters claimed to be the "godly party", and there is no doubt that they embraced in their faction a goodly number of well-intentioned ministers of the Church. At the same time the Resolutioners being the more numerous of the two, were often credited because of their moderation, with having in their ranks men of little ability and low morality. Yet it must be recognised in this connection that Broghill's testimony (already mentioned) is not without some weight.

The origin of the disruption in the Church may be traced to what one is forced to call a politico-ecclesiastical difference, namely, the presence of the so-called Malignants in the army.

The /

The Protesters apparently looked on the conflict upon which they were engaged as a Holy War: the Resolutioners on the other hand took their stand upon the platform of nationality. As they point out in their "True Representation", "We doubt not that in the case of invasion by forraigne force, and when the whole nation is in common hazard, all subjects and compatriots as well those that are orthodox Christians as others, though they were idolaters, Jewes, Turks, heathens, may be called forth, and that a conjunction of them in armes for the defence of the Commonwealth and their own mutuall preservation is lawfull, yea, and a necessary duty." (1)

This fundamental difference remained a root cause of the separation that ensued, but in forgiveness or forgetfulness, not in legislation, lay the remedy. McCrie judiciously remarks "The great practical mistake of the Protesters lay in their demanding from their brethern repentant acknowledgments of past error, which, even had they been prepared to make them, were felt to be not only humiliating to their pride as individuals but prejudicial to the authority of the Church which they represented." (2)

Further than this there was a marked difference between the two parties so far as the upholding of the Stuart /

---

(1) See Reg. Cons. 305.
(2) Edit. note Row's Blair - 334.

Stuart dynasty was concerned. Believing as they strongly did in the religious and even divine character of the earlier conflict with that dynasty, those who ultimately became the Protesters were by no means averse to a democratic if not a republican polity. This explains the early attitude of the Protesters to the Cromwellian regime. Their brethern, the Resolutioners, adhered for long to their belief in the Stuart dynasty, and thus in a monarchical polity. It was only after the futility of it dawned upon them, backed by outside pressure, that the Resolutioners ceased to pray for the King, but even then he was mentioned in a circumlocutery fashion in public prayers. The republican polity of Cromwell did not at the first appeal to the Resolutioners, and even after the positions of the two factions changed, it was not so much love for that system of polity as expediency that was the motive of the Resolutioners. It is only fair to remark that the Protesters rigidly maintained their anti-Stuart attitude, though, as their party was divided, from different motives. Warriston, for example, became a convert to the Cromwellian republican view, and took office under the Protector.

Much may be said on either side with regard to their purely ecclesiastical differences. The Resolutioners certainly /

certainly made a mistake in endeavouring to exclude their protesting brethern from the 1651 Assembly, though as is remarked in the "True Representation," "This sayeth nothing against the Assembly 1652, where no prelimitations were, and yet they protested against it." (1) On the other hand, the conduct of the Protesters was unconstitutional in many respects, particularly in regard to the revival of the Commission of the General Assembly of 1650. None of them is really free from censure respecting the upholding of the constitution of the Church as previously formed. The only remedy for their ecclesiastical differences lay in wiping out the memories of past failings and aberrations, and in beginning anew, on the lines of their former ecclesiastical polity.

When the religious considerations per se are examined, so far as that is possible, we touch upon what had become through time fundamental differences. So far as the doctrine and faith of the Church were concerned, both groups were in the direct descent from the older reformers, using the same doctrinal methods and standards.

If anything, the Protesters were more strict in their views than their brethern, and by their celebrations of the Lord's /

---

(1) Reg. Cons. 319.

Lord's Supper and impositions of Fasts sought to live up to their title of the "godly party". The net result of all their efforts, however, was the formation of a new sect. While, therefore, political differences at the first seem to have been more prominent, there had always been a strong religious undercurrent, and as the controversy proceeded, these religious differences became more prominent, eventually becoming the chief barrier against reconciliation.

The Resolutioners, being the majority, embraced more heterogeneous elements than did their protesting brethern. Probably this accounts in some measure for their more tolerant views, which were condemned by their opponents as not tolerant but lax. The Resolutioners in their turn criticised very severely their brethern's rigid methods, particularly in regard to their use of Scripture. "A great noise is made of objections from places of Scripture gathered together in heaps..... Neither shall we enter into a particular examination of these Scriptures. Only this in the generall, most part of them are out of the Old Testament, spoken to the people of the Jewes then by divine visitation.....and so do not all touch our case of joint acting in armes for just and necessary defence of subjects of one nation habitually or antecedently incorporate and now in common hazard." (1)

This /

(1) Reg. Cons. 312.

This is a shrewd piece of criticism, with almost a modern note in it, applicable not merely to the controversy under discussion, but to many of the endeavours made by differing churchmen to claim Scriptural warrant for their actions. As yet, the general view of Scriptures was mechanical to a large extent. There was little, if any attempt to apply the tenets of a strict literary criticism to Scripture, with the result that the appeal to Scripture might be applied equally well to serve opposite ends.

CHAPTER VII.

LIFE AND WORSHIP.

The prominence of ecclesiastical controversy in this period to a great extent obscures much of the real work that was attempted and performed by the Church, despite the handicaps under which it laboured. Since the General Assembly largely controlled the national destinies of the people in Scotland, the abrogation of its power was bound to produce disintegrating effects upon the country as a whole, and upon the life of the Church in particular. The split in the Church and the emergence of two sects served but to hasten this process. The Synods, effective enough in their own sphere, could not take the place of an Assembly, representative of all classes and opinions in the nation. The axe had been laid to the principal court in the land and the most effective of national instruments, and certain disturbing effects were bound to follow.

Yet it says much for the merits of Presbyterianism as a system of ecclesiastical polity that much of the life and work of the Church continued under the control and direction of Presbyteries, and where divisions had penetrated too deeply into them, in many cases under the aegis /

aegis of individual Kirk Sessions. No doubt there was a distinct lack felt at times owing to the fact that there was no court of appeal, and it cannot be categorically stated that the tentative measures adopted always made for uniformity in practice and policy, nevertheless, the progress of the Church was not unduly hindered.

The generalisation is often made by writers on this period that Synods and Presbyteries continued to meet without interruption. While this may be true so far as the majority is concerned, yet the records of certain Synods and Presbyteries which are still extant reveal the fact that interruptions were not uncommon.

Prof. A.F. Mitchell, writing in reference to the records of the Synod of Perth and Stirling speaks of finding "a state of repression in that central province more systematic than previous research had prepared me to expect." (1) In 1652 the Synod met at Dunning, but the members were kept out of the church by those who favoured the English faction. In 1653 the Synod met, but "considering the poverty of the number and also the want of freedom, being interrupted by the soldiers of Captain Robertson's command," the meeting was adjourned until the spring. In 1654 the members met under fear of interruption, but were not /

(1) Rec. Comm. Gen. Ass. ii. xii.

not interfered with. At the next meeting in 1655 they reversed the order of procedure, the business being conducted first, and the sermon coming last. Only thus did they complete their work for a detachment of troops came in at sermon-time, and they were commanded to dissolve. (1)

The Synod of Fife was also interfered with in 1653, two English officers appearing to make sure that nothing was done which would prejudice the interests of the Commonwealth.(2) In 1655 when the Synod met once more, no business was transacted, owing, as Lamont informs us, to Monk's orders against public meetings.(3)

In Aberdeen a controversy had arisen because of the alleged "Pharisaicall way" in which Andrew Cant, minister there, was celebrating the Lord's Supper. The matter was taken as a last resort to the Synod, but "whill as this Assemblie was going about the trying of that mater in a most sober, peaceable and tender way, they were commanded peremptorily by ane officiar from the commander in cheife within the towne, to desist from medling any more in that business, or otherwise to ruse; upon which motion this Assembly waved this business, and layd it asyde to a more convenient tyme." (4)

As /

(1) Ibid. xiii.
(2) Lamont - pp 59-60.
(3) " - Diary p.86.
(4) Sel. K.S. Pres. and Synod Records of Abdn. pp.128&233.

As we have already seen, Lilburne was prepared to forbid the meeting of provincial Synods as well as of the General Assembly. Only the fear of a general rising on the part of the people prevented his taking this further step. As it was, Synods of large proportions were view with distrust, and were closely watched by agents of the government.

The Presbytery of Elgin was unable to meet in 1653 as "the meeting was interrupted by the Inglish troopers who had a number of ther horses in the church which was the place of meeting." (1) The case of Sir Alexander Irvine of Drum also serves to bring out the attitude adopted by the reigning government and its subordinate officers towards ecclesiastical disputes. Irvine had refused to subscribe the Covenant when called upon and had written to the Moderator of Aberdeen Presbytery in very strong terms making reflections upon the conduct of the Presbyterians. For this he was excommunicated, upon which he appealed to Colonel Overton, the English commander, whereupon the Presbytery was ordered to cease from pressing their strictures upon him. (2)

The ordinary church services were also on occasion interrupted. /

---

(1) Records of Elgin - 16th Nov. 1653.

(2) Prot. of Sir Alex. Irvine of Drum against Presb. of Aberdeen 1652. Spalding Club Misc. Vol. 16. See also Aberdeen and Banff - Cty. Hist. ed. Wm.Watt. p. 260.

interrupted. Thus in the Kirk Session records of Elgin we find a minute dated March 2, 1654. "No lectour, the Inglish horses being in the kirk," and this happened not infrequently in this congregation owing to English troops being quartered there.

Hogg, the minister of Leith was in 1655 ordered to cease preaching, the reason being that there came crowds to hear him. "For there mett sometimes 1500 neer our magazin." (1)

Owing to the suppression of the General Assembly the ordinary procedure of Church courts was greatly hindered, and there are not a few instances of irregularities in the conduct of affairs. One singular instance occurs in the appointment of a minister to the second charge of Stirling. In 1654 a vacancy had occurred through the death of David Bennet. The minister of the First Charge, James Guthrie, would not acknowledge the whole of the eldership as a competent Kirk Session, with the result that the Provost and Council, in the absence of the General Assembly, sought the advice of certain Edinburgh and Glasgow ministers. Later the Town Council appealed to the ministers of Edinburgh desiring them to "supplie this incorporatian with some of their britherine to preatche some few Sabothes to thame."/

---

(1) Thurloe - State Papers III pp. 439-440.

thame." Having agreed on Matthias Simpson to be their minister, they next approached Cromwell's Council asking "the libertie and freedome dew to thame for establishing their pasture whome they have callit." No answer was received, and another commission was sent to Edinburgh seeking a reply. Finally, Cromwell's Council arranged that Simpson be recognised and that he be entitled to the legal stipend as second minister.(1) This is only one of many irregularities that occurred in the life and work of the Church, due to the lack of a supreme court as well as to internal divisions and dissensions.(2)

It must not be assumed, however, that the English occupation of Scotland was entirely responsible for irregular procedure in the Church. The grievous cleavage of the Church into Resolutioners and Protesters brought with it strife and division into the remaining courts of the Church, and interfered greatly with what organising powers were left. The intruding of ministers upon congregations and the quarrels resulting therefrom were a common source of annoyance, and spelt disaster for many a congregation. From Baillie we hear of congregational disturbances at

Bathgate /

(1) Ext. Rec. Royal Burgh of Stirling pp.216-225. Baillie. iii 283-4. Guthrie and a few others had meanwhile given a call to a certain Rubert Rule.

(2) Baillie records others, iii 247.257-8. See also Dingwall Presb.Records, where the Presb.had to assume pro tem. the rights and privileges of a General Ass. in the re-admission of a minister. pp. 269-270.
A very late example of the powers exercised by Cromwell's Council is to be found in the Nat.Lib.of Scot.where there is a document showing that Mr.PatrickStrachan was "appointed by His Highness Council in Scotland for the Government thereof" to be Minister of Carmilly 4th Day of March 1657 (8)
See Charter B.20. Practices seem to have varied a great deal.

Bathgate, Lenzie, Douglas, Roberton, Glasgow, Stirling, Eccles, Campsie, Rutherglen, Cathcart and Sprouston, and no doubt there were as many more unrecorded.(1) We find also rival Synods and Presbyteries, each acting as the competent Synod or Presbytery. The Synod of Glasgow especially was seriously affected through the prevailing religious controversy.(2) Among the Presbyteries affected were Glasgow, Linlithgow, Lanark, Stirling,and Chirnside.(3) In Aberdeen the Synod was also split into two sections, and, as in the case of Glasgow, negotiations were later commenced in order to bring about a reconciliation.(4)

Thus the progress of the Church was hindered; bitter feelings were aroused; the Sacraments were neglected, and a chaotic state ensued where these disturbances were most rife. But we must also take into consideration that certain Synods had little or no wrangling in ecclesiastical matters. Baillie mentions the Synods of Angus, Moray and Argyll as free from controversy, while in Fife he says there were only a few malcontents, and in Lothian a few in the Presbyteries of Linlithgow and Biggar.(5)

---

(1) Letters iii 245-7-258.283-4. 313-4-5.
(2) Baillie Letters iii. 245-6. 254. 277-8.
(3) Ibid. iii. 245-7. 257. 284.
(4) Sel. K.S. Presb. and Synod.Records of Abdn. p. 234-7.
(5) Letters iii. 299.

In regard to the celebration of Communion we find that in many places there had been no Sacrament dispensed for a long period. In Edinburgh, Glasgow, St.Andrews, and Dundee this was the case, but the cause of it was in a measure due to the fact that certain magistrates were excluded from participation because of their intercourse with the English, and in order to obviate any trouble through them, the Sacrament was held in abeyance.(1) In 1665 there had been no celebration of Communion at Fodderty for twelve years. Apparently, however, this was not entirely due to the new regime, for we further learn that at Kiltearn in the same Presbytery no Communion was held from 1643-1650(2), this being no doubt due to the earlier religious troubles in the reign of Charles I. From the Kirk Session Records of Ayr we find that there had been no communion celebrated there between 1649 and 1656.(3) This much may be said to show that too great stress cannot be put upon these omissions. Communion was not celebrated then with the same regularity or frequency as is customary nowadays, there being always a fear /

---

(1) See Baillie-Letters iii 280; Nicoll Diary p.155; and Rogers - Soc.Life in Scot. quoting St.Andrews K.S. Record.
(2) See Inverness & Dingwall Records xxi.
(3) Annals of Ayr 1560-1692.

fear that such regularity might be mistaken for leanings towards Popery.

Yet it is surprising, despite the various irregularities which occurred during these years, how much real work was attempted and performed. Oppression and division did not entirely obliterate the interest and enthusiasm of both pastors and people, and within the limits prescribed for them by these contingencies, the life of the Church was at least maintained, if no great national progress was effected. Much of the real work of the Church was done in individual congregations, for in effect the polity of the Church had become an enforced congregationalism. In the Memoirs of Blackader we see how much was attempted and effected, despite the adverse circumstances prevailing. Weekly preachings were instituted, meetings for fellowship fostered, and the people encouraged to supply themselves with Bibles, in some cases monetary help being given for this purpose.(1) The Kirk Session records of Dalgety, in Fife, also reveal a state of conditions that almost seems idyllic in these troublous times. We find there all the regular parochial machinery at work, unless when extraordinary pressure rendered this impossible. Services were held most regularly, districts visited by elders, and the /

---

(1) Memoirs - Ed. Chrichton pp. 38-41.

the Sacraments were regularly dispensed. (1) Dalgety perhaps is an outstanding case of a well-organised parish, but wherever the organisation of the Church could be effectively put into operation, this appears to have been done.

It is impossible, of course, to sum-up in a general statement the condition of the Church as a whole, since conditions varied throughout the whole country. Much depended on the attitude of individual officers in Cromwell's service, so far as the reigning power was concerned, and again, ecclesiastical controversy affected some districts more than others. This much may with truth be said. Presbyterianism in Scotland had been crushed and seriously divided, but there still remained not a few indications which augured better times in store.

In the worship of the Church at this period we notice certain changes in order and procedure, due to diverse causes. Disorganisation in the Church naturally led in some instances to a lack of uniformity in practice, and paved the way for the innovations which the Protesters began to introduce.

The most outstanding of these is without doubt the increased prominence that came to be given to the celebration of /

(1) See Ross - Glimpses of Pastoral Work in Covenanting Times p. xiv. and extracts from records.

of the Lord's Supper. This Sacrament had not always, even before the English occupation, been celebrated regularly, but the Protesters who were responsible for the new methods, went far beyond the rule laid down by the Act of Assembly of 1645. So much so that in 1655 the Resolutioners in their overtures for union made mention of the fact that celebration of Communion should be in accordance with this Act of Assembly, "to prevent and remove confusion at communion." (1) The methods adopted by the Protesters brought increased notice and attention not only to the Sacrament but to their own party. In the "True Representation" there is an account of the proceedings which show the spectacular nature of their methods. "To omitt their way of admitting persons who came from other congregations, they do not now usually celebrate that ordinance, but they have a great many (sixe or seven, and sometimes double or more) of ministers gathered to it whose congregations (most part) are left destitute of preaching that day, great confluences from all the countrey and many congregations about are gathered at them and on everie day of their meeting (which are Saturday, the Lord's Day, and Monday), many of these ministers do preach successively one after another, so that three or four, and sometimes more do preach at their preparation, and as many on the Monday following, and on the /

(1) Reg. Cons. - 91.

the Lord's Day sometime three or four do preach before they goe to action, besides those who preach to the multitude of people who cannot be contained in the Church. These practices, as they are a clear violation of the order unanimously established in the Church, and do occasion great animosities and alienations in simple people against these ministers who will not imitate these irregular course, so uninterested observers do perceive a cleare designe in all this to set themselves up as the only pious and zealous people worthy to be trusted and followed in our publicke differences." (1) The Resolutioners also took exception to the institution of Public Fasts by their opponents, which only served to widen the breach between them,(2) These Fast Days were also employed at Communion seasons.(3)

We have already seen that both political and religious considerations were responsible for the ecclesiastical controversy which prevailed in the land. From the religious point of view alone, the statement of Dr.Leishman that they (the Protesters) were "a new evangelical denomination" aptly sums up the whole situation.(4) With the enforced disappearance for the time being of political issues, the Protesters were now proceeding /

(1) True Repn. Reg. Cons. 326. See also Ibid. 106.110. Also Lee - Hist. ii 312.
(2) True Rep. Reg. Cons. 327.
(3) Ibid.327. Also Leishman in Story's Hist. of the Church of Scotland Vol.V. p.391.
(4) Leishman Vol.V. p. 389.

proceeding on their course as a new religious body, and the fact that there was no supreme court of the Church meeting gave them added opportunity to further this schism.

Certain other changes in ritual appear about this time, most of them being the application of previous statutes and customs which had been allowed to fall into desuetude. The Westminster Directory, approved in 1645, was in general use in the Church, but practice varied occasionally. Thus we find the Edinburgh ministers in 1650 viewing the discontinuance of week-day morning and evening prayers as injurious, instituted a daily lecture, each minister having to officiate in turn.(1)

By the Westminster Directory of 1645 the office of reader had been virtually discontinued, the result being that there was no reading of Scripture or singing of psalms on Sundays.

Psalm-singing was re-introduced by the Edinburgh ministers and the catechising of two boys in public every Sunday was instituted to take the place of the ordinary reading.(2)

The ritual in the Church, however, varied greatly in different districts, in part due to the lack of national organisation and to the disunion which prevailed.

One /

(1) Nicoll - Diary p.5. McCrie - Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland. p.224.
(2) Nicoll - Diary pp.114-5.

One change of national importance occurred immediately before the beginning of the English occupation of Scotland. The General Assembly of 1649 ordered the Commission of Assembly to print and publish a new version of the psalms which had been prepared by Francis Rous, Provost of Eton College.(1) The use of any other version was prohibited after 1st May 1650. It has to be noticed, however, that Rous's version underwent a change at the hands of Scottish revisers, and that certain older tunes, as a result, were retained in the new psalter.(2) Baillie, indeed, had serious doubts, because of Rous's connection with Cromwell and with Republicanism generally, whether "a Psalter of his framing, albeit with much variation, shall be receaved by our Church."(3) The later history of this compilation shows that his fears were groundless.

The only other innovation of any importance during this period that calls for remark concerns a new mode of preaching, of which Baillie has given us an account. Speaking of the admission of one Andrew Gray to the Outer High Church, Glasgow, he says, "He has the new guyse of preaching, which Mr. Hew Binning and Mr. Robert Leighton began, contemning the ordinary way of exponing and dividing a text /

(1) Baillie iii 97. Sprott-Worship of the Ch.of Scot.1638-1660 p.34.
(2) McCrie - Pub.Worship. p.221.Sprott of Ch.of Scot. p.35.
(3) Letters iii 97.

text, of raising doctrines and uses; but runs out on a discourse on some common head, in a high, romancing, unscripturall style, tickling the ear for the present, and moving the affections in some, but leaving, as he confesses, little or nought to the memorie and understanding." (1) Bailie's animadversions, however, were in reality the result of prejudice, for both Binning and Leighton in their day were regarded as preachers of outstanding merit, and their sermons were published and re-issued in later times.(2)

Taken as a whole, the worship of the Church at this period exhibits no great radical change, with the exception of the vagaries of the Protesters. It remained strongly Presbyterian in character, and was uninfluenced to any extent by English customs or usages. Without a doubt, the polity of the Church accounts for the mould in which the ritual of the Church was cast, and the uniformity which on the whole prevailed is strong proof of the efficacy of Presbyterianism as a system of ecclesiastical polity.

The suppression of the General Assembly by the Cromwellian government and the unhappy schism which rent the Church prepared the way for the rise and progress of sectarianism in Scotland. That is not to say that this would not have come in time, but a divided and oppressed Church /

---

(1) Letters iii 258-9.
(2) See Lee. Hist. ii 313-4.

Church was more susceptible to such influence. The presence of English troops, and the inter-marriages which took place were also contributing factors.

The spectacle of a divided Church in Scotland has caused much ridicule to be heaped upon it and upon Presbyterianism by such historians as Andrew Lang, but we have to remember that England presented also a scene of confusion in ecclesiastical matters far surpassing that in Scotland. The principle of toleration was indeed the only one which Oliver Cromwell could safely have adopted in a land where Presbyterians, Quakers, Fifth Monarchy Men, Brownists, Separatists, and adherents of voluntary associations found themselves at variance one with another. Writing of this period in England Dr. Shaw truly says "The ecclesiastical history of this period is simply a record of confusion. The key to the religious problems of the Commonwealth is to be found in the conflict between the political necessity which drove Oliver to attempt to conciliate the Presbyterians and that exalted conception of freedom and toleration which distinguished him beyond all his contemporaries."(1) This "ecclesiastical confusion" spread to Scotland on account of the influences already noted and in contemporary documents we find many records of the activities /

(1) Camb. Mod. Hist. IV. Ch. xv. p.453.

activities of the principal of these sects, which reveal the extent to which sectarianism in Scotland.

In a News Letter from Dundee of date 8th Jan. 1651 we find mention of the fact that the people in Sutherland "will rather leave their owne ministers and come to private houses where our officers and souldiers meete together."(1) That the propagation of Independency was contemplated thus early is to be seen from an extract from the contemporary Mercurius Scoticus advocating the removal of certain preachers and the establishment of Independents "at Edinburgh, Glasgow, S. Johnston (Perth), Dundee and Aberdeen, and one or more considerable Townes in this Nation."(2) A few Independent congregations were ultimately established particularly in the Lowlands, during the year 1652.(3) These congregations in all probability had their origin in places where garrisons had been established.(4)

In 1653 we find Colonel Lilburne writing that many had come "into a neerer communion with those that truly feare God amongst us, and divers are become Members of Churches." /

---

(1) Scot. and Comm. p.31. See also p.364.

(2) Ibid. p. 339.

(3) " p. 370.

(4) " Int. xxxix. xl.

Churches." But he complains that "many more would if meanes were nott wanting amongst them." (1) Particular mention is made by Monk of "congregational ministers who have bin instruments of much good in Scotland," and he acknowledges thanks in a further letter for the pro-vision to be made for them by the Commissioners for the visi-tation of the Universities out of the treasury of vacant stipends or otherwise.(2)

Reference is also made to three "re-baptised churches in St. Johnstone's, Leith, and Edinburgh," but these were churches "consisting of officers, soldiers and others," where garrisons had been planted. The movement in the direction of sectarianism was viewed with great disfavour by the Presbyterians in Scotland. In 1656 and 1657, the ministers of the Synod of Fife were ordered to proceed against anabaptists in their parishes.(3)

Despite the proselytising which proceeded in some parts and the encouragement given to Independent congregations by Lilburne and Monk, comparatively little was achieved that was designed to be permanent. With the /

---

(1) Ibid. 123.

(2) See Scot. and Prot. 185.193. Also Nicoll - Diary p.267.

(3) Eccl. Records. Synod of Fife 176.180. Also Presb. of Cupar, 176-7-8. 182.

the Restoration and the recall of English troops from Scotland, much of the work that had been effected became undone.

When we came to the rise and spread of Quakerism, there is abundant evidence that this sect attained greater proportions than did their Independent brethern. Nicoll makes numerous reference to the Quakers, invariably with the note that they are on the increase.(1) The sect was not viewed with favour by the officers commanding troops, particularly because of their doctrine of the equality of all men.(2)

From Jaffray's Diary we learn that meetings were held in the south of Scotland as early as 1653, but not under recognition of the Society of Friends in England.(3) From the same source we get the information that two agents came north from England in 1654 and other two in 1655.(4) George Fox, the founder of the sect, was in Edinburgh in 1657 and preached there.(5).

Quakerism, /

---

(1) Nicoll - Diary - 147-8. 153-4. 177. 193. 250.

(2) See Scot. and Prot. 350-1. 362-3.

(3) Diary - 229.230.

(4) Diary - p.230. See also Thurloe - State Papers VI. 136. 145. 162. 167. 208. 215. 241. re activities of Quakers.

(5) Jaffray - Diary p. 230.

Quakerism, however, was greatly suspected by churchmen in Scotland. Baillie, recording in 1656, their activities in Clydesdale says, "their increase is feared," and in 1658 he mentions "Lenzie, Douglas and other places, most where that faction had been troublesome."(1) A minute of the Presbytery of Lanark records that names of Quakers were to be given in, Lesmahagow and Douglas being particularly mentioned as stronghold of the new faith.(2) Those embracing this new form of the faith were to be excommunicated.(3)

Despite all this, the sect continued to exist and to gain converts but it was not until after the Restoration that they began to make real progress.

An examination of the actual life of the people during the Commonwealth and Protectorate brings us face to face with facts and problems that are not peculiar to the regime of Cromwell, but are a marked feature of 17th Century life in Scotland. In discussing the influence of Cromwell upon Scotland as a nation and people we shall see later the results of his rule. The ecclesiastical records of this period and before it, which are a principal source of information, are full of much unsavoury material and the presence of this in these records /

---

(1) Letters iii 328,357.

(2) Records. Presb. of Lanark. p. 101.

(3) Ibid. p. 103.

records has often led students of history to make false judgments upon the religious life of the people, and the influence that was exerted by the Church. The Rev.Wm.Stevenson in editing the records of the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy has given in short summary a very interesting commentary upon the morals of the times, which helps to explain much that is contained in similar records.

(1) The fact has to be taken into consideration that the people were only two or three generations from the period of the Reformation.

(2) The common people were generally ignorant for education was not yet widely diffused.

(3) There was no example set them by their superiors in regard to questions or morals.

(4) Everybody belonged to the Church in these days. Consequently we know the worst that can be told about the people, for the Church in these times performed the duties of Police-Court and Registrar-General. (1)

When the subject is examined in the light of these remarks, a different complexion is thrown upon certain matters. We cannot, for one thing, read our own social ideas and ideals into the seventeenth century. That would be to alter completely the /

---

(1) See the Presbytrie Booke of Kirkcaldie 1630-1653. Int. by Rev. Wm. Stevenson. A contrast is offered in the editorial note to Records of Lanark Presb. but the writer's prejudices are too violent to admit of endorsement here.

the bias of history and prevent an exact understanding of the period. Further than this, we have to consider the chequered career of Presbyterianism in Scotland from the Reformation to the Restoration. From the very first Presbyterianism had to fight for its existence, and even when it was established and allowed there was no saying when it might fall. From the ecclesiastical point of view the policy of James VI. and his son Charles made it incumbent upon the Church to continue in the political arena. The overthrow of Presbyterianism, partial at first and complete afteewards, certainly made the Church, whether Presbyterian or Episcopal, less effective as a social instrument. The opportunity of Presbyterianism only came at a later date when political questions ceased to have the same enthralling interest for Church members and leaders. What social influence was exerted on a national basis was exerted by the only organisation capable of it, namely, the Church.

That is not to say that the Church had not failed in some measure to make more headway. Nicoll the diarist complained of the great interest taken in political affairs by Churchmen, and it is a sad commentary upon ecclesiastical history that too great participation in political life in the past hindered the Church as a social and spiritual agency. The problem admits of /

of too many implications, however, to be adequately summed up in a few sentences. Had the course of history been different and the Church freed from the political ties which had been forced upon it, it might have effected more for the social life of the people.

Apart from the immorality that is shown in almost every record and diary, the most interesting feature in the social life of the century is the strength of superstitious beliefs. The amount of references in the brief period under discussion and the variety of weird beliefs exhibited reveal the power of the opinions held. Witchcraft was by far the most prominent cult to come under the censure of the Church, but the belief in witches and witchcraft was not confined to ecclesiastics. It was an almost universal belief, shared in by learned and ignorant, by physicians and politicians as well as ecclesiastics.

Andrew Lang waxes eloquent on the subject of the cruelty of ministers in regard to professed witches, and the shortcomings of Presbyterianism in Scotland at this time, citing the conduct of one Walter Bruce, minister of Aberdour, as representative of ecclesiastical cruelty.(1) But to be impartial one has only to examine the Kirk Session records of a neighbouring parish, that of Dalgety, to find that it is singularly /

---

(1) Hist. Vol. III. p. 260.

singularly free of such atrocities. Bruce, it may be noted, was an Episcopalian under Charles I, a Presbyterian under the Kirk and Cromwell, and Episcopalian under Charles II. after the Restoration, a sort of Vicar of Bray, as Dr. Ross calls him.(1) Evidently, therefore, the form of polity was not at fault in this instance.

The practice in dealing with witchcraft seems to have varied in different places, and there is no doubt that sometimes cruelty marked the proceedings. In some instances professional pin-prickers were employed to find the devil's mark, but in others such barbarous methods were dispensed with.(2) So far as the law was concerned, Parliament and the General Assembly seem to have been unanimous as to the evil of witchcraft and the need for legislation. In 1644 Parliament endorsed a recommendation of the General Assembly that a conference of lawyers, physicians and ministers be appointed to consider what steps should be taken to suppress witchcraft. Nothing, however, was effected, and in 1649 the General Assembly proceeded on its own initiative to appoint such a conference.(3) During the Commonwealth and Protectorate witches were tried by the English officials and some condemned. On the whole a liberal and /

---

(1) See Fasti Eccl. Scot. Vol.II. p. 575. Also Ross - Glimpses of Past.Work in Covenanting Times - quoting K.S. records of Dalgety.
(2) See Records - Presb. of Lanark. pp. 75.78.80. Presb. of Cupar. pp 130.142; Presb. of St.Andrews p.58.
(3) Acts. Gen. Ass. 216-7.

and humanitarian policy was adopted, for we find Baillie writing in 1661 of the closing years of the English regime, "There is much witcherie up and downe our land; though the English be but too spareing to try it, yet some they execute.(1)

Besides the profession of witchcraft, alleged or imagined, there were many other superstitions in the lands, practised by people who in all probability had inherited their fears as relics of the Dark Ages. In the records of Dingwall reference is made to the action of certain people in burning torches through their corn on St. John's Day. (2) At Applecross certain people were accused of sacrificing bulls at a certain time upon the 25th August, this day being dedicated to St. Maoelrubha or St. Maelrue, an early missionary to the Highlands. Excursions were also made to certain ruined chapels, round which they marched. When making a journey it was customary for some to use a round stone with a hole in it. If their heads fitted into the stone, they expected to return, but if not, the sign was ominous.(3)

In some parts of the country pilgrimages to wells were a common superstition. The well of St.Fithac, in the Bay of Nigg, near Aberdeen, was one of those places of resort, as was /

---

(1) Letters iii 436.

(2) Records. Presb. of Dingwall p. 268.

(3) Ibid. p. 280.

was also the Well of Seggett, in Turiff.(1) In 1659 the Synod of Aberdeen also recommended ministers to speak against, "charming, heathenish customes in cutting of thee heades of beasts and careing off them from one laird's lands to another."(2)

Whether witchcraft and superstition in this age can really be accounted for as "the reflection by a diseased imagination of the popular theology" is exceedingly doubtful. The roots of these superstitions lay deeper than Calvinistic theology, for many of them have a history that can be traced to pre-Reformation times. Superstitions are long in dying out, especially where ignorance is rampant. The lack of a systematised scheme of education in Scotland (despite Knox's efforts and the ideals propounded by him) and the chequered career of Presbyterianism made it impossible for a sustained influence to be exercised. The rule of Cromwell in Scotland was also too short to exercise any influence of a permanent character. The leniency of his lieutenants in regard to these matters shows the breadth of the views they entertained in comparison with those prevailing generally in Scotland.

We have already seen the measures adopted by Cromwell in 1654 anent the Universities in Scotland and their maintenance. It cannot, however, be said that the Commonwealth and /

---

(1) Records K.S. Presb. and Synod of Aberdeen.

(2) Ibid. p. 250.

and Protectorate furthered to any extent the cause of education in the land. We find Baillie remarking frequently the scarcity of students in the college at Glasgow, and there is no record of any great activity in any of the other colleges.(1)

As already seen, Cromwell's chief aim in controlling the Universities was a political one, and evidently was not dictated solely by educational considerations. In regard to general education it must be said that the suppression of the supreme ecclesiastical court had an adverse effect upon national education, for up to this time the control of educational matters had been in the hands of churchmen. Yet we find the Presbyteries for the most part continuing the regulations laid down by Act of the General Assembly of 1645. This was to the effect that every Grammar School was to be visited by representatives of Presbytery and Kirk Session in landward parishes, and in burghs by the ministers and town council.(2) References are also to be found in most records of provision made by Synods, Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions for the maintenance of bursars at college, for the upkeep of schools. /

---

(1). See Baillie iii 199. 205-6-7.

(2) See Dingwall Presb. Records. Also Records of Elgin for visitation of schools and appointment of schoolmasters.

schools, for the appointment of schoolmasters, and for anything else connected with the welfare of the children at school.(1) A common notice is that of collections taken for bursars at college or for poor children. The very full reference to educational matters in the records of Dalgety Kirk Session show what could be attempted and performed, and within the limits prescribed because of the difficulties of the times this seems to have been a general experience.

Of actual English interference in educational matters in the schools there is scant reference. The Cromwellian governor at Inverness did take an interest in the district appointed to him, and "directed ane letter to the Presbytery of Dingwall for triall quhat mortifications has formalie (formerly) bene allotted for maintenance of schooles in all paroches." The Presbytery was further directed to see that schools were provided, but no practical result followed from these measures.(2)

It cannot be said that the system in operation before or during the Cromwellian regime attained to the ideal set the Church by John Knox. The times were troublous and prevented any /

---

(1) See Records. Synod of Fife - p. 166. Presb. of Lanark pp. 66-67: Presb. of Cupar - p. 136.: Presb. of St.Andrews - p. 65; vide Ross - Glimpses. pp.44-45-49-50. Presb. of Elgin - passim.

(2) See Records - Dingwall Presb.

any real advance being made. The coming of Cromwell made no difference to education in the schools, nor did his rule leave any impress upon educational policy, and while the Church continued to be divided little headway upon a national scale could be made.

CHAPTER VIII.

A SHORT SUMMARY OF GENERAL EFFECTS OF CROMWELL'S RULE UPON RELIGIOUS AND NATIONAL LIFE IN SCOTLAND.

It is perhaps not just to compare the rule of Cromwell with that of any of the Stuart kings in Scotland, They entered into a heritage which was explicitly regarded as their own; Cromwell governed as an interloper and conqueror. In addition, the period of his actual rule was of such short duration, that any comparison with former rulers would only serve to convey a wrong impression. The weaknesses of Cromwell's government are very apparent and may be shortly summarised here.
(a) It was a despotism. Whether benevolent or otherwise is beside the point at present. Scotland was ruled as a vanquished country, and even the representation given to her in the Commonwealth Parliaments could not efface this knowledge. Indeed, as S.R.Gardiner remarks, "the Scottish people had everything to gain by a return (of monarchy), and were certain to oppose themselves to any government which stood in its way." (1) Dr. A.F.Mitchell puts the case very strongly in his summing-up of Cromwell's influence when he declared, "there can be no question of the military genius or personal prowess or piety of Cromwell. /

(1) Cromwell's place in History, p. 65.

Cromwell, nor of the high-toned morality or many of his entourage, nor of the worthiness of the ends aimed at in much of his foreign and domestic policy", yet these things "ought not to be allowed to blind us to the false--ness of the position in which he put himself towards the legitimate aspirations of the nation, nor to the unworthy trickeries and cruelties to which at times, in maintaining his position, he condescended to have recourse." (1) There can be no doubt that both the strength and weakness of Cromwell's position as supreme ruler in England, Scotland and Ireland lay in the military despotism which of necessity he had to assume. From the very first, his policy in Scotland was therefore out of sympathy with national interests.

The result of this was that his rule was intensely disliked by the majority of people who were jealous of national interests, and disposed to think that Scotland's place in the incorporating union with England was no better than that of an inferior dependency. National aspirations, however, were curbed by the presence of troops in the land, as well as by the measures taken for the enforced dissolution of secular and religious institutions of a national character. The break-up of the General Assembly by Colonel Cotterell's troops acting upon Lilburne's orders serves /

---

(1) Ass.Comm.Rec. ii. Int. ix.

serves but to show the weakness of Cromwell's military despotism, and manifests the fear that dictated Lilburne's policy. Thus it was that Cromwell became, to use Hill Burton's words "the emblem of forced obedience." (1)

(b) It is not our province here to discuss the economic policy of Cromwell in so far as it affected the trade and commercial outlook of the people in Scotland. But along with ecclesiastical and religious considerations there were others of a purely secular nature which contributed generally to the spirit of antagonism shown in many quarters to the Cromwellian rule. In particular, the heavy taxation of the people, principally for the upkeep of garrisons in their own land militated against the success of the Commonwealth government. It was a common complaint of Baillie's that the people were groaning under very heavy burdens.(2) That this was no exaggeration on the part of Baillie is seen from the reports submitted by Monk to the Protector, to the Committee for the Army and to Lord Broghill, where he continually speaks of the wasted nature of much of the land, the lack of trade in the burghs, and the impossibility of raising the stipulated assessments.(3)

It is not that this is the principal question at issue, but it was a very important one, and the cumulative effect of these hindrances, both religious and secular, was to keep alive a spirit of antagonism against everything that was

(1) Hist.of Scot. VII. p. 75.
(2) Letters iii.288,318,387.
(3) See Firth: Scot. and Prot.162,190,195,202,295.Also Thurloe State Papers, VI.330.

was attempted in the name of the Commonwealth.

(c) As already noted, sentiment in Scotland was almost wholly against the Cromwellian rule, because of its despotism. There were other considerations also at work. Republicanism as a system of government was wholly alien to the thought and wishes of most of the people, and its counterpart in the ecclesiastical sphere, Independency, was no less heartily contemned. The Restoration, in its initial moments, goes far to prove how deeply ingrained was the respect and liking for the ancient line of the Stuarts. In the north especially the hope of replacing the Stuarts on the throne was tenaciously held. Not a few Scotsmen in the Midlands and South, including Johnston or Wariston, did indeed accept office under the new government, but expediency was very often at the root of their compliance. We have already noticed that Independency as a system of ecclesiastical polity did not progress to any great extent in the kingdom. The quarrels of Churchmen might go far enough, but Presbyterianism was still regarded with veneration as the national form of religion, and of ecclesiastical polity. The national spirit, indeed, was not without its religious and ecclesiastical bias, and the Church, though rent and divided, still stood for the national aspirations of the people.

Against this, Cromwell had very little to offer. Problems of domestic policy in England and foreign policy on the /

the Continent absorbed his energies and attention. As James VI. ruled Scotland by a clerk of council, so it may be said of Cromwell that he ruled Scotland through his subordinates. Lilburne and Monk certainly displayed a realisation of what was necessary to keep the land under control, but it was left to Lord Broghill to effect a temporary reconciliation through his readiness to modify the policy of his predecessors, this being done without prejudice to the interests of his government.

Nevertheless, Cromwell's rule in Scotland was not without certain redeeming features. Poverty still continued, despite the introduction of a free trade policy, but there was a certain stability and orderliness about his regime which commended itself to many. It is impossible, of course, to go the whole length with Kirton in what has been described as his panegyric on the English rule. He regarded the interval between the two kings as "Scotland's high-noon", when the only complaint was that of people who had not liberty enough to sin. (1)

At the same time there is abundant evidence that the rule of Cromwell exercised a beneficent influence upon Scotland. Writing from a knowledge of the English policy in the North of Scotland, Dr. Cameron Lees says "There can be no doubt that the soldiers of Cromwell exercised

a /

(1) See Kirton - Hist. pp. 48-50.

a civilising influence in the North, as throughout Scotland. . . . . Even the Royalist minister of Kirkhill grows eloquent as he writes of all they did for Inverness 'They brought such stores of all wares and conveniences to Inverness that English cloth was sold as cheap as in England . . . . . They not only civilised, but enriched the place.' One thing they certainly did beyond all doubt - they kept the Highlands in order, and repressed with strong hands those clan feuds and robberies which form so great a part of Northern history, and which at their departure broke out with the old violence." (1)

Cromwell's own dictum upon the English rule provides an interesting commentary from another point of view upon Scottish affairs. Speaking to his Parliament in 1658 he remarks "In good earnest, I do think the Scots Nation have been under as great suffering, in point of livelihood and subsistence outwardly, as any people I have yet named to you. I do think truly they are a very ruined Nation. And yet in a way . . . . . it has pleased God to give that plentiful encouragement to the meaner sort in Scotland . . . . . The meaner sort in Scotland live as well, and are likely to come into as thriving a condition under your government, as when they were under their own great Lords, who made them work for their living no better than the peasants of France. I am loath to speak anything which may /

(1) J.Cameron Lees - Inverness - County Histories of Scotland - p.85 - See also Records - Presbyt. of Inverness - Int.p.ix. Also Firth - Scot. and Prot. Int. xlvi.

may reflect upon that Nation: but the middle sort of people do grow up there into such a substance as makes their lives comfortable, if not better than they were before." (1)

Our principal concern, however, is the effect of Cromwell's regime upon the life and character of the Church in Scotland. As we have already noticed Cromwell's policy did not follow upon any hard and fast lines, but was dictated to a large extent by the circumstances and events of the day. Here as elsewhere, his nationality proved to be a stumbling-block. Not only was it really difficult for him to guage the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland, but it was equally difficult for him on a passing acquaintance with their ecclesiastical institutions and customs to formulate such a comprehensive ecclesiastical scheme for Scotland as he had done for England. Directly, Cromwell's rule made no impress of a permanent character. The Scottish Church continued during the Commonwealth and Protectorate to follow in the main the distinctive lines of Presbyterian polity hitherto followed. No doubt, the fact that Cromwell was dependent upon military force told against his influence in this direction, especially at the beginning of his government. Yet indirectly, the influence of Cromwell was felt in the land, and indeed is /

---

(1) Carlyle - Cromwell's Letters & Speeches. X. p.342.3. See also Firth - Oliver Cromwell, 297-8.

is reflected in the later policy of the Resolutioners. The credit for this lies not so much with Cromwell, as with Lord Broghill. The latter's success in dealing with the Resolutioners was due not so much to his amiability as to his psychological appreciation of the religious aspirations of the Scots. His treatment of certain problems, including that of praying for the exiled king, shows how far he had come to understand national sentiment. At the same time it was a strategic move of his to make this recognition subserve the general interests of the Cromwellian rule.

Cromwell's own ecclesiastical policy was frankly the outcome of political considerations. These also governed the measures adopted in relation to the Universities. Certainly it must be maintained that as a diplomat Cromwell remains in the front rank, but diplomacy is not government and no policy of balance in ecclesiastical matters could ever have brought satisfaction or stability to a rent and divided church. It did not require genius to preserve the <u>status quo</u> of the Church in Scotland, nor to repress dissatisfaction. The early attempt of the Protector to adjust the tangled skein of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland by granting a commission to Patrick Gillespie represents indeed a sad lapse in insight if not in diplomacy. From the very first,

as /

as we have already seen (Chap.VI.) his measure was doomed to failure, partly because a minority could not hope to bring stability to a Church seriously divided upon political questions, and partly also because this move ran counter to the already fixed constitutional procedure of Church courts in the land. In essence, such conduct amounted to a tacit assumption on the part of Cromwell to guide ecclesiastical affairs, the Protector virtually becoming Supreme Head of the Church every bit as much as Henry VIII. and Elizabeth in England and James VI. in Scotland. Logically concluded, this action of Cromwell's could only have brought in a new hierarchy whose apex and crown was himself.

After his failure in this early venture into the thorny path of Scottish ecclesiasticism, Cromwell did not seriously enter into the religious controversy in Scotland, beyond being the ultimate arbiter in all things ecclesiastical and religious. It was left to his subordinates to dictate a policy on their own lines without prejudice to the interests of the Commonwealth government. The sad truth indeed remains that for the Protector Scotland came to be a side-issue, important so long as it might prove troublesome, but otherwise of minor interest.

It must be conceded, however, that as conqueror of Scotland, Cromwell's measures, both ecclesiastical and civil /

civil, might easily have been more despotic in character. In consequence, much of the criticism of Cromwell's ecclesiastical policy in Scotland might appear to be too stringent. In a sense, however, the Protector is not to be regarded as the conqueror of Scotland so much as the liberator of Scotland. It was indeed to a great extent in this sense that he regarded himself, and he conceived himself to be acting in the name of liberty, justice, and, not least of all, in religion. The Solemn League and Covenant is so much proof of that. Had he been merely a conqueror or regarded himself solely as such, much of the criticism that has been levelled at his government of Scotland would be entirely irrelevant. But in adopting the more difficult role of liberator, the standard was inevitably raised, and much more expected of him. It is perhaps indeed on the platform of morality and religion rather than that of pure politics that Cromwell's character will in future be considered.

When we turn to the details of religious controversy of this period we see also that indirectly the influence of Cromwell's rule is evident. During the Commonwealth there emerged a neo-Calvinistic spirit, to be distinguished from the Calvinism of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century. Indeed, this period is important as marking the beginning of what really is a new phase of Calvinism, /

Calvinism, for the new spirit was largely the effect of certain factors which same into prominence at this time.
(a) There was, first of all, a distinct breakaway on the part of a section of the Church, the Resolutioners, from the rigid Calvinism of preceding years. Ideas of a native character were beginning to assert themselves in the minds of such churchmen, due in a measure to the political events of the day, as well as to the necessity for the adoption of progressive measures. These inevitably led away from the stricter tenets and dogmatic interpretations of the older Calvinism. As yet, these ideas were in a state of flux, but the tendency was there, and is important for its bearing not merely upon future religious controversy, but upon the future life and character of the Church.
(b) While toleration as conceived by Cromwell was at the beginning tabooed by both Resolutioners and Protesters, yet the tolerance exhibited by the Cromwellian government at a later stage was not without its influence upon the life and thought of certain in the Church. The aim in either case was a similar one, towards a more liberal, enlightened and progressive form of religion. The merit of the Resolutioners, as representative of Scottish Presbyterianism, lay in moving away from the central Calvinistic position, without losing the distinctive qualities /

qualities of their Presbyterian polity. In them, Presbyterianism is seen to be both adaptive and progressive.

Unhappily, this trend towards a more enlightened and liberal form of religion was hindered by the schism in the Church which dates from this period, and in which lay the germs of future religious controversy. The Protesters, while sympathetic towards Cromwell's policy at the beginning, though not to his doctrines, turned at a later stage, and looked upon it as anathema. It is hard to account for this change, unless it was brought out by the favour which came to be shown to the Resolutioners. By the time that the policy of the Protesters came to he sharply defined, we seem then to be the literal descendants of the older Calvinistic spirit. At the end they remained uninfluenced by the larger views beginning to prevail, and totally uninfluenced by the policy of toleration and comprehension of Cromwell.

Cromwell's rule did not prevent disunion in the Church nor did it hasten reconciliation. As ultimate arbiter between the two parties, he was enabled to maintain his own position, without yielding one jot or tittle to either. Probably the only thing that can be said for his rule in this connection is that his conquest of Scotland /

Scotland only served to precipitate a schism that was bound to come sooner or later.

The older Calvinism brought face to face with new ideas and opinions was really on trial. Probably the need for stability in authority, the desire to maintain tradition and uniformity moved many to maintain their former position. On the other hand, the neo-Calvinism of the Resolutioners represents a modification of the original Calvinistic position, a tendency perhaps, and little more, but nevertheless, a step in the direction of a new spirit of toleration and enlightenment.
