JOHN RAYMOND HORNE CORBETT

THE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND, 1603 - 1649:
A STUDY IN CHURCH UNION.

DIVINITY

S.T.M.

Abstract

The paper investigates in some detail the attempts at union between the Churches in England and Scotland from the union of the crowns in 1603 to the death of Charles I in 1649. The Introduction provides an outline of ecclesiastical affairs in England and Scotland from 1559 to 1603. Chapter one traces the successive steps used by James to bring the Church of Scotland into reasonable conformity with the Church of England both in church government and in worship. The second chapter considers Charles' ecclesiastical policy, the stages leading up to the introduction of the new Scottish Service Book, and the violent reaction following its use. The third chapter surveys the attempt of the Scottish Covenanters to establish a Presbyterian system of Church government in England. The paper concludes by considering why these endeavours at church union ultimately failed. This study is primarily concerned with the Church of Scotland.

CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND, 1603-49: A STUDY IN CHURCH UNION

THE CHURCHES IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND, 1603 - 1649: A STUDY IN CHURCH UNION.

by

John Raymond Horne Corbett

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Sanctae Theologiae Magister.

McGill University

1970.

Foreword

It is the intention of this paper to investigate in some detail the attempts at union between the Churches in England and Scotland from the union of the crowns in 1603 to the death of Charles I in 1649 and, finally, to consider why these endeavours at church union ultimately failed. It should be noted that this study is primarily concerned with the Church of Scotland and only related to events in England that influenced the life and work of the Scottish Church.

Table of Contents

The Introduction

Background from 1559 to 1603.

Some knowledge about the earlier and formative years is necessary in order to understand better the significance of Anglo-Scottish ecclesiastical relations after the union of the crowns. This introductory chapter, therefore, provides an outline of ecclesiastical affairs in both England and Scotland beginning with the meeting of Elizabeth's First Parliament in 1559 and the establishment of the Reformed Church in Scotland in 1560.[1.]

A. The Church of Scotland.

(1) 1559 - 1573.

At Perth on May 11th, 1559, after the return of John Knox and the outlawing of the Protestant preachers by the Queen Regent, a riot broke out in the words of Knox "to abolish idolatry, the places and monuments thereof. . .to wit, the Grey and Black thieves, and Charterhouse monks (a building of wondrous cost and greatness) were so destroyed that the walls only did remain of all these great edifications."[2.] With the destruction of the religious houses there began a series of conflicts between the Queen Regent, who was aided by a small band of French troops, and the Reformers. The latter made little headway and, as a result, in July 1559, the Protestant Lords of the Congregation appealed to England for help. An English fleet eventually entered the Firth of

---

1. There is some debate over the proper date for the establishment of the Reformed Church. Some date it from the first General Assembly which met in 1560. Others claim there is no legal basis for the Reformed Church till 1567. And as far as the Reformers were concerned the 7th March, 1559, was the 'appointed Day' of the Scottish Reformation (Duncan Shaw, The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland 1560 - 1600, (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1964), p. 14).

2. W.C. Dickinson (ed.), John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, (London: Nelson, 1949), Vol. 1, p. 163 (Hereafter referred to as 'Knox').

Forth and with the death of the Queen Regent during hostilities compelled the withdrawal of French troops (The Treaty of Edinburgh, July 6th, 1560).[3]

These events led to the meeting in August 1560 of the 'Reformation Parliament' which accepted the Confession of Faith and passed acts abolishing Papal jurisdiction in Scotland and annuling all anti-Protestant legislation. It should be noted, however, that the Book of Discipline, the blueprint of the new Church, never became law. The 'Reformation Parliament' also failed to deal with church polity and endowment as members of the old hierarchy were still allowed to cling to their livings and seats in Parliament. This meant, in effect, as W. C. Dickinson puts it that "two churches existed side by side - one, silenced and well-endowed; the other active and miserably poor."[4] Nevertheless, the Reformers managed fairly well to put their policy into effect and placed Protestant ministers into many towns, appointed Superintendents, and made use of those Bishops who turned Protestant.[5]

When Queen Mary came to Scotland in August 1561 the doubtful status of the Reformed Church was not altered as she refused to ratify the legislation that was passed by the 'Reformation Parliament' the year before. However, the murder of Darnley and Mary's marriage to Bothwell shortly afterwards lost her all support and led to her deposition in July 1567. Her abdication and flight into England

---

3. For details about the Treaty see David Calderwood, The History of Kirk of Scotland, (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1845), Vol.11, pp 2-10.
4. W.C. Dickinson, Scotland from earliest times to 1603, (London: Nelson, 1961), p. 351.
5. Calderwood provides details about these activities in vol. 11, of his 'History', see especially pp. 207 and 392.

brought to an end the questionable position of the Reformed Church, legislation passed in its favour was ratified by Parliament, and the coronation oath of the infant James Vl committed him and his successors to its maintenance.[6]

Another matter of importance, in those early years of the Scottish Reformation, was the relations between the State and the General Assembly, the chief legislative body of the Church of Scotland, which first met in 1560. Dr. Duncan Shaw believes that the vast majority within the Church did not think of the Church existing over against the State; they considered, rather, the Church and State to be two functions of the one society.[7] The Reformed Church, in effect, desired a real connection with the State, Thus it appealed to the 'godly magistrate' when hope of a 'godly prince' was frustrated by Queen Mary. It requested in 1564 that the Privy Council become an essential part of the General Assembly.[8] And it reminded the Privy Council again in 1573 that the Assembly was composed "not only of the powers of the Ministrie, but also of the haill members of the Kirk professing Chryst."[9]

The State, however, did not respond. The reason was probably, as Dr. Shaw suggests, that it considered the General Assembly to be a purely 'ad hoc' group and that the responsibilities of such a group

---

6. T. Thomson (ed.), The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, (1814),Vol.3, pp 23-24 (Hereafter referred to as A.P.S.).

7. Shaw, op. cit., p. 17.

8. "William Wallace of Carnall, and Andrew Ker of Fadownside, war sent to the Lords of Secreit Counsell, to requeist their honours to assist the Assemblie (Dec. 1564) with their presence and counsell (The Book of the Universal Kirk, (Edinburght: Bannatyne Club, 1839), p. 52 (hereafter referred to as B.U.K.)."

9. Shaw, op. cit., p.52.

could now be taken over by the State on the appointment of a godly magistrate or prince.[10] It was inevitable, therefore, that the Church from 1567 began to change to a position over and against the State. In order to ease the increasing tension between the Church and the State an extraordinary General Assembly called a 'Convention' was held at Leith in January 1572 to work out a compromise.[11] One of the most important articles passed at Leith permitted the crown to nominate bishops and archbishops with powers similar to superintendents.[12] The Convention also set down important precedents that had far-reaching effects. For example, when the Parliament of 1606 re-established Episcopacy it did so according to the terms of the Leith Convention, and the Glasgow Assembly of 1610 made use of the bishop's election oath set forth by the same Convention.[13] It is quite clear, however, that although Regent Morton succeeded by the Leith Concordat in making the Church of Scotland emulate to a considerable extent the Anglican pattern, as he looked forward to union with England, the General Assembly was still determined to subject the bishops to its authority.[14]

---

10. Ibid., p. 53.
11. Those who believe in the anti-prelatic character of the Scottish Reformation have called the Convention a re-establishment of Episcopacy, while others like Prof. Gordon Donaldson, who believes the Reformation in Scotland was in a very real sense a reaction in favour of an episcopate but freed from the corruptions of Rome, considered the Convention to be essentially a financial arrangement (Gordon Donaldson, Scotland, Church and Nation through sixteen centuries, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1960), p. 59).
12. For other articles passed at the Convention, see Calderwood, op.cit. III, p.170
13. G. Campbell Wadsworth, The General Assembly of 1610, University of Edinburgh, p. 16 (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis).
14. Calderwood tells us in regard to the censure of bishops that in the 27th and 28th General Assemblies which met on August 6th 1573 and March 6th 1574 that "James Paton, Bishop of Dunkelden, was delated for receaving the name, and not exercing the office of a bishop within his bounds"; that the Bishop of St.Andrews was given instructions by the Assembly "to reforme the Collatioun given to Robert Dowglas, a simple reader"; and that the Bishop of Murray "was delated for fornication committed with Ladie Ardrosse, and ordeanned to purge himself before the Assembly (Calderwood, op.cit. III, pp.287-309)."

(2) 1574 - 1596.

This section deals with the rise and triumph of Presbyterianism and the King's answer to it. In 1574 Andrew Melville returned from Geneva with views on relations between Church and State and on church government which created considerable strife and controversy.[15] His views are set forth in the Second Book of Discipline published in 1578.[16] On the question of church government he defended the parity of ministers and hence the illegality of Episcopacy. And Church courts, later known as Presbyteries, were to take over the jurisdiction previously exercised by bishops.[17] On relations between Church and State he saw them both as distinct and separate or as what he called 'two kingdoms'.[18] This meant for one thing that only "ecclesiasticall personis", that is, ministers, doctors of theology, such as Melville himself, and those elders ordained into church offices for life could "repair to this Assemblie to voitt."[19] It also meant that "ecclesiasticall personis" were not to become involved in civil affairs.[20]

---

15. Archbishop Spottiswoods comments: "In the Church this year (1575) began the innovations to break forth that to this day have kept it in a continual unquietness (John Spottiswoode, History of the Church of Scotland, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1851), [illegible]. II, p. 200)."
16. For the complete text, see B.U.K., pp. 488 - 512.
17. The Book of Discipline did not mention 'Presbyteries' as such, but stated that Bishops were not to usurp the powers of Presbyters (B.U.K., p.425).
18. In 1596, in Falkland Palace, Andrew Melville rather tactlessly but nevertheless accurately interpreted this doctrine before King James: "And thairfor, Sir, as divers tymes befor, sa now again, I mon tell yow, thair is twa Kings and twa Kingdomes in Scotland. Thair is Chryst Jesus the King, and his Kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is, and of whase Kingdome nocht a King, nor a lord, nor a heid, bot a member! And they whome Chryst hes callit and commandit to watch over his Kirk, and governe his spirituall Kingdome, hes sufficient power of him, and authoritie sa to do, bathe togidder and severalie, the quhilk na Christian King nor Prince sould controll and discharge, bot fortifie and assist, utherwayes nocht fathfull subjects nor members of Chryst (James Melville, Autobiography and Diary, (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), p. 370)."
19. B.U.K., p. 500.
20. For Melville, however, such separation excluded the use of the pulpit which could be used to instruct the civil magistrate (B.U.K., p. 489).

Melville's influence predominated and by 1580 the Leith Convention had been undermined to such an extent that in the July meeting of the General Assembly Episcopal government was condemned, and in the following year the Assembly presented a comprehensive scheme for the setting up of Presbyteries.[21] Again, so influential had Melville's party become that in 1582 we find that the kidnapping of the King by the Presbyterian Ruthven Raiders met with the approval of the General Assembly which called it "the late actione of the Reformatione. . .to deliver the Kirk of God within this realme, and the true religion professed within the same."[22]

Shortly after James escaped from his captors, his answer to the rise of Presbyterianism was the 'Black Acts' passed by Parliament in 1584. By these acts the king was declared supreme over all persons and all estates, the ancient jurisdiction of the Three Estates ratified, the ecclesiastical power of the bishops confirmed and all ecclesiastical assemblies required to receive royal licence to meet and adjourn.[23]

By 1586, however, after two years of bitter controversy, a conciliation between Church and State was worked out which produced a limited Episcopacy.[24] The General Assembly, for the most part Presbyterian in sympathy, reluctantly accepted the compromise and then artfully forgot it as it continued to encourage the spread of Presbyterianism throughout the country, and, strangely enough, without government interference.[25] Then in

21. Ibid., p. 453, pp. 480 - 487.
22. Ibid., p. 594.
23. A.P.S., [redacted], pp. 292 - 294.
24. Calderwood, op.cit. IV, pp. 491 - 493.
25. The reason for the State's leniency towards the spread of Presbyterianism at this time was probably due to the fact that the outcome of the struggle between England and Spain was in 1586 still uncertain. James, therefore, in order to satisfy Spain was reluctant to censure the rebellious Catholic Earls, and to appease the Presbyterians on this matter he permitted them considerable autonomy to carry out their ecclesiastical changes. For a comprehensive account of the political climate at this time, see D.H. Willson, King James VI and I, (London: Cape, 1963), p. 81 ff.

1587, to the further dismay of the Episcopalians, the Act of Annexation was passed whereby Parliament annexed to the Crown most of the Ecclesiastical temporalities. The passing of this Act was later regretted by King James who, as W.C. Dickinson puts it, "unwittingly struck a severe blow at the episcopal system which he was striving to erect. . . Who now would want to be a bishop?"[26]

By 1592 the Presbyterians had sufficiently reasserted themselves to have an Act passed by Parliament establishing their own form of church government. But the triumph of the Presbyterians fell somewhat short of what they desired. For example, the office of bishop was not abolished nor was there according to the 'two kingdom' doctrine complete ecclesiastical independence so that the King or royal commissioners had the right at each General Assembly to name the date and place of the next meeting. And equally important and significant, as W.C.Dickinson explains, "no provision was made whereby a General Assembly could be called if the King or the royal commissioner, being present, did not name the date and place of the next meeting - a loophole of which James took advantage in his continued struggle with the Kirk after his accession to the English throne."[27]

We believe it may be worth while to consider for a moment the opinion of the Presbyterians towards the young King who reached his majority and began to exercise his kingly power during the years under discussion. James Melville, the nephew of Andrew Melville, describes James as a well brought up Prince tutored as he was by George Buchanan, an international scholar and a man much admired by the Presbyterians, but

---

26. Dickinson, op. cit., p. 357.
27. Ibid., p. 358.

that it was a pity to see his childhood so miserably corrupted, first, "with evill and maist dangerus grundes and principalles in government of Kirk and Comoun-weill," and secondly, "to think the haill manner of Reformation of Religion to haiff bein done be a privie faction, turbulentlie and treasonablie." And among others influenced by such as Arran who "put the opinion of absolut power in his Majestie's head," and Patrick Adamson, Bishop of St. Andrews, who instructed him, "'that a Christian King sould be the cheif governour of the Kirk, and behovit to have Bishops under him, to hald all in order.'"[28]

As far as James was concerned the years only increased his hatred of the Presbyterians. The following extract from the 'Basilikon Doron', written by James probably in the year 1598 for the benefit of his son Prince Henry, reveals to us quite frankly his contempt for the Presbyterians and his plans for the Church:[29]

> The reformation of religion in Scotland being made by a popular tumult and rebellion. . .and not preceeding from the Prince's order (as it did in England), some of our fiery ministers got such a guiding of the people at that time of confusion, as finding the gust (taste) of government sweet, they began to fantasy to themselves a democratic form of government. . .and after usurping the liberty of the time of my long minority, settle themselves with that hope to become 'tribuni plebis'. . .For preservative against their poison, entertain and advance the godly, learned and modest men of the ministry, whom (God be praised) there lacketh not a reasonable number; and by their preferment to bishoprics and benefices (annulling that vile Act of Annexation, if ye find it not done to your hand) ye shall not only banish their parity (which I can not agree with a monarchy) but ye shall also re-establish the old institution of three estates in parliament, which can no otherwise be done.

There is little doubt that James was convinced that his control over the Church could only be achieved by the overthrow of Presbytery and the re-establishment of Episcopacy.

---

28. Melville, op. cit., pp. 120-121
29. W.C.Dickinson and Gordon Donaldson (eds.), Source Book of Scottish History, (London: Nelson, 1954), [redacted]. 111, pp. 50 - 51

Perhaps, before closing this section, we should note that from 1573 the Roman Catholic cause in Scotland was more or less dead even though the fear of a Catholic revival was genuine enough among the Protestant population. Gordon Donaldson points out that the faction called 'Roman Catholic' were those associated with the cause of Queen Mary and with the intrigues of continental powers, especially Spain. In other words, they did not represent the practice of Roman Catholicism, but only "a catholic 'interest', politically conservative, allergic to the ethos of the New Religion. . .a politico-religious preference which could not issue in regular sacramental practice owing to the great scarcity of priests."[30] Gordon Donaldson also refers us to "William Semple's reports on Scotland in 1588 and 1610" in the English Historical Review, XL1, pp. 579 - 583, where the editors comment that at this time "the term catholic is used in a purely political sense."[31]

(3) 1596 - 1603.

These years mark the beginning of the process in the re-establishment of Episcopacy. It was the Edinburgh 'riot' in December 1596 that provided James with the opportunity he was looking for to attack the Presbyterians. The underlying causes of the 'riot' are difficult to pinpoint. Calderwood believes that some of the Cubiculars or Courtiers of the royal household resenting the influence of the Octavians, who managed the King and Queen's finances, tried to create an incident between them and the Church.[32] And it cannot be overlooked that trouble was also brewing between James and the Church over the

30. Gordon Donaldson, Scotland: James V to James V11, (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1965), p. 174.
31. Ibid., p. 174.
32. Calderwood, op.cit. V, p. 510.

indulgence being shown to the excommunicated Catholic Earls while certain Presbyterian ministers were under censure, especially David Black of St. Andrews.[33] The immediate cause of the 'riot', however, appeared to be James' refusal to accept from the Presbyterians a petition denouncing his leniency towards the Catholics. When the King's refusal was broadcast some of the Presbyterians, according to Spottiswoode, "caused such a clamour and lifting up of hands, as none could hear what another spoke. . .some cried to arm. . .others cried, 'The sword of the Lord and Gideon'"[34] Spottiswoode admits, however, that no mischief was done although the disturbance required Sir Alexander Home, provost of Edinburgh, to come to the street where with fair speeches he encouraged them to return to their homes.[35]

It would appear that the 'riot' was spontaneous, a minor affair, and that the Presbyterian ministers in no way encouraged it. The King, however, seized upon the incident as an opportunity to attack his opponents. Thus, in a letter to the Aberdeen Presbytery, he speaks of the

> "greit sclaunder quhilk the ministeris of the towne has done to the religione be the steiring up of the last uproare of the peple in Edinburgh. . .their seditious preicheing. . .and exhorting of the Raskall of the towne to armour and their wryting to the Lord Hamiltoun and utheris of our nobilitie to mak ane plaine rebellione against us."[36]

James also caused Parliament to declare it an act of treason. Meanwhile, hearing they were to be arrested, two of the Edinburgh ministers fled into England and the other two sought refuge in Fife.

---

33. Spottiswoode mentions that Black "had in one of his sermons cast forth divers speeches full of spite against the king, the queen, the lords of council and session, and amongst the rest called the queen of England an atheist, a woman of no religion (Spottiswoode, op. cit. 111, p. 13)."
34. Ibid., p. 29.
35. Ibid., p. 29.
36. Scottish History Society, The Warrender Papers. (Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1932), [redacted]. 11, p. 303.

With the Presbyterians now in disarray the moderate or episcopal party in the Church came to the fore.[37] This enabled James to persuade the General Assembly in May 1597 to appoint fourteen commissioners who were to act as advisers to the King concerning the welfare of the Church. And when in December of the same year the Commission presented a petition that ministers should have a seat and vote in Parliament, James readily concurred. David Calderwood, with considerable justification, attacked the Commission as "the King's led horse", and as "a wedge taiken out of the Kirk, to rent her with her owne forces, and the verie needle which drew in the thread of bishops."[38]

The General Assembly, which met at Montrose in March 1600, however, wished to make it clear to the King that it desired the representative of the Kirk in Parliament to be responsible to the Assembly, chosen from a list drawn up by the Kirk, discharge no episcopal function and be faithful to his own particular congregation.[39] The King's answer in October was to ignore these safeguards laid down by the Assembly, and he appointed on his own ministers to the vacant sees of Ross, Aberdeen and Caithness.[40] It should be noted, however, that these bishops exercised no function in the life and work of the Church, but even so we can see here yet another step towards the re-establishment of Episcopacy.

---

37. The outlook first of the moderates then of the radicals is described by Spottiswoode in the debate over the trial of David Black: "'If by our strictness matters go to the worst, our weakness shall soon appear, and thereafter shall the Church be no more feared or regarded; too great stiffness doth seldom succeed well, and it is often seen, that they who will have all their wills, do lose all in the end.' This was the reasoning of the wise and more moderate sort. Others flattering themselves in their precisenss held, 'that the only way to prevail was to stand by their grounds; the cause was God's which he would maintain; that worldly powers were not to be feared; and that God had in his hand the hearts of princes to turn them wither he pleased (Spottiswoode, op cit. 111, p. 19)."
38. Calderwood, op. cit. V, p. 644.
39. Ibid., Vl, pp. 17 - 20.
40. B.U.K., pp. 955 - 956.

By the turn of the century we must agree that James' efforts to re-establish Episcopacy had been fairly successful. What in 1600 Calderwood called the "Trojan hors, the Episcopacie"[41] had indeed been brought in. But it should be noted that in 1603, in spite of James' advancement of Episcopacy, the Church was still Presbyterian. The 1592 Act establishing Presbyterianism was in effect. The system of Church courts - Kirk Session, Presbytery, Synod, General Assembly - was still intact. The parity of ministers also remained. Another seven years were to pass before the process of Episcopal re-establishment would be completed.

B. The Church of England. 1559 - 1603.

(1) The Elizabethan Settlement.

What is known as the Elizabethan Settlement consisted of the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity which were passed by Elizabeth's First Parliament which met January 23rd to May 8th, 1559.[42] There is little doubt about the Acts' far-reaching importance as G.W. Prothero comments: "All that followed, for more than a century, was built on this foundation, for, setting aside the revolutionary epoch of the Long Parliament and the Commonwealth, there was no departure from the lines which Elizabeth had laid down until they were modified by the Act of Toleration (1689)."[43]

Arising out of the Elizabethan Settlement Cyril Garbett indicates four ways in which the supremacy of the Crown could be used.[44] First,

---

41. Calderwood, op. cit. Vl, p. 20.
42. The text of both Acts is given in full by G.W.Prothero, Statutes and Constitutional Documents, 1558 - 1625, (Oxford: University Press,1954).
43. Ibid., p. xxx.
44. Cyril Garbett, Church and State in England, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950, pp. 60 - 63.

the Queen sometimes acted herself in ecclesiastical affairs without any intermediary. Henry Vlll obtained from Parliament an Act decreeing that a Proclamation made by the King should be obeyed and Elizabeth felt free to use the same method of Proclamation for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs.

Secondly, the Queen also exercised her authority over the Church by means of the Court of High Commission or, as Prothero suggests, "we ought rather to call it, the group of courts held by virtue of royal commissions issued under the Act of Supremacy."[45] This Commission was expected to exercise some of the ecclesiastical powers which belonged to the Crown such as to ensure that the ecclesiastical system, as set up and administered by the Church, was in proper working order.[46] T.M.Lindsay, however, believes that what was involved here was not a dispersal of royal powers, but that Elizabeth through the Commission was given even more ecclesiastical jurisdiction than her father as here was a "provision which enabled her to be felt in every corner of the land."[47]

Thirdly, the Queen used Parliament both to control the Church and protect it. Parliament was willing to support the Crown in its struggle with Rome, but it had not the same inclination to act against the Puritans. The Crown, in fact, on several occasions, was forced to deter Parliament from supporting the Puritan cause.[48]

---

45. Prothero, op. cit. p. xl.
46. W.H.Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James 1, (London: Macmillan, 1911), p. 39.
47. T.M.Lindsay, A History of the Reformation, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 394.
48. Prothero, op. cit. 221.

Fourthly, the Queen also exercised her supremacy through the bishops. For example, when Parliament, as so often happened, failed to act against the Puritans, the Queen expected the Bishops to do so. Thus, in 1573, the Queen in a Proclamation against Nonconformists urges "archbishops and bishops. . .to put in execution the Act for the uniformity of Common Prayer and the administration of the sacraments. . .with all diligence and severity."[49]

Yet another way, not mentioned by Garbett, whereby the Queen exercised her supremacy was through the running of the Convocation. This legislative assembly of the Church had two provinces, one of Canterbury and the other of York. But it only met on receiving a summons from the Queen, its canons only became valid on receiving royal assent and even the subjects of discussion were dictated by the Crown.

The majority of Anglican churchmen appeared quite content to accept the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical affairs, and there were some, like Bishop Jewel, who raised the doctrine of the 'godly prince' to ridiculous heights. Norman Sykes illustrates well this radical side of Anglicanism when he comments on Bishop Jewel's apology of the Crown's authority:

> To Queen Elizabeth I herself indeed Jewel applied the words of the Prophet that "she is unto us a comfortable water in a dry place, as a refuge from the tempest, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land"; and he continued in hardly less eulogistic vein: "The great blessing which God giveth to any people is a godly prince to rule over them. The greatest misery that can fall upon a people is to have a godly prince taken from them. For by a godly prince he doth so rule the people as if God himself were with them in visible appearance (Works, [redacted] IV, p. 1153)." From such premisses it was a very moderate conclusion that "it is lawful for a godly prince to command bishops and priests; to make laws and orders for the church; to redress the abuses of the sacraments; to allege the scriptures; to threaten and punish bishops and priests, if they offend (Works, [redacted].1,p.287)."[50]

---

49. Ibid., p. 208.
50. Norman Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter, (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), pp. 5 - 6.

When we consider such affirmations as these regarding the authority of a Christian ruler as well as the matter of fact control the Crown exercised in ecclesiastical affairs, we may agree with S.R. Gardiner that the cardinal principle of the English Reformation was the doctrine of Royal Supremacy.[51.]

(2) Opposition to the Elizabethan Settlement.

The Elizabethan Settlement was threatened by the Roman Catholics, including the forces of Catholic Spain, and by the Puritans. The Catholic menace inside England, however, was never so great as imagined even though there was a genuine dread by the majority Protestant population of Jesuit missionaries and Spanish conspiracies.[52.]

The more serious opposition to the Elizabethan Settlement came from the Puritans who were a group of Genevan orientated Protestants not separate from the Church of England, but who from within the Church desired to reform it from the remnants of popery. Their ideals were quite similar to the Scottish Presbyterians, an abhorrence of Episcopacy and dissatisfaction with rigid ceremonial. They were also respected by the English public who saw them as pious men genuinely seeking reforms.

When in 1563 the Puritans presented their reforms to the lower house of the Convocation Assembly their proposals were rejected by just one vote. This failure, however, did not hinder them from proceeding independently to put into effect in their own parishes the reforms they

---

51. S.R. Gardiner, History of England, 1603 - 1642. (London: Longmans, 1895), [redacted]. p. 27.

52. Ibid., pp. 12 - 16. See also Prothero, op. cit. pp. xlvii - liii and p. 83 ff.

believed were necessary.[53] The Crown's answer to these irregularities came in 1566 with the 'Advertisements' of Archbishop Parker which were a series of rules for the purpose of constraining clergymen who refused to wear the proper vestments, but they also raised the vexed question of the Church's authority. Many of the Puritan clergy resigned rather than subscribe and drew to themselves considerable public sympathy and support. Meanwhile, Parliament was reluctant to act against them and even some Ministers of the Crown went out of their way to protect them.[54]

Puritanism eventually led to Presbyterianism. The English Book of Discipline of 1574, which was republished in 1584, set forth, as did the Scottish Book, the Presbyterian system of government.[55] The Anglican W.H. Frere admits to Presbyterism being introduced by the Puritans into the Church of England, and he speaks about it with considerable displeasure:

> The puritan clergy had been managing their parishes according to the provisions of the 'Book of Discipline', to which many of them had bound themselves by a formal subscription, and in defiance of the discipline of the Church of which they were ministers. They had been taking their commission from the presbyterian bodies and not from the bishops, except as a matter of legal form, and their directions from the 'classes' (presbyteries) and rival synods and not from convocation.

---

53. Something of the Puritans' determination to set up their own form of church government come what may is well illustrated in the closing paragraph of their 'Admonition to Parliament' (1572): "If this cannot be obtained, we will, by God's grace, address ourselves to defend his truth by suffering and willingly lay our heads to the block, and this shall be our peace, to have quiet consciences with our God, who we will abide for with all patience until he work our full deliverence." (Prothero, op. cit. p. 199).
54. William Cecil to Archbishop Whitgift in a letter dated July 1st,1584, condemns the way Puritans had to subscribe to certain articles. (Prothero, op. cit. pp. 213 - 214).
55. A summary of the English Book of Discipline is given by Prothero, op. cit. pp. 247 -49.

> They had used only such parts of the rites of the Church as they pleased, worn what they pleased, preached as they pleased, done what they pleased, and depraved everything with which they were displeased; yet they still continued to occupy the rooms and take the revenues of the Church, while they pledged themselves to seek to pervert its government.[56]

By 1588, however, the influence of the Puritans in the Church of England began to wane. This occurred after the threat of a Catholic revival more or less vanished with the defeat of the Armada and the execution of Mary Queen of Scots which then enabled Elizabeth to pursue a more vigorous policy against them. Also by the turn of the century the Episcopal Party had within its ranks notable and respected divines like Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes who by their scholarly writings and upright lives created a fine impression in the minds of the people to rival that of the Puritans. Puritan nonconformity survived, however, if not to the same extent inside the established Church, to a considerable degree in the House of Commons.

Conclusion

The conflict between Episcopacy and Presbytery in England and Scotland reveal some interesting parallels. In both countries it seems there was no easy victory for either party. In Scotland there was good support for Episcopacy as there was in England for the Puritan-Presbyterian cause. By the union of the crowns, however, Episcopacy was solidly established in England while in Scotland the Presbyterian establishment was in decline. It would appear,

---

56. W.H. Frere, op. cit., p. 281.

therefore, that any plan for uniformity of religion between the two kingdoms, in the near future, could only mean the overthrow of Presbytery in Scotland in favour of an Episcopal Church at least reasonably similar to that of the Church of England.

CHAPTER I: JAMES I'S ATTEMPT TO REORGANIZE THE SCOTTISH CHURCH

A. James' settlement of ecclesiastical affairs in England

In 1603 on his journey to London, James was presented with the Millenary Petition supported by the Puritan ministers of the Church of England desiring reform of some ceremonies and abuses in the church.[1] One of the most noticeable features of the Petition was the change from the militant demands to abolish Episcopacy and introduce Presbyterianism, as made by the Puritans in the early part of Elizabeth's reign, to asking James "for certain definite alterations in the existing system."[2] The bishops and the universities, however, saw in the petitioners, as they explained to the King, the same kind of men as the rebellious Presbyterians in Scotland.

The two factions met before the King at Hampton Court on July 14th, 1604. James as the Conference began dealt fairly with the Puritans and agreed with them in several points such as the necessity for a new version of the Bible and the need for an educated and preaching ministry. The Conference ended, however, in dismal defeat for the Puritans who handled their case very badly. For example, their chief spokesman John Reynolds unwisely referred to the Bishop with his Presbyters which brought an angry retort from James thinking that they

---

1. The Petition requested that in church services the sign of the cross at baptism and the interrogation of infants be taken away, the cap and surplice not urged, those wishing to take communion to be examined, communion to be administered with a sermon, the Prayer Book corrected by removing priestly terms such as absolution, the ring no longer to be used in marriage, the canonical scriptures only to be read in the church, those advanced into the ministry to be properly qualified, the abuse of clergymen holding several benefices at the same time to be removed, and that they be not required to subscribe to the whole of the Prayer Book, but just to those articles bearing on the King's supremacy (Prothero, op. cit. 414).
2. Gardiner, op. cit., 1, p. 148.

CHAPTER I: JAMES I'S ATTEMPT TO REORGANIZE THE SCOTTISH CHURCH

A. James' settlement of ecclesiastical affairs in England

In 1603 on his journey to London, James was presented with the Millenary Petition supported by the Puritan ministers of the Church of England desiring reform of some ceremonies and abuses in the church.[1] One of the most noticeable features of the Petition was the change from the militant demands to abolish Episcopacy and introduce Presbyterianism, as made by the Puritans in the early part of Elizabeth's reign, to asking James "for certain definite alterations in the existing system."[2] The bishops and the universities, however, saw in the petitioners, as they explained to the King, the same kind of men as the rebellious Presbyterians in Scotland.

The two factions met before the King at Hampton Court on July 14th, 1604. James as the Conference began dealt fairly with the Puritans and agreed with them in several points such as the necessity for a new version of the Bible and the need for an educated and preaching ministry. The Conference ended, however, in dismal defeat for the Puritans who handled their case very badly. For example, their chief spokesman John Reynolds unwisely referred to the Bishop with his Presbyters which brought an angry retort from James thinking that they

---

1. The Petition requested that in church services the sign of the cross at baptism and the interrogation of infants be taken away, the cap and surplice not urged, those wishing to take communion to be examined, communion to be administered with a sermon, the Prayer Book corrected by removing priestly terms such as absolution, the ring no longer to be used in marriage, the canonical scriptures only to be read in the church, those advanced into the ministry to be properly qualified, the abuse of clergymen holding several benefices at the same time to be removed, and that they be not required to subscribe to the whole of the Prayer Book, but just to those articles bearing on the King's supremacy (Prothero, op. cit. 414).
2. Gardiner, op. cit., 1, p. 148.

aimed at a Scottish Presbytery which, he said agreed with the Monarchy as well as God and the Devil.[3] Patrick Galloway in a letter from London to the Edinburgh Presbytery reported that when the King asked the Puritans what they desired to be reformed "it was verie louslie answered, and coldlie."[4] S.R. Gardiner also criticises their presentations: "Unless the Puritans have been misrepresented their inferiority in breadth of view is conspicuous."[5] In a letter to the Earl of Northampton, James himself writes contemptuously of the Puritan representatives:

> They fled me so from argument to argument without even answering me directly, 'ut est eorum moris', as I was forced at last to say unto them that if any of them had been in a college disputing with their scholars, if any of their disciples had answered them in that sort, they would have fetched him up in place of reply, and so should the rod have plied upon the poor boy's buttocks.[6]

The Conference, therefore, came to an end with James opposed to the Puritans and determined to enforce uniformity. In July a proclamation enjoining conformity to the Prayer Book was made[7] and, later in the year, the Convocation passed new canons which according to Frere "further tightened the screw of discipline."[8]

S.R. Gardiner accuses James and the bishops with making schism in the Church of England inevitable and charges that they, not Parliament or the Puritans, were the true fathers of Protestant dissent.[9] D.H.Willson makes a somewhat similar judgement that James' enforcement of conformity was unnecessary in that Puritanism in England in 1603 was mild in tone and lacked the ferocity of that in Scotland.[10] In James' favour, however, it may be said that it would have been difficult for him, considering the temper of the age, to condone even a milder form of

3. Willson, op. cit., p. 202.
4. Calderwood, op. cit. VI, p. 242.
5. Gardiner, op. cit., 1, p. 155
6. Willson, op. cit., p. 208.
7. Prothero, op. cit. p. 421
8. Frere, op. Cit., P.314
9. Gardiner, op. cit.,1,p.198.
10. Willson, op. cit., p. 202.

Presbyterianism which the Puritan reforms seemed to advocate. James believed, as did most of his contemporaries, that only one Church system should be approved by the State as divisions in religion would mean national divisions as well. Thus, William Cecil, the Elizabethan statesman, expressed James' own feelings and that of the age when he wrote that "there is no enmity so great as that for religion, and they that differ in the service of God cannot agree in the service of their country."[11] Francis Bacon, on the other hand, who advocated religious toleration and spoke about returning to "one faith, one baptism; and not, one hierarchy, one discipline"[12] was a man before his time. This S.R. Gardiner, who quotes Bacon against James, seems to have forgotten.

The main result of the Hampton Court Conference was that "No Bishop, no King" became the charter of James' regime. The Scottish Presbyterians were upset at such a conclusion to the Conference and they sympathized with their Puritan brethren whose hopes along with their own had been severely dashed.[13] James, with the future shape of his ecclesiastical policy in England settled, was now ready to resume his plans for the re-establishment of Episcopacy in Scotland.

---

11. J. Hurstfield, "Church and State: The task of the Cecils." from Studies of Church History. (London: 1965), [illegible]. 11, p. 124. Richard Hooker also felt the need for religious uniformity within a nation when he wrote: "There is not any man a member of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth, which is not also of the Church of England ('Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity' viii, 1, 2)."
12. Gardiner, op. cit., 1, p. 147.
13. After the Hampton Court Conference James Melville writing to the Presbytery in Edinburgh suggests "that they would, as Christian and brotherlie compassioun craved, be greaved and tuiched with sorrow, with manie godlie and learned brethrein in our nighbour countrie, who, having expected a reformatioun, are disappointed and heavilie grieved; and if no way could be found for helpe, that they would at the least helpe by their prayers to God, for their comfort and releefe (Calderwood, op. cit. Vl, p. 246 - 247)."

B. The re-establishment of Episcopacy in Scotland.

(1) The attack on the General Assembly and its ministers.

By 1603 the first stage of James' re-establishment of Episcopacy had been completed by the right of certain ministers to vote in Parliament. After this precedent had been established there was what Gordon Donaldson describes as "something of a lull, while the church was left to digest the 'parliamentary bishops' and the way was prepared, by circumstances as much as by deliberate policy, for the King's next campaign."[14.]

In March 1605 James declared in a letter to the English nobleman, Cranborne, that unless the English Privy Council advised him to the contrary, he would never call another General Assembly as long as he lived.[15.] The King at this stage had apparently made up his mind to renew his attack against the Presbyterian system by striking at the General Assemblies. The first shot in the new campaign was fired in September 1604 when a proclamation sent from Hampton Court forbad extraordinary meetings of the Scottish clergy.[16.] Next, he prorogued the General Assembly called to meet in Aberdeen in July, 1604, to the same month the following year. Then in June 1605, he prorogued the Assembly indefinitely.

By June, however, many Presbyteries had already nominated Assembly Commissioners who, not hearing officially that their commission had been cancelled, proceeded to Aberdeen to hold the Assembly. Thus nineteen ministers met to constitute an Assembly at Aberdeen on July 2nd, 1605. This was to be a significant Assembly for those concerned in it and for the Church at large as the course of events resulting from the Aberdeen

14. Donaldson, op. cit., p. 202.
15. Gardiner, op. cit., 1, p. 303 (Quoted from The King to Cranborne. Hatfield MSS 188, fol. 90).
16. The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, (Edinburgh: H.M.General Register House, 1887), V11, pp. 13 - 14 (hereafter referred to as R.P.C).

Assembly, as we shall see, gave James grounds, so he believed, to assail the leading ministers of the Church.

As soon as the ministers gathered the Laird of Lauriston delivered to them a letter from the Privy Council, but as it was addressed "To the Brethren of the Ministry convened in their Assembly in Aberdeen" they constituted the Assembly before receiving it. The letter was then opened which requested them to disperse and not to appoint any new meeting of the Assembly.[17] To the first point the ministers agreed, but they asked Lauriston to name the date of the next Assembly. He refused whereupon they adjourned the Assembly to the first Thursday in September. Lauriston at this point declared them to be an illegal Assembly from the beginning and charged them, under pain of arrest, to dissolve the Assembly. William Scot of Cupar says this was needless as the ministers had already resolved to discontinue in obedience to the Privy Council's letter.[18]

After the Assembly had been terminated the ministers, fearful of reprisals as intimated by Lauriston, went to Thomas Mollesone, common clerk of Aberdeen, that he might attest to their obedience to dissolve the Assembly as they said "within the space of ane quarter of one hour since, that they (the Privy Council) sould suffer their Assemblies to desert."[19] The document was signed and authenticated by Mollesone and eight witnesses and then sent to the Privy Council.[20]

It is probable that the Privy Council, if they had been left to themselves, would have let what happened at Aberdeen pass without giving

---

17. Ibid., P. 471.
18. William Scot, Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland, (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1846), p. 135.
19. John Forbes, Certaine Records Touching the Estate of the Kirk, (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1846), p. 393.
20. R.P.C., V11, 1st series, p. 472.

it too much attention. The Laird of Lauriston, however, repeated the whole affair to the King and declared in addition, what James Melville calls "ane false and deidly lie", that he had discharged the ministers to meet on the day before the Assembly was constituted by open proclamation in the market cross of Aberdeen.[21] The King on hearing from Lauriston saw here a favourable opportunity to move against the ministers involved. Thus, in a letter to Secretary Balmerino, dated July 19th, he says he cannot overlook "the haynousnes of their crymes" and instructs the Privy Council to proceed against the ministers and punish them "as trespassours in a very heich degree."[22] In order to please the king an act was passed accusing the ministers at Aberdeen of rebellion.[23]

First John Forbes, the Moderator of the Aberdeen Assembly, and John Welsh were arrested and transported to Blackness Castle on Friday, July 27th. Another twelve ministers were imprisoned shortly afterwards. The imprisoned ministers issued an apology for their action in Aberdeen claiming that they had warrant of the Word of God and the laws of the country, and that they acted constitutionally according to the usual practice of the Church since the Reformation. They also issued a declinature on the Privy Council's judgement saying they would be willing only to be tried by the General Assembly which they considered as the only competent judge.[24]

Their appeal was ignored and the trial began in Linlithgow on January 10th, 1606. Elaborate preparations were made by the Earl of Dunbar, the

---

21. Melville, op. cit., p. 574.
22. R.P.C. Vll, 1st series, pp. 474 - 475.
23. It should be noted perhaps that the Council declared that the charge against the ministers had nothing to do with the legality of General Assemblies, but that "they had unlawfullie made privie conventicle (R.P.C., Vll, 1st series, p. 431)."
24. Calderwood, op. cit. Vi, p. 347.

presiding judge, to procure a verdict of guilty. The jury, for example, consisted of many of Dunbar's friends and relations, and as the trial proceeded he tampered with the jury and allowed the Privy Council themselves to assist in judging their own case.[25] About the trial itself, S.R.Gardiner says that it "turned upon purely legal points as to the interpretation of words in certain articles of Parliament, and upon the extent to which the Act of 1584 was replaced by the Act of 1592."[26]

The ministers, on all accounts, presented a good case. They argued with conviction that Lauriston was lying about the proclamation prohibiting the Assembly the day before it convened. Then John Forbes added the telling point that the Commissioners appointed after the General Assembly of 1602 to handle, with the King's guidance, the affairs of the Church between Assemblies would lose their commission when the next General Assembly was constituted. In other words, if the Aberdeen Assembly was legal then the Commissioners appointed by the previous Assembly, who were for the most part the King's men, would cease to hold office. As Forbes expressed it with considerable truth:

> "I sie we must bear the punishment of the iniquitie of the Commissioners of the General Assembly, who through their naughtie devises and crooked courses, in seeking to subvert the libertie and lawfull jurisdictions of the Kingdome and Church of Christ. . .are the authors and procurers of whatsoever vexation and trouble we have sustained."[27]

The jury was impressed by these arguments and began to doubt what the verdict should be. The Privy Council, fearful of an unfavourable

---

25. William Scott, op. cit., p. 152
26. S.R. Gardiner, op. cit., 1, p. 312. It is interesting to note the different interpretation of the 1592 ecclesiastical settlement as expressed by Presbyterians and Episcopalians. For the Presbyterian position, see Calderwood, op. cit. Vl, p. 307 and for the Episcopalian, see Calderwood, op. cit. Vl, p. 427.
27. John Forbes, op. cit., p. 483.

verdict, illegally interfered with the jury's deliberations reminding them of their obedience and duty to the King in this matter and that if they did not convict the accused their lives, lands and goods would fall into the King's hands.[28] It is not surprising, therefore, that a verdict of guilty was finally pronounced, and yet six of the jurors cleared the ministers and one juror in addition said he found them to be honest ministers, faithful servants to Christ and good subjects.[29]

Secretary Balmerino immediately advised the King about the results of the trial, and he did not fail to mention how close the verdict had been.[30] The King's reply from Whithall, dated January 22nd, thanked the Council and instructed them, first, to prepare a pamphlet giving the history of the events surrounding the Aberdeen Assembly to be circulated throughout Scotland, and, secondly, to make arrangements for the trial of the eight remaining imprisoned ministers on the capital charge of treason.[31] In regard to the second command the Council was appalled and reiterated to the King how difficult the late trial had been and advised him to drop the matter.[32] This James eventually agreed to do. In October six of the ministers sentenced at Linlithgow were banished for life and the others removed to remote parts of Scotland.[33] Meanwhile, by February 1606, speeches and sermons made in defence of the Aberdeen Assembly were punishable by death.[34]

What we may call this act of terrorisation was quickly followed by another. This occurred when eight leading Presbyterian churchmen, including Andrew and James Melville, were summoned by James to London where they arrived September 19th, 1606. They were interrogated by James whether the Aberdeen Assembly was lawful, if it be lawful to pray publicly for persons convicted and whether a Christian King may convocate,

28. Ibid., p. 488
29. Scot, op. cit., p. 155
30. R.P.C. Vll, series 1, p. 480.
31. Ibid, p. 480.
32. Ibid., p. 485.
33. Calderwood, op.cit.Vl,p.590.
34. R.P.C. Vll, 1st series, p.179.

prorogue and adjourn any ecclesiastical assembly or meeting.[35] The Presbyterian ministers neither denied the validity of the Aberdeen Assembly nor condemned the imprisoned ministers. And in regard to the King's prerogative in ecclesiastical matters, they said this would have to be answered not by them but by a General Assembly.[36] The Scottish ministers, however, went further than perhaps was prudent when in their interviews with James they began to censure the Episcopal system. On one occasion Andrew Melville charged the Archbishop of Canterbury to his face with "all corruptiouns, vaniteis, and superstitiouns of their charge, and bearing doun of faithful preachers, holding up of antichristian heirarchie, and Popish ceremonies." Then striding to the Archbishop he shook his lawn sleeves and called them "Romish rags."[37] Andrew Melville also while he was in London composed some Latin verses admonishing the Church of England.[38]

Andrew Melville was called before the English Privy Council and charged by them for composing verses "tending to the scandal and dishounour of the Church of England."[39] Not long afterwards Andrew Melville was sent to the Tower. He was released in 1611, and until his death in 1622 he remained in exile as a Professor of Divinity at the University of Sedan. James Melville was sent to Newcastle and later to Berwick, but

---

35. Calderwood, op. cit. vI, p. 480.
36. Ibid., pp. 571 - 577.
37. Ibid., p. 597.
38. Melville, op. cit., p. 682 and 706. One of the verses translated reads:

Saint Andro, Chrystis Appostle trew,
Does signe the Scotismanes ritis;
Saint George, Armenian Heresiarch,
The Inglischmanes delytis.
Let Scotisman, thane, hauld fast the faith!
That is holie Appostolicke,
Howbeit that Ingland keipes the cours
That Papistis Apostaticke.

39. Calderwood, op. cit. Vl, p. 599 See also Spottiswoode, op.cit.lll, p,183

was never allowed to return to Scotland.[40] The other ministers were permitted to return home, but were put under probation.

(2) The Scheme for Constant Moderators.

The King's manipulation of the General Assemblies by his prerogative of moving the date and place of the next meeting, the trial and banishment of the ministers of the Aberdeen Assembly and the removal from the Kirk of its leaders created what Gordon Donaldson describes as "a suitable atmosphere. . .for the King's next moves, designed to fit the bishops into church government very much as they had been fitted in the compromise of 1586, when bishops had been acknowledged as permanent moderators of presbyteries and synods."[41] The first significant move in that direction was made through the Parliament which was held in Perth, July 1606. The principle acts passed by Parliament affecting the Church concerned the King's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, the restitution of the Estate of Bishops, the annulment of the Act of Annexation of 1587 and the revival of Cathedral Chapters. The Presbyterian reaction was strong. On Chapters and Bishops William Scot writes that they "were damed by this Kirk of Scotland. . .yet the Estates in this Parliament ratified both, without so much as advising with the Kirk, or General Assemblies of the Kirk."[42]

Meanwhile the King, although he detested the General Assembly, began to realise that to satisfy the Church of Scotland one would have

40. James Melville in 1607 on the death of his wife obtained a licence to return home for one month (Calderwood, op. cit. VI, p. 668).
41. Donaldson, op. cit., p. 205
42. Scot, op. cit., p. 164.

to be called to ratify his schemes for re-establishing Episcopacy. Calderwood scoffingly comments: "Some show of Assembly they must have." James understood, however, that he could not rely on the success of a regular Assembly so he called in the meantime in substitution a Clerical Convention which convened in Linlithgow, December 1606. There met at Linlithgow 136 clergy, about 33 of the nobility and the Privy Council. The clergy were all nominees of the King, each Presbytery being required to send the ministers as named in the King's letters.[43] Spottiswoode gives the Convention the name of a General Assembly intimating that was what the King actually called. However, not until the meeting itself was it constituted a General Assembly, and Calderwood claims it was only made so conditionally "if things framed to the King's contentment."[44]

Most importantly this Assembly gave its consent to constant moderators in Presbytery. This proposal, however, was hedged with considerable cautions so that few felt the Presbyterian system was in danger. Thus, the forms of moderatorship were to be limited as follows: they could do nothing without the advice and consent of their brethren, they were subject to the trial and censure of provincial assemblies and they were to be chosen by the General Assembly.[45] Then, to institute the scheme, a list was drawn up of all Presbyteries and a name inserted who was to be the constant moderator of each Presbytery.[46]

The King, however, was not satisfied with such a mild success and it is likely that he altered the Convention minutes to read that there had been agreement to introduce constant moderators of Synods as well.[47]

43. Calderwood, op.cit. Vl, p. 603 (King's letter to the Presbytery of Dumfermlin
44. Ibid., p. 609.
45. Ibid., p. 618.
46. Ibid., pp. 622 - 624.
47. When the minutes appeared their authenticity was challenged by several Synods. See Calderwood, op.cit. Vi, p. 624 and R.P.C., Vll, lst series, p. 433 (footnote).

This was put in definite form when in June 1607 the Synod of Fife was required to choose the Archbishop of St. Andrews as constant moderator on the ground that it had been passed by the Linlithgow Assembly.[48] There arose strong opposition to the scheme especially when it became evident that constant moderators of Synods was simply the re-introduction of diocesan episcopacy.[49] Nevertheless, this stage in the re-establishment of Episcopacy was virtually completed and generally accepted by 1609.

(3). The Power of the Court of High Commission.

The King through the Privy Council, Parliament and his astute handling of the General Assembly continued to strengthen the position of the bishops. In December 1607 the frequently prorogued General Assembly (there had not been a generally recognised Assembly since 1602) was again prorogued to be held in Dundee in July 1608, the reason being given that the King himself would then be present. Calderwood's explanation of the delay was that the Episcopalians required more time to find sympathetic commissioners, and to prove his charge he describes in considerable detail the visit of Bishop Law to his own Presbytery of Peebles and how "he procured the choice of such commissioners as pleased him to the next Assemblie."[50] Before the Assembly met, a Conference was held in Falkland, June 15th and 16th, in the hope of reconciling the two factions, but it ended in failure.[51]

The place being changed from Dundee to Linlithgow the Assembly, without the King being present, met late in July. Bishop Law was elected Moderator.

48. R.P.C., Vll, 1st series, p. 380.
49. Calderwood recounts many examples of opposition to constant moderators (Calderwood, op.cit., Vl, pp. 632, 644, 678 and 680).
50. Ibid., p. 712
51. Details of the Conference are given in Calderwood, op.cit., Vl,pp.716-734.

The Assembly, to avoid too much controversy, discussed almost exclusively the problem of Roman Catholicism in Scotland. The conflict between Presbytery and Episcopacy was referred, because of lack of time, to a committee for a future report.[52] Calderwood even admits that the Bishops in this Assembly "gott a great vantage."[53] This Assembly may be considered to be the turning point among many of the clergy who now were willing to see the King's Episcopal policy tried.

The next advance in favour of the bishops came through the Parliament which met in Edinburgh in June 1609. In this Parliament the acts in the preceding Assembly were ratified and a statute was made in regard to the apparel of churchmen which was to be approved by the King.[54] The Presbyterians reacted bitterly to this act saying that "the king might impose the surplice and the baboun, yea, he might impose hood and bells by this act, so slavishly were they addicted to flatter and please him."[55] The Presbyterians, although they complained steadily about the imposition of Episcopacy, were getting progressively weaker. This is reflected in William Scot's letter to James Melville, September 1609, in which he describes their sad condition and asks: "But what can we doe? I beseeke you. . .lett us understand with this trustie bearer your minde particular, and wherein we may be more steadable: for we have great need to be advised and spurred."[56]

---

52. The second Falkland Conference which met in May 1609 took up this commission, but nothing concrete was done but to write down all the differences between the two parties (Calderwood, op.cit. Vll, p.36).
53. Ibid., Vl, p. 776.
54. Spottiswoode, op. cit., lll, p. 205.
55. Calderwood, op. cit. Vll, p. 41.
56. Ibid., p. 48.

With the Presbyterians in disarray the King pressed his advantage in favour of bishops one step further. In February 1610, James established two Courts of High Commission, one for the province of St. Andrews and the other for Glasgow. Each Court needed only a quorum of five, one requiring to be the respective Archbishop. The Court of High Commission to everyone's satisfaction fortified the discipline imposed by the local Kirk Session on an offender, but, and this was damaging to the Presbyterians, it could also deal with ministers who made public speeches against the established order of the Church, or against any of the conclusions of previous General Assemblies, or spoke in support of any who were banished or imprisoned by the State.[57] The Court's findings, however, were only relayed to the Privy Council which directed the charges. Nevertheless, as the Presbyterians rightly realised to their dismay, the bishops were now armed with temporal power as well as spiritual.

(4). The Glasgow Assembly, June 1610

After the Parliament of 1609, the King urged the bishops to take upon themselves the administration of the Church. They were, however, unwilling to make any change without the approval of the ministers, and in order to accomplish this an Assembly was appointed to be held in Glasgow on June 10th, 1610. James no doubt saw in this Assembly the final stage of at last bringing the ecclesiastical system of Scotland into line with the Church of England.

---

57. Calderwood, op. cit. Vll, pp. 60 - 61.

The Glasgow Assembly met on Friday, June 8th. Archbishop Spottiswoode was elected Moderator. The Assembly consisted of 138 ministers who in all fairness it must be said represented nearly every district in Scotland.[58] On Saturday the ministers convened at eight o'clock and, according to Calderwood, "sett looking one to another till about ellevan" while the bishops and six ministers in private conference drew up the Assembly articles.[59] In the afternoon they were presented to the Assembly by the Moderator who told the delegates "they had past in privie conference, none excepting two contradicting."[60] Just before the vote was taken, however, Dunbar, the King's commissioner to the Assembly, produced a letter from James threatening to abolish the Presbyteries. This Calderwood rightly comments "was but a Skarcraw to putt them in feare" and thus aid the Episcopalians in the vote, and perhaps it did since the Assembly the same afternoon accepted the articles. This meant that the step from Presbyterianism to constitutional Episcopacy had now been taken. The acts of the General Assembly were later ratified by Parliament in 1612.[61]

Because of the importance of the Glasgow Assembly its articles are outlined below with notes where alterations were made by Parliament.[62]

Article I: The Aberdeen Assembly was condemned, general meetings of the church were subject to royal prerogative, and the General Assembly was to meet every year. No mention of this latter point is made in the Act of Parliament.

Article II: The bishops were to be constant moderators of Synods.

---

58. The list of ministers and their districts is given in Calderwood, op.cit. VII, pp. 104 - 107.
59. Ibid., p. 95.
60. Ibid., p. 96.
61. A.P.S., IV, pp. 469 - 470.
62. The articles are given in Calderwood, op. cit. VII, pp. 99 - 103 and in Spottiswoode, III, pp. 206 - 207, and the alterations are given in considerable detail in Wadsworth, op. cit. p. 112 ff.

Article III: No sentence of excommunication or absolution was to be pronounced against or in favour of any person without the knowledge and approval of the bishop of the diocese.

Article IV: All presentations to a charge were to be directed by the bishop, but in order to perfect the act of ordination he was to be assisted by some of the ministers. Neither in Spottiswoode's History nor in the Act of Parliament, however, do we find any reference to the minister's function in admitting a new minister.

Article V: The bishop in association with local ministers was to deprive ministers if just cause is found.

Article VI: This dealt with the oath of loyalty to the King. Parliament in 1612 added an oath of loyalty to the bishop as well. And another change was the replacement of the clause: "als weill in things temporall as in conservatutioun and purgatione of religion" by "als weill in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical as in things temporall." Dr. Wadsworth comments on this alteration: "The assertion of the royal supremacy was thus given a sharper and more effective edge."[63]

Article VII: The visitation of every diocese was to be done by the bishop himself.

Article VIII: The exercise of doctrine was to be continued weeklie among the ministers. The term 'exercise of doctrine' replaced the usual word 'presbytery' to please the King.

Article IX: This article stated: "The bishops sall be subject in all things concerning their life, conversatioun, office, and benefice, to the censure of the General Assemblie; and being found culpable, with his

---

63. G.C.Wadsworth, op. cit., p. 115.

Majestie's advice and consent, to be deprived."[64] This important article was completely left out by Spottiswoode in his History and by Parliament.

Article X: The bishop elected was to be over forty and have ten years experience as a teaching minister. No reference to this article appears either in the Acts of Parliament or Spottiswoode's History.

Article XI: None of the ministry in the pulpit or in public were to be permitted to speak against any of the acts of the Glasgow Assembly.

(4) The Consecration of the Scottish Bishops.

The bishops from 1600 were only the king's appointees; they had no spiritual authority. The Scottish bishops, therefore, would not be recognised by the English churchmen as legitimate bishops as they lacked episcopal ordination. Thus until such time as they were episcopally consecrated no union or meaningful relationship between the two churches would be possible.

By 1610 no episcopally ordained bishop was alive in Scotland, Thus, three Scottish bishops went to Westminster for consecration in October 1610. Dr. Andrewes, the Bishop of Ely, raised the question whether they "must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop."[65] Archbishop Bancroft, however, maintained "that thereof there was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of

---

64. Calderwood, op. cit. VII, p. 102.

65. Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, p. 209.

the reformed Churches."[66] Bishop Andrewes agreed and the Scottish bishops were consecrated. It must also be said to the English divines' credit that neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor of York took part in the consecration in order to avoid any suggestion that the Church of Scotland was in subjection to the Church of England. It is interesting to note that on the bishops' return to Scotland, while they consecrated the other bishops, they did not re-ordain any men in presbyterian orders.

---

66. Ibid., p. 209.

C. James' Liturgical Policy, 1614 - 1618.

(1) The New Liturgy.

The Church of Scotland by the acts of the General Assembly of 1610, the acts of Parliament in 1612 and the consecration of the Scottish bishops had been brought into reasonable conformity with the Church of England. And yet, the Episcopacy James established still fell short of an ideal Episcopacy. In Scotland the office of deacon was unknown, presbyterian orders still remained and above all the liturgy was bare of forms and ceremonies as practised in the English Church. James appeared satisfied, however, with the advances made in church government, but he now began to advance liturgical changes.

As early as 1601 proposals were made to alter the Book of Common Order.[67] These suggestions, however, were rejected by the General Assembly and from that time up to 1614 nothing of substance was done. Then on March 4th, 1614, the ministers were commanded by proclamation at the market cross in Edinburgh to prepare the people for the Lord's Supper on Easter Day, April 24th. This was the start of James' liturgical policy. Calderwood admits reasonable success in that "the most part obeyed, but not all."[68] Then in 1615, James, probably encouraged by the fact that he had been fairly successful the previous year, commanded Easter to be celebrated for all times coming.[69]

In 1615 a beginning was also made in regard to a new liturgy. Archbishop Spottiswoode while in London in May, and almost certainly in consultation with the King, mentions for the first time in a letter

67. B.U.K., pp. 970 - 971. Since the 1560's the official service book of the Church of Scotland had been the Book of Common Order which also contained the Psalm Book, that is, the Metrical Psalms.
68. Calderwood, op. cit. VII, p. 191.
69. Ibid., p. 196.

the need of a new Book of Common Order: "There is lacking in our Church a form of divine service; and, while every minister is left to the framing of public prayer by himself, both the people are neglected and their prayers often impertinent."[70]

The General Assembly on the King's summons met at Aberdeen in August 1616. Most importantly the Assembly agreed that a new liturgy or book of common prayer should be formed for the Church, a book of canons prepared using as its basis the past acts of the General Assemblies, a catechism composed for family instruction and a simple Confession of Faith drawn up.[71]

A Confession of Faith prepared by John Hall and John Adamson in 1612 was accepted by the Assembly. A Committee, however, consisting of the Bishop of Galloway, Dr. Howie, George Hay and William Struthers, was appointed to revise it before printing.[72] The Catechism was ready for printing by 1619.[73] The task of drawing up a Book of Canons was given to Archbishop Law and William Struthers, but according to William Scot "the Book of Canons we doubt was ever fulfilled by those to whom it was committed."[74] The same, however, cannot be said for the Liturgical Committee, consisting of Patrick Galloway, John Adamson, Peter Hewat and William Erskine, which began the work which resulted in the making of three draft liturgies.[75]

The work on the first draft liturgy began immediately after the Assembly and was probably completed by the later months of 1616. The

70. G.W. Sprott, Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, (Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1891), p. xvi.
71. The work of the Assembly is described in Calderwood, op.cit. VII, p.225 ff and Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, p. 236 ff.
72. The Confession is given in full in Calderwood, op. cit. VII, pp. 233 - 242.
73. Sprott, op. cit., p. xxxvii.
74. Scott, op. cit., p. 245.
75. The first and third drafts are printed in Sprott, op. cit., and the second draft in Scottish History Society, Miscellany X. (Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1965). p. 92 - 117.

liturgy bears the name of Peter Hewat who was appointed convener of the Committee. Hewat is known to have been a minister of moderate views. This draft, therefore, reflects the moderate or central party position which advocated liturgical reform, but still wished to preserve as a model the Book of Common Order. About this draft Gordon Donaldson writes: "It was of a morning service, broadly on the Knoxian model, but with more distinctly liturgical character and with rubrics which were compulsory and not permissive."[76.]

The second draft liturgy refers to sitting with the minister at Communion and thus must antedate the Five Articles of Perth which were drawn up at the end of 1617. The date is therefore assigned to 1616 - 17. The final leaf bears the name of Bishop William Cowper of Galloway. Again, like the first draft, there were no radical innovations, although some revision had been made by another hand on the first three pages bringing it more into line with the English Prayer Book.[77.]

The third draft of the liturgy is also associated with Bishop Cowper and is dated 1618 - 19. It was much closer to the English Prayer Book than the other two had been with orders for morning and evening prayers based on Mattins and Evensong. And yet, as Gordon Donaldson points out, Bishop Cowper and other Anglophile churchmen were by no means forgetful of Scottish tradition and the familiar 'Knoxian' structure was not superceded.[78.] Archbishop Spottiswoode took the third draft with him to London for final revision and obtained a license dated June 3rd 1619 for Gilbert Dick, an Edinburgh Bookseller,

76. Gordon Donaldson, The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, (Edinburgh: University Press, 1954), p. 32.
77. S.H.S., Miscellany X. op. cit., p. 90.
78. Donaldson, The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, p. 36.

to print the new liturgy in conjunction with the new catechism. In the meantime, however, the King's other policy involving the introduction of certain observances related to the liturgy, known as the Five Articles of Perth, caused such trouble in the Church that it stopped the introduction of the new liturgy and prevented any further liturgical revision until after James' death.

(2) The Five Articles of Perth.

The acts of the Aberdeen Assembly of 1616 were sent to the King for his approval. The King's answer was favourable except with regard to the motion on confirmation which he called "a mere hotch-potch, and not so clear as was requisite."[79] James asked, therefore, that this act be reformed and besides he directed Archbishop Spottiswoode to insert certain articles. These proposals by the King, later to become known as the Five Articles of Perth, were: kneeling at Communion; the observance of the holy days of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension and Whitsunday; private Baptism; private Communion and episcopal Confirmation. Spottiswoode, however, was reluctant to introduce these articles as they had never been approved by the Church. He suggested, therefore, that the attempt be made by James himself during his Scottish visit planned for the summer of 1617.[80]

In the meantime, in preparation for the King's visit, workmen began to repair the Chapel Royal in Edinburgh which involved the setting of portraits of the apostles in the pews. These changes were seen by both ministers and people as the setting up of images and the

79. Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, p. 236.

80. Ibid., p. 237.

cry went out that "ere long they should have the mass."[81] The King was eventually persuaded to discontinue these unpopular alterations, but, at the same time, he informed the Scottish bishops that on his arrival they would be instructed by the English divines in what had taken place in the Chapel Royal as well as in other points. "God make us wise and faithful," the Bishop of Galloway writes to the minister of Stirling, "and keepe us from their usurpation over us, which is evendtlie perceived."[82] There is little doubt that the ministers and bishops were perturbed with the thought of the King's coming visit which was being heralded by such intimidation and so many unwelcome innovations.

By the 16th of May the King was in Edinburgh, and, as if to confirm the Kirk's misgivings, the following day began the English service in the Chapel Royal. Next in the Palace of Holyrood on Whitsunday the communion elements were served in the English manner. Here the bishops present all received communion kneeling except the Bishop of Galloway, but he also, says Calderwood, "continued not long in that mode."[83] On the following Tuesday, June 10th, the King ordered the Privy Council to warn some of the noblemen present in the Chapel Royal who did not communicate to prepare themselves to receive communion kneeling at the next Lord's Day.[84] Then on June 13th the Diocesan Synod of Lothian was asked to consent to the five articles prepared by the King, but they wisely avoided the issue by saying they could not without the advice and consent of the General Assembly.[85]

---

81. Ibid., p. 239.
82. Calderwood, op. cit. VII, p. 245.
83. Ibid., p. 247.
84. Ibid., p. 247.
85. Ibid., p. 249.

The Church had now adequate cause for concern, but it was the Parliament called to meet in Edinburgh on June 17th that revealed the King's first broad move towards radical change. The article to be enacted which troubled the Church was: "That whatsoever conclusion was taken by his majesty with advice of the archbishops and bishops (and a competent number of the ministry) in matters of external policy, the same should have the power and strength of an ecclesiastical law."[86] The ministers quickly presented a protest to the King in which they reminded him of the purity of the Scottish communion, asked for the protection of the General Assembly which they feared the article under discussion would have overthrown, and expressed a dread that he intended conformity with the Church of England.[87] The protest was rejected by James. The controversial article, however, was eventually withdrawn by the King who justified its removal by saying it was "a thing no way necessary, the prerogative of his crown bearing him to more than was declared by it."[88]

The King certainly was not daunted by this setback, indeed he ignored it, and proceeded to use what he believed was his prerogative to make new ecclesiastical laws. He called, therefore, a clerical diet, composed of the bishops and some ministers, to meet in St.Andrews on the 10th of July. The purpose of the diet was to establish James' five articles in the Church of Scotland.

James, however, was about to discover that resentment to his five articles ran deep, although the degree of opposition varied with

---

86. Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, p. 241. The phrase in brackets was later added to the original draft (R.P.C., XI, 1st series, p. 1).
87. Calderwood, op. cit. VII, p. 255.
88. Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, p. 245.

the different articles. For example, the article on episcopal confirmation was generally accepted to be a matter of indifference. The same appears to be true concerning the article on the keeping of holy days. And yet, Patrick Galloway pointed out that in the Church of Scotland the observance of holy days would be hard to embrace as they had been free of them, keeping only the Lord's Day. The Church of Scotland, moreover, he maintained, had never been negligent in observing the events these holy days represent, its ministers preaching "sufficientlie of Christ's nativite, passion, resurrectione, and ascessione, and coming of the Holy Spirit almost in all our sermons."[89] He was also afraid that the setting up of holy days would lead to superstition and perhaps, we might say, to a form of sentimentalism such as we see exhibited today at Easter and Christmas. It is also interesting to note that the arguments against the observance of holy days was in line with Knox's admonition that the keeping of them was "utterlie to be abolished from the realm."[90]

The other three articles were more vehemently opposed. The article on private baptism radically interfered with the Church's sacramental theology. The practice of the Reformers in the administration of baptism was that because the Word and Sacrament belong inseparately together baptism must be ministered in the church before the face of the congregation, and where there is clear instruction in the Word of God.[91] Concessions, however, were made on humanitarian grounds, where the child was seriously ill, to baptisms taking place outside the normal times of preaching, but

89. Ian Cowan, "The Five Articles of Perth," D.Shaw (ed.), Reformation and Revolution, (Edinburgh: St.Andrew Press, 1967), p. 163.
90. Knox, op. cit. p. 281.
91. Church of Scotland Commission on Baptism, Baptism in the Church of Scotland - An Historical Survey to 1843, (Edinburgh: St.Andrews Press, 1958), p. 16.

no exceptions were made that baptism must be accompanied by a sermon and take place in church. These concessions, however, were not sufficient to please the King who desired baptism in private homes. The article was also opposed because it came into conflict with the Church's teaching that the lack of baptism was not harmful to a child's salvation. Thus, according to the Bishop of Galloway, to grant baptism in private homes to those who request it was to confirm the dangerous opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism.[92] Again it is interesting to note that every aspect of the opposition to the article is found in the teaching of the Scottish Reformers.[93]

There was also considerable antagonism to the article on private communion. The conjunction of Word and Sacrament, as in baptism, and the emphasis on communion and corporate participation rather than on sacrifice were behind the decision of the Reformers, and hence those who opposed the article, to forbid private communion. That it went on, however, is clear from an act of the General Assembly of 1581 which deals with the prohibition of the Lord's Supper in the homes of the people. And just prior to 1617, there seems to have been several instances of private communion being distributed, one example being that of the Earl of Orkney who before his execution received the Lord's Supper on a date which was not set aside for regular communion.[94] The

92. Cowan, op, cit., p. 162.
93. The First Book of Discipline declares: "Baptism may be ministered whensoever the word is preached; but we think it more expedient, that it be ministered upon the Sunday, or upon the day of prayers, only after the sermon; partly to remove the gross error by the which many deceived think that children be damned if they die without Baptism; and partly to make the people assist the administration of that sacrament with greater reverence than they do (Knox, op. cit., p. 313)."
94. William McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1560 - 1638. (London: James Clarke & Co., 1931), p. 210.

article, however, had the adverse effect of bringing this issue out into the open. The assembly at St. Andrews in 1617 produced a compromise which stated that if a sick person had been confined to bed for a year, the minister of the parish being requested should give communion to him in the presence of six elders and other witnesses.[95] This compromise James rejected as he desired that private communion should be freely available.

The greatest hostility was reserved for the article requiring kneeling at communion. In the Scottish church it was the custom to kneel at all prayers, and this was used as an argument by the advocates of the articles that if it was right to kneel, for example, at the prayer of consecration why not at the reception? George Gillespie in English Popish Ceremonies answers by saying that giving thanks to God was an "immediate worship of God", while kneeling at receiving the elements was "idolatry".[96] Another argument against the article was based on the scriptural description of the Last Supper. Patrick Galloway writes:

> I think as yet that the best forme of taking it is, as we do sitting; becaws, first, Christ our Lord did so: he had a table, (Luk.22.21; and vers 14), sat doun with the twelf to celebrat the supper; and Christis action sould be our institutione. . .Nixt, prayer and prayse going immediatly before the actioun, and following immediately after the actioun, with kneeling; it appearis most seemly that the actioun itself sould be according to the custome used in such actioun, and that is, to eate and drink sitting, and as communicants with our Lord, to rejoyce with him at his table.[97]

This argument was also in accord with the First Book of Discipline which stated that "sitting at a table is most convenient to that holy action."[98] The King, however, refused to consider these strongly held convictions of the Church and was determined to enforce kneeling at communion along with the other articles.

---

95. Calderwood, op. cit., VII, p. 285.
96. McMillan, op. cit., p. 166.
97. Cowan, op. cit., p. 513.
98. Knox, op. cit., II, p. 282.

It was in a strained atmosphere that the Clerical Diet met in St. Andrews to approve the articles and, after consultation, it informed the King that an answer to the articles was too large a responsibility without the consent of a General Assembly. The King, though displeased, yet agreed to an Assembly being called to meet in St. Andrews in November 1617. The St. Andrews Assembly, however, also refused to accept the articles and made a motion to delay their endorsement to yet another General Assembly.[99] In the meantime, it sent a compromise statement to the King who replied by condemning the Assembly as a disgrace and refused augmentation of stipends, passed at the previous Parliament, to ministers who would not further the acceptance of the articles. Then in a postscript in the King's own hand was written: "Since your Scottish Church hath so far contemned my clemency, they shall now find what it is to draw the anger of a king upon them."[100]

The bishops, now fearful of the King's intentions, began in January 1618 a campaign to pressure the ministers and people into accepting the articles. By the time the General Assembly met at Perth in August, the bishops felt that there was now sufficient conformity to have the articles passed. Archbishop Spottiswoode assumed the position of Moderator of the Assembly without election. The King's letter was then read which included the ominous words:

> "We were once fullie resolved, never in our time to have called anie moe Assemblies there, for ordering things concerning the policie of the churche, by reason of the disgrace offered unto us in that late meeting at St. Androes. . .we suffered ourself to be intreatted by you our bishops for a new convocation. . hoping assuredlie, that ye will have some better regard of our desires." 101.

---

99. Spottiswoode, op. cit., III, p. 248.
100. Ibid., p. 249.
101. Calderwood, op. cit., VII, p. 309.

Spottiswood after reading the King's letter protested that neither he nor the Church of England desired these innovations into the Church of Scotland, but he was now convinced that the King would be more glad to see the Assembly pass the articles than to possess all the gold of India. He then warned the Assembly that if they refused the articles "the whole estate and order of our kirk wold be overthrowne, some ministers wold be banished, other some deprived of their stipend and office, and all wold be brought under the wrathe of authoritie."[102.]

After Spottiswoode's address the smaller Conference of the Assembly convened at three in the afternoon where the King's letter was again read and the articles presented, but they were not voted on. The next day, however, at eight in the morning, the same Conference met again and this time voted in favour of the articles. Then, the following day, the public Assembly voted acceptance. In order to encourage acceptance, according to Calderwood, the question put in the voting was "Will ye consent to these articles or disobey the King", and in calling the names, Archbishop Spottiswoode cried out "Have the king in your mind! Remember of the king! Looke to the king!"[103.] After this fashion the articles were endorsed by the Perth Assembly.[104.]

---

102. Ibid., p. 311

103. Ibid., p. 332.

104. Hereafter they were known as the Five Articles of Perth and are given in full in Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, pp. 255 - 257

D. Reaction to James' Liturgical Policy, 1618 - 1625.

It is quite clear what the Church of Scotland felt about James' proposals from the strenuous opposition they engendered from the beginning. After the articles had been passed at Perth order was given to the parish churches to exhort obedience. The majority, however, still refused to conform so that disturbances broke out especially in the Edinburgh churches where the people, if their ministers obeyed the articles, withdrew in great number to other ministers they knew to be defying the law.[105] The trouble, as might be expected, centered on kneeling at communion which, besides being the most controversial article, was the most difficult one to circumvent.

In the meantime, with Easter approaching on the 28th of March 1619, the bishops warned the presbyteries to obey the articles.[106] Then on March 14th the King commanded the Privy Council to take communion kneeling under pain of loss of office.[107] Upon Easter day itself, however, the communicants were given the option to sit, stand or kneel as they pleased, but many did not come, some received without kneeling and others who kneeled were seen to be weeping. Calderwood comments that "cold and graceless were the Communions, and few were the communicants."[108] By June 1619 books were secretly being distributed condemning the articles and the Perth Assembly.

A Conference between the bishops and ministers was held at St.Andrews in November 1619 in the hope of promoting greater harmony in the church.

---

105. Spottiswoode, op. cit. III, p. 257.
106. Calderwood, op. cit. VII, p. 340.
107. Ibid., p. 355.
108. Ibid., p. 359.

The bishops told the dissenting ministers that they would be happy without the articles, but as the King wanted them, they could not tolerate their refusal any longer. Archbishop Spottiswoode then read to them the King's letter which said in part: "I doe command you. . .that ye depose all these that refuse to conforme (and). . .if there be not a sufficient number remaining to fill their places, I will send you ministers out of England."[109] The ministers, despite this threat, refused to conform and nothing was accomplished by the bishops through this Conference. Meanwhile, church members were being fined for refusing to attend communion, and ministers were cited before the Diocesan Synods and Court of High Commission, but with little effect.

It is obvious that James miscalculated the strength of the opposition to the Five Articles of Perth. Thus when they were to be ratified by Parliament in July 1621, the Marquis of Hamilton, the King's commissioner, promised if the Church of Scotland would receive them, he had the King's word that he would never burden them with any more ceremonies during his lifetime.[110] Parliament ratified the articles, but here again the strength of the opposition can be seen by the vote of seventy-eight in favour to fifty-one against from a body which usually just rubber stamped the legislation placed before it. James, however, kept his word as promised by Hamilton.

The Church of Scotland never in any meaningful way accepted the articles, and by 1627 Spottiswoode tells us that kneeling at communion had been given up where it had formerly been observed.[111] And John Row

---

109. Ibid., p. 397.
110. Ibid., p. 496.
111. William McMillan, op. cit., p. 182.

also writes that in the Easter communion of 1627 "there were not above six or seven persons in all the toun that kneeled, also some of the ministers kneeled not."[112] There is little doubt that James' apparent triumph was tantamount to a defeat as the trouble caused by the articles affected the movement for a new liturgy, the authority of the crown was weakened, and a great number of the people and many moderate ministers became permanently dissatisfied with the episcopal system.[113]

---

112. John Row, The History of the Kirk of Scotland. (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), p. 343.

113. A typical reaction to the articles was that expressed by Robert Blair: "Matters being thus carried (at the Perth Assembly), I had no doubt, nor ever doubted since, on what side truth stood. Yea, then I perceived that Prelacy itself was the worst of all corrupt ceremonies and was then fixed in my judgement never to approve their way, it being destructive to the purity of the Gospel (Robert Blair, The Life of Robert Blair, (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1848), p. 15)."

CHAPTER II: CHARLES I'S ATTEMPT TO REORGANIZE THE SCOTTISH CHURCH, 1625-1638

A. Charles I's Ecclesiastical Policy.

(1) In England.

In March 1625 King James I died. The Puritans in England became apprehensive when within a week of the King's death Bishop Laud, an Arminian and strict supporter of the Church of England as established, was appointed by Charles to preach at the opening of Parliament. Then, at the same time, Buckingham, the new King's chief adviser, received from Laud a list which classified the clergy as "O" for Orthodox or Arminian and "P" for Puritan. Meanwhile Bishop Williams, a Puritan sympathizer, after attending the funeral of the late King, was excluded from the Coronation Service.

The Puritans must have also been concerned when Laud, speaking in a sermon about early Hebrew worship, and no doubt with non-conformists in mind, told Parliament (February 1626):

> God tied them to one place of worship, lest wandering here and there in strange places, they might fall into the service of strange gods. And mark it, God would have but one temple erected, one altar, in one city, that the people might not fall asunder into different superstitions, and leave true religion least followed. [1]

The threat of imposed uniformity is clearly anticipated in Laud's exposition. And Parliament itself must have felt its authority challenged when in the same sermon, Laud said:

> And surely it was a blessed figure, that God's house and the King's stand together at Jerusalem. . .that no man might think himself further from God by serving the King, nor further from the King by serving God. The King's power is God's ordinance, and the King's command must be God's glory; and the honour of the subject is obedience to both. [2]

It is fairly obvious that Laud and his supporters looked to the King to further their designs, and were claiming, therefore, that behind the

1. William Laud, Works. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1853), 1, p. 78.
2. Ibid., p. 79.

king lay the divine sanction. Rushworth mentions that after the death of Buckingham in January 1629, "The King seemed to take none to favour so much as Dr. Laud. . .afterwards none became so intimate with his Majesty as the said Bishop."[3] Clearly the high-church party, with Laud as its leader, was becoming strongly established in the King's favour.

Laud's ideal, according to C. V. Wedgwood, was a church "rigidly and efficiently organised, its services reverently conducted according to a uniform ritual, its hierarchy sagely established, and the whole population gathered together into one docile flock."[4] And what Laud proposed for the church was readily endorsed by Charles. How Laud exercised his new found power to achieve these things, we shall elaborate on briefly.

First of all, those whom the Puritans opposed Laud had promoted. For example, Richard Montague, a well known Arminian clergyman, who in one of his books excused the Church of Rome from apostacy, was appointed Bishop of Chichester and this despite the fact that the late Bishop of the same diocese had been one of his bitterest opponents. Laud also managed to have the Calvinist Archbishop of Canterbury suspended from his office for refusing to licence an Erastian sermon preached by a Dr. Sibthorpe. Other bishops, including Laud, were then appointed to execute the Archbishop's jurisdiction.[5]

Secondly, Laud attacked the system of lecturers and private chaplains who, although episcopally ordained, remained outside a bishop's control.

---

3. John Rushworth, Historical Collections, (London: 1721), 1, p. 637.
4. C.V. Wedgwood, The King's Peace, (Collins: Fontana Library, 1966), p.87
5. Rushworth, op. cit. 1, p. 431.

The conforming minister read the service after which the lecturer, who had been sitting in the vestry, entered the pulpit to preach the sermon. In this way the Puritan clergy escaped the obligation of subscribing to the whole Prayer Book and, at the same time, without breaking any church law, freely expounded their Puritan creed. The lecturers were paid by Puritan laity and sometimes obtained a chaplaincy in a home of some person of rank where the church exercised no jurisdiction. Laud was determined to bring them under episcopal control. Thus, early in 1629, he presented to the King a document titled Considerations for the better settling of the Church Government in which the bishops were to be advised that the King would be pleased that "a special care be had over the Lecturers in every Diocese, which by reason of their Pay are the People's Creatures, and blow the Bellows of their Sedition."[6] And in order to decrease their power the bishops were instructed that every lecturer would be required to read the Divine Service in his Surplice before the sermon, that no one would be permitted to preach unless he had a cure of souls, and that no nobleman would be allowed to have a private chaplain in his home.[7]

Thirdly, Laud began to promote what he called the "beauty of holiness" in the worship service. At the time of his trial he wrote:" I evidently saw that the public neglect of God's service in the outward face of it. . . had almost cast a damp upon the true and inward worship of God; which, while we live in the body, need external helps, and all little enough

---

6. Ibid., II, p. 7.
7. It is obvious in a letter from Laud to Charles, January 1634, that progress was not being made as quickly as he would have liked. He mentions that many lay supported lecturers were still preaching "without any relation to bishop or archbishop (Laud, op.cit. V, p. 321)."

to keep it in any vigour."[8] The external and visible means used by Laud were the elaborate practices of the Medieval Church.[9] This widened the gap between himself and the Puritans.

Fourthly, Laud believed that his liturgical policy must be linked with uniformity of practice. "I laboured nothing more," he said at his trial, "than that the external public worship to God must be preserved, and that with as much decency and conformity as might be; being still of opinion, that unity cannot long continue in the Church, where uniformity is shut out at the church door."[10] That Laud was determined to see his policy of uniformity successfully carried out is exemplified by the tragic case of Alexander Leighton. This Scottish born minister, the father of Archbishop Leighton of Dunblane, wrote a book A Plea against Prelacy in which he attacked the bishops calling them antichristian, satanical, men of blood and enemies to God. He also described the Queen as the "Daughter of Heth".[11] He was arrested and taken before the Court of the Star Chamber on June 4th, 1630. His

---

8. Ibid., IV, p. 60.
9. Just how elaborate and highly ceremonial Laud was inclined to be can be seen from the following description of the Consecration of the Sacrament at the dedication of St. Katherine's Church, London, January 16th, 1630: "As he approached the Communion Table he made several lowly Bowings, and coming up to the side of the Table where the Bread and Wine were covered, he bowed seven times, and then after the reading of many Prayers, he came near the Bread, and gently lifted up the corner of the Napkin wherein the Bread was laid, and when he beheld the Bread he laid it down again, drew back a step or two, bowed three several times towards it, then he drew near again, and opened the Napkin, and bowed as before.
   Then he laid his hand on the Cup, which was full of Wine with a cover upon it, which he let go again, went back, and bowed thrice towards it, then he came near again, and lifting up the cover of the Cup looked into it, and seeing the Wine he let fall the cover again, retired back and bowed as before; then he received the Sacrament (Rushworth, op.cit., p.77)."
10. Laud, op. cit. IV, p. 60.
11. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 55.

sentence, however, was appallingly severe. First, he was expelled from the ministry and then he was severely whipped, put in the pillory where he had one of his ears cut off, one side of his nose slit and one cheek branded with a red hot iron with the letters S.S. signifying a stirrer up of sedition. One week later the sentence was repeated by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of the nose, and branding the other cheek. Rushworth criticises his "untempered zeal" that prompted him to write such a book. Nevertheless, he also comments that "the severe punishment of this unfortunate Gentleman many people pitied."[12] Meanwhile other clergymen were being censured and some excommunicated, as Laud informed the King, "for refusing to subscribe to the articles establised by the canon of the Church."[13]

Perhaps we should note here that although Laud was determined to establish uniformity wherever Charles was King, he showed little interest in the affairs of foreign churches. This can be seen in his languid support of the scheme proposed by John Durie, a Scottish clergyman, to unite Calvinists and Lutherans. He was disinterested not because he believed the Reformed Churches of Europe were illegitimate churches, but rather that they were outside his province as Archbishop of Canterbury. As S.R. Gardiner puts it; "Laud held it to be his business to reduce the Church of England to order, not to meddle with other churches. And he could speak without irritation of Presbyterians beyond the sea so long as the Presbyterians were not subjects of King Charles."[14]

---

12. Ibid., p. 58.
13. Laud, op. cit. V, p. 318.
14. Gardiner, op. cit., VII, p. 314.

This raises the interesting question whether the Church of Scotland was regarded by Laud as a foreign church. It is clear that the Church of Scotland was equated with the foreign reformed churches at the consecration of the Scottish bishops in 1610.[15] Laud, however, did not hold this view. For example, in a letter to Bishop Hall in January 1639, he comments, "you do extremely well to distinguish the Scottish business from the state of foreign Churches."[16] And it is reasonably clear that he viewed the Church of Scotland as a domestic church when at his trial he admits that his policy was to remove any "inconsistence" between the two national churches so that there might be one ecclesiastical government in one island, and under one monarch.[17]

Finally, it was also part of Laud's ecclesiastical policy to raise the position of clergymen in the affairs of the State. There is little doubt that Laud's aim was to make the clergy the equals of the nobles. Churchmen were accordingly promoted to positions of power in the government. Bishops became more active in the Privy Council and late in 1635 an almost unprecedented step was taken when Bishop Juxon was made Lord High Treasurer. Laud, elated, wrote in his diary: "No Churchman had it since Henry 7. time. I pray God bless him carry it so, that the Church may have honour, and the King and the State service and contentment by it."[18] The nobles, in the meantime, were becoming increasingly disturbed over the Church's intrusion into the great affairs of the State. One nobleman informed Wentworth (March 1636): "We begin to live here in the Church triumphant."[19] And the Venetian ambassador, at the same time,

---

15. Supra., p. 39.
16. Laud, op. cit., VI, p. 577.
17. Ibid., III, p. 385.
18. Ibid., p. 226.
19. H.R.Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud, (London: MacMillan, 1940), p. 211.

reported that "the most conspicuous offices and the greatest authority in the Royal Council are falling by degrees into the hands of ecclesiastics, to the prejudice of the nobility and governing houses."[20] There is little doubt that Laud believed the Church should be active in the affairs of State, and that he considered himself as much a politician as a churchman. Such then, in outline, was Charles I's ecclesiastical policy in England, as directed by Archbishop Laud, and which was in substance to spill over into his northern kingdom.

---

20. Ibid., p. 227.

Charles I's Ecclesiastical Policy.

(2) In Scotland.

We may say that Charles, in line with his ecclesiastical policy in England, wanted three things for Scotland: the clergy enriched, elevated, and the imposition of a liturgy with greater splendour. First of all, we shall consider Charles' policy to promote the financial well-being of the Church. In a letter to the Privy Council, July 1625, Charles revoked all gifts of any kind granted by himself and his father.[21] Then on October 12th the Act of Revocation, as it was now called, was passed through the Scottish Privy Seal in a more extensive form. By this Act properties belonging to the old church now in lay hands were to be re-annexed to the Crown.[22]

This right of retrospective revocation claimed by Charles, however, was no novelty as it had been acknowledged by Parliament as belonging to his father who exercised it in reference to his mother Queen Mary, and she in turn used it in reference to James V, and so by each sovereign in series back to James III.[23] Nevertheless, the Act caused great alarm among the landowners especially as there was much secrecy surrounding the initial proceedings. The King's intentions, therefore, were subject to considerable rumour. A Royal Letter was accordingly sent from Whitehall ordering Proclamation throughout Scotland to explain the King's motives and views in the controversy. The letter was prefaced by a reference to the King's "princelie care for the advancement of religioun and justice."[24] The Proclamation, however, had little effect in quietening the fears of the landowners.

---

21. R.P.C., 2nd series, 1, pp. 81 - 82.
22. Gordon Donaldson makes the interesting comment: "There were few issues on which Charles I agreed with Andrew Melville, but one was the claim of the reformed church to all the old ecclesiastical revenues. (Scotland: James V - James VII, p. 296)."
23. R.P.C., 2nd series, I, p. xlvii.
24. Ibid., p. xlvii.

The Privy Council, in July 1626, announced that Charles was now willing to offer compensation to all who would voluntarily surrender their rights to land which in any case, he claimed, should belong to the Church or Crown.[25] When, however, no surrenders were received, Charles sent instructions, dated August 22nd, that the Court of Session was to take an "action of improbation and reduction" against all those Scottish subjects whom he meant to bring within the scope of the Act.[26] This resulted in a new commission being appointed February 1627 to receive surrenders. The terms of reference of the commission, however, when finally worked out, were not so stringent as expected. The task of the commission was to alleviate the fears caused by the Act of Revocation, and to negotiate with those who possessed Crown or Church property that it might be kept by them upon reasonable conditions.[27] By the end of September 1629 a compromise was finally agreed upon in which the Church lands were to remain with their present owners but held by the King who would exact a rental. Tithes or teinds for the Church were dealt with in a more complicated fashion. But as far as the Church was concerned Charles ensured that the same Commission set up in February 1627 would provide their ministers with an adequate stipend. Shortly afterwards the minimum stipend was fixed at a reasonable 800 merks.[28]

The policy of Charles to restore to the Church its property by the Act of Revocation produced tremendous resentment among the nobles. A letter from the Privy Council, November 1625, informed the King that the fear of Revocation "is generallie apprehendit their upoun be all

---

25. Ibid., p. 352.
26. By the Scottish process called "an action of improbation" any private person maintaining that property rightfully belonging to him was wrongfully held by another person could compel that person to come to court and either prove his titles or have them declared null (R.P.C. 2nd Series, 1, p. 398).
27. Ibid., p. 510.
28. For a detailed account of the reform of parish finances, see W.Roland Foster, "A Constant Platt Achieved: Provision for the Ministry,1600 - 1638" in D. Shaw (ed.) Reformation and Revolution, p. 124 ff.

your goode subjectis and murmurit at, as nothing hes at only time heirtofore occurrit whilk hes so far disquyeted the myndid of your goode subjectis and pessest them with apprehensionis and feares of consequenceis thairof."[29.] Although the conclusion of these proceedings was not so drastic as at first imagined, the nobles still remained apprehensive and dissatisfied. Sir James Balfour called the Act "the ground-stone of all the mischeiffe that followed after both to this Kinges governiment and family."[30.] Such a statement is perhaps somewhat exaggerated as the main cause of Charles' troubles in Scotland. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the Act of Revocation helped to unite a great number of dissatisfied nobles with discontented churchmen when the new Service Book was introduced in 1637.

The elevation of the clergy, the second measure in Charles' ecclesiastical policy, arose concurrently with his financial policy for the Church. This also proved to be a cause of dissatisfaction among his Scottish subjects. The number of bishops steadily increased in the Privy Council. By 1637 two archbishops and seven bishops were members of the Council and all of them, apart from the Bishop of the Isles, were deeply involved in the work of the Council as the attendance record reveals. Then in 1634 Archbishop Spottiswoode was made Chancellor, a position that had been held by a layman since the Reformation.

The discontent caused by the advancement of the bishops further increased over the composition of the Committee of Articles. This committee had complete control over the legislation to be introduced to Parliament which generally did no more than rubber stamp the bills placed before it.

---

29. R.P.C., 2nd series, 1, p. 193.
30. Ibid., p. 82.

The composition of the Committee of Articles, therefore, was extremely important to the King, and like his father before him Charles employed the same unpopular electorial procedure whereby the bishops created by the Crown elected the nobles known to be the King's men, and the nobles in turn elected the bishops, and prelate and noble together then elected the representatives of the small barons and freeholders and commissioners of burghs. Thus, through the bishops, the Committee of Articles was certain to be under Charles' control.

The advancement of the bishops into temporal offices, however, not only irritated the nobles but also the majority of churchmen. For example, Robert Baillie, a moderate churchman, describes with considerable satisfaction the failure of several schemes to increase the already rising power of the bishops:

> The last year (1636) our Bishops guided all our estate, and became verie terrible to our whole countrie: they are now a little lower. The first rubb they had was in the matter of the Abbacie of Lindores. They had weill near gottin that through, as a first preparative to have all the rest follow, that our Abbacies should have been conferred on preachers, that so many new Lords of Parliament should have been erected for the Church. This all the Nobilitie did so band against, that the King's minde was drawn clear off the designe. The next rubb they gotte was in the matter of the Thesaurer, fra Canterberrie had gottin the Bishop of London Thesaurer of Ingland. At the word of Mortoun's demission, Rosse (Bishope of Ross) thought himself sure of that office, and so did we all; bot the Duke and the Marqueise, sett out by a number of our Noblemen, did concurr to stirr up Traquair to make meins for that place, that he might, by his great partes, be a barr to hinder the inundatione of our impetuous Clergie, which was like to overflow all. 31.

The third thing Charles desired for the Church of Scotland was a new liturgy. The liturgical revision abandoned by King James was therefore in 1629 revived by Charles. Bishop Maxwell on his visit to London in 1629 discussed the new liturgy with Laud, and presented to him the draft

---

31. Robert Baillie, Letters and Journals, (Edinburgh: Lawrie & Co., 1841), 1, pp. 6 - 7.

liturgy prepared in the time of King James and which Maxwell claimed embodied substantially the views of the Scottish Church. Laud, however, was dissatisfied with the draft liturgy; it was too bare for his liking.[32] Laud persuaded the King not to accept it and told Maxwell that "if his Majesty would have a Liturgy settled there, it were best to take the English Liturgy without any variation."[33] But, according to Laud, the Scottish bishops, at the time of the Royal Visit to Scotland in 1633, pressed to have "a Liturgy framed by themselves" so that the King at last agreed to the making of a Scottish Prayer Book and "commanded me to give the bishops of Scotland my best assistance in this way of work."[34] In the meantime the English Liturgy was to be used until the new liturgy was ready.

There is no doubt that Charles found in Laud a man of similar persuasion as himself, but unfortunately neither of them understood Scotland. Though Charles was born in Scotland at Dunfermline on November 19th 1600, he had been brought up in England and he knew no more than Laud the 'stomach' of his Scottish subjects. The Royal visit to Scotland in 1633 revealed both Charles and Laud's imcomprehension of Scottish values. For example, at the coronation service of Charles at St. Giles, the Archbishop of Glasgow who refused to wear a surplice was pushed aside by Laud with the words: "Are you a Church man and wants the Coat of your Order."[35] Again when Laud was made a burgess of Perth, he refused to swear to defend the true Protestant Reformed Religion saying that "it is my part rather to exact for religion

32. Sprott, op. cit., p. xlvi.
33. Laud, op. cit. III, p. 428.
34. Ibid., p. 428.
35. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 182.

an oath, than you of me."[36] Another unfortunate incident occurred when Laud was in the church of Dunblane which he praised as a goodlie church, whereupon someone standing by added that it was also a fine church before the Reformation. "What, fellow," Laud replied, "Deformation, not Reformation."[37]

Meanwhile the worship services in Scotland were being altered by Charles and Laud to fit the English pattern. About these changes we have this critical comment from the Presbyterian Row:

> On the Sabbath, June 23, the King came to the Great Kirk of Edinburgh to heare sermon. . .Mr. John Maxwell, minister of Edinburgh, but now made Bishop of Rosse, came doune from the King's loft, caused the Reader remove from his place, sett doune there two Inglish chaplains, clad with surplices, and they with the help of other chaplains and Bishops there present, acted their Inglish service. That being ended, in came Mr. John Guthrie, Bishop of Moray, clad also with surplice, went up so to pulpit and taught a sermon. At thir things many marvelled, to see and heare such things openlie avowed and done in this Kirk, without any warrand or pretext, either of law or reassone, or occasion offered to them to alter the settled ordour of the Reformed Kirk. [38]

After Laud returned to England he left behind him unpleasant memories of himself personally and also Scottish fears for the future. Nonetheless, in October the same year, Charles gave Laud permission to correspond with the Dean of the Chapel Royal in Edinburgh in order to inform him what changes the King desired for this Service.[39] Laud was also to be kept informed by the Scottish bishops about the preparation of the new Service Book.[40] About Laud and Scotland at this time H.R.Trevor-Roper writes: "Charles had no independent ecclesiastical adviser for Scotland; and in practice Laud dictated the policy of the Scottish Church without any hesitation, as if it were part of the province of Canterbury."[41]

36. Row, op. cit., pp. 368 - 369.
37. Ibid., p. 369.
38. Ibid., p. 363.
39. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 206.
40. Laud, op. cit. III, p. 337.
41. Trevor-Roper, op. cit., p. 339.

The truth of Trevor-Roper's comment is clearly seen in Laud's dealings with Bishop Ballanden in particular. Laud had him removed from Dunblane to Aberdeen because he omitted the use of the English liturgy.[42] Ballanden, while in Aberdeen, was again criticised by Laud in a letter to Archbishop Spottiswoode for allowing a public fast throughout his diocese on the Lord's day and he instructed the Scottish Archbishop that "if the Canons be not already printed, (as I presume they are not,) that you make a Canon purposely against this unworthy custom, and see it printed with the rest; and that you write a short letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen, to let him understand how he hath overshot himself."[43]

While the new Service Book was nearing completion the Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiasticall Gathered and put in form, for the Government of the Church of Scotland was published in 1636.[44] The history of the Canons we may say began at the Glasgow Assembly of 1610 when Episcopacy was re-established. This was a form of government completely foreign to the Prexbyterian Second Book of Discipline. Thus in 1616 at the Aberdeen Assembly instructions were given for the preparation of a Book of Canons, but the work was never carried out.[45]

The Canons when they came into the hands of the Scottish clergy were ill received. It was plain to see that they were a close copy of the Canons of the Church of England of 1604, and, equally distasteful, it was obvious that Archbishop Laud had a hand in their formation. John Row's indictment was typical and he objected for the following reasons: they had not been approved by a General Assembly, Holy Orders was raised almost to

42. Laud, op. cit. VI, letters LXXIV, LXXX and CIII.
43. Ibid., p. 443.
44. The Canons are given in full in Laud, op. cit. V, pp. 583 - 606.
45. Supra., p. 60.

the status of a sacrament, a new office of preaching Deacon was introduced, transubstantiation was apparent in how the elements were to be handled and in receiving them kneeling, the practice of private baptism fostered "the popish opinion of the necessitie of baptism," extemporary prayer was forbidden, and the baptismal font was to be near the entrance of the church so that "anon we shall come to the sprinkling of holie consecrated water upon everie intrant."[46] Row was also critical of what the Canons omitted: "In all the Canons not once mention of an Ruleing Elder. . .no word of a Session. . .no word of a Presbyterie. . .instead of a Provinciall free Synod, ye have twice a year a Bishop's court. . .and, lastlie, the Generall Assemblie is in effect abolished."[47]

We should also take note of the famous "under the curtain" Canon referred to by Laud in a letter to the Bishop of Ross: "I am very glad your Canons are also in so good a readiness; and the true meaning of that one Canon remains still under the curtain. I hope you will take care that it may be fully printed and passed with the rest. Twill be of great use for the settling of that Church."[48] This refers to Canon number four in Chapter eight which prohibited the Church in any of its courts to alter any rubric, article, canon, doctrinal or disciplinary, that came from the King. The Scottish Commissioners, at Laud's trial, were aware of the Canon's intent and quite rightly charged the Archbishop with the Canon saying that it held the door open for more innovations.[49]

---

46. Row, op. cit., p. 393.
47. Ibid., p. 395.
48. Laud, op. cit. VI, p. 434.
49. Ibid., III, p. 321.

In the meantime, the first edition of the English Book of Common Prayer was published in Scotland in 1633 and in 1634 two other editions followed, as the English liturgy was to be the official worship service for the Scottish Church until the new Service Book appeared. By April 1635 the Scottish bishops, through Bishop Maxwell, informed Laud that they had made good progress and hoped the work would go forward with the Archbishop's assistance. The following month the King approved the work of the Scottish bishops and recommended the Book for publication, but he included in his acceptance certain corrections and instructions which were to be added. It appears that 'second thoughts' were also coming from Scotland from Bishop Wedderburn. Many of the changes he suggested, however, met with Laud's approval and were accepted.[50] All these corrections and new considerations curtailed the printing, and even by the 20th of December 1636 when the Privy Council commanded its use by the Church it was not in its entire form. The complete Service Book did not come off the press until April or May 1637.

The hostile reception the Service Book received and the labelling of it as 'Laudian' according to Gordon Donaldson was less than fair. He believes that a serious attempt was made to incorporate existing Scottish usages or preferences. "If the compilers are to be judged," he writes, they are to be judged not on the general resemblance of their book to the Book of England - for in that they had no choice; but on the changes which they made, and on the further changes which they proposed."[51] According to

50. Laud writes to Wedderburn about these changes saying that "as many of them as his Majesty approved, I have written into a Service Book of ours, and sent you the book with his Majesty's hand to it, to warrant all your alterations made therein (Laud, op. cit. VI, p. 456)."
51. Gordon Donaldson, Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, p. 60.

Donaldson, the first of the changes representing concessions to Scottish views was the substitution of the Authorised Version of the Bible. Although the King James' translation was not printed in Scotland until 1633, dissatisfaction had been expressed with the Genevan Bible as early as the General Assembly of 1601. And that radical Presbyterians such as George Gillespie and Johnston of Wariston favoured the Authorised Version would suggest that the Church of Scotland was willing to accept the new version.

Another concession was the deletion of the Apocrypha from the Lectionary and the Sunday lessons. The use of the Apocrypha had been condemned by the Scottish Presbyterians as far back as 1584 and by the Scottish bishops in 1633. Twelve verses of the Apocrypha, however, were to be retained for use on six saints' days, but as the Scottish Church was not at once expected to observe them, this meant that it evaded completely the use of the Apocryphal books.

The elimination of the term "Priest" was also a concession to the Scottish Church. Dislike of this term was of long standing. The Scottish Presbyterians objected to its use because it referred back to the old priesthood of the law which was to deny the purpose of Christ's coming (Rom. 3:21-26; Heb. 10:5-18), and besides that the term was too closely bound up with the Popish Priesthood. Another change in terminology to conform to the Scottish usage was the printing of 'Pasch' and 'Yule' as alternatives to 'Easter' and 'Christmas'.

In the Preface an apology, which may be considered a concession, was made for following the English Service Book by including in the Liturgy "Festivals, and some other rites, not yet received nor observed

in our Church."[52] The reason for their inclusion was that the Scottish Church might not offend the English Church by omitting them.

In the Morning Prayer a concession was made by substituting for the "Benedicite', which was condemned by the Presbyterians in their objection to the Apocrypha, by a psalm or scriptural verse. The provision, too, for the saying of the blessing at the conclusion of Morning Prayer reflected a Scottish partiality for the Benediction.

In the celebration of Holy Communion, the prayer for the church retained the phrase of the English Prayer Book - "militant here in earth" - but it was expanded by the inclusion of a petition for the "congregation which is here assembled" and the blessing for the faithful departed both of which were in line with Scottish tradition.[53] Then by including an epiclesis in the eucharistic prayer of consecration, a concession was made to Scottish opinion. For example, one of the main Scottish complaints of John Knox's 'The Forme of Prayers' was the serious omission of the epiclesis. This invocation had been a part of the old Celtic rite, and there are grounds for believing that its use never quite died out in Scotland.[54] Calderwood, writing about 1620, says that it had been the custom in Scotland for sixty years to 'bless' the bread and wine.[55] And one of the complaints John Row made of the Holy Communion in the High Kirk of Edinburgh, in 1622, was that in it there was "not one word of Lord blesse the elements or action."[56]

---

52. Ibid., p. 102.
53. Ibid., pp. 189 - 190.
54. William D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship. (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 124.
55. Ibid., p. 125.
56. Row, op. cit., p. 331.

Among the more notable features of the Service Book that were objectionable to Scottish opinion was, first of all, the Kalendar. The Church of Scotland had been for a long time opposed even to the observance of the Christian year let alone saints' days. The Scottish compilers, therefore, tried to persuade the King to mitigate the use of the full Prayer Book Kalendar, but they were overruled. And to make matters worse the Prayer Book when published not only retained saints' days, but increased their number; the English Book had twenty-seven and the Scottish Book had twenty-nine. This was done, however, because of the insertion of about a dozen Scottish names. But, as mentioned above, the use of the Kalendar was not at once to be obligatory.

The rubrics as to the posture of worshippers also raised objections such as to standing at the Gloria Patri, the Creed and the reading of the Gospels. The objection to the last was based on the Presbyterian insistence that all Scripture was of equal value. Private Baptism was another aspect that did not please the Scots.

The main feature that the Scots found objectionable in the Service Book itself was that it had been drawn up by Laud. Although Gordon Donaldson calls this the 'Laudian myth' and has given us an impressive list of changes representing concessions to the Scottish point of view, a few of which have been described above, Hugh Watt, on the other hand, believes the charge was perfectly justified. He says that there was no attempt to meet genuine Scottish wishes.[57] He sees rather in the Scottish Prayer Book an attempt by Laud through Wedderburn to revise the English Liturgy in a ritualistic direction to get behind

57. Hugh Watt, Recalling the Scottish Covenants, (London: Nelson & Sons, 1946), p. 53 ff.

the Elizabethan Compromise back to mediaeval practice. How otherwise, he maintains, could Laud in his secret correspondence with Wentworth refer to the Scottish Service Book as the 'summum bonum'. The purpose, therefore, behind its introduction was the 'summum bonum' for England, by the restoration of the priestly rites and ancient values, through that 'summum bonum' attained in Scotland. And it was the wreckage of this great scheme, according to Watt, that explains Laud's bitter exasperation with the Scots: "It was not that by their determined obstinacy they had missed a good thing for themselves; they had ruined the golden dream for England which it was his dearest ambition to achieve."[58]

We imagine that the truth lies somewhere between the two positions expressed by Gordon Donaldson and Hugh Watt. But whether or not the Service Book was 'Laudian', there is little doubt that the Scottish nation as a whole resented its introduction.

---

57. Hugh Watt, Recalling the Scottish Covenants, (London: Nelson & Sons, 1946), p. 53 ff.

58. Ibid., p. 58.

B. The Revolt against the Service Book.

The revolt which led to the National Covenant and the famous Glasgow Assembly, and from these events to the Bishops' Wars and the Great Rebellion of the 1640's began with the reading of the new Service Book in St. Giles Cathedral on the 23rd of July, 1637. Johnston of Wariston describes the outbreak:

> At the beginning thairof thair rayse sik a tumult, sik ane outcrying quhat be the peoples murmuring, mourning, rayling, stoolcasting, as the lyk was never seien in Scotland; the bischop both after the foranoones sermon was almost stoned to dead; the dean was forced to caige himselth in the steeple; Mr. James Fairly to leave of reading et al; Mr. H. Rollok not to beginne; and Mr. David Fletcher to stay till the people went out. This uproar was greater nor the 17th of December (1596), and in all historie wil be remarqued as the faire, plausible, and peacible wealcome the service book receaved in Scotland. [59]

The first indication of trouble, however, occurred earlier in May when every minister under pain of arrest was commanded to buy two Service Books for use in his parish, and then it was, Baillie writes, "There began to be much talking of that business."[60] The Service Book was immediately condemned on two counts: the popish character of the Book, it going even beyond the English Service Book, and the way of imposing, it, that is, without any meeting of Church or Parliament. These complaints, Baillie informs us, "did sound from pulpits, were carried from hand to hand in papers, were the table talk and open discourse of high and low."[61] Thus on the fateful day of the Service Book's first reading it had already received an unfavourable reception.

The day following the disturbance, a Proclamation was issued by the Privy Council condemning the riot and making the City magistrates responsible for any further outbreak.[62] Then on July 28th the magistrates

---

59. Scottish History Society, Johnston of Wariston's Diary, (Edinburgh: T.& A. Constable, 1911), series 1, 61, p. 265.)
60. Baillie, op. cit. 1, p. 16.
61. Ibid., p. 17.
62. R.P.C., 2nd series, VI, p. 484.

were charged with what was really an impossible task of securing the peaceful reading of the Service Book the following Sunday.[63] By Saturday it was obvious that no one could guarantee the peace if the Service Book was used the next day. The Archbishop of St. Andrews, therefore, in the name of the bishops, wisely reported to the Privy Council that the use of the Service Book would be suspended until the instigators of the riot were punished and in the meantime neither the old service nor the new would be used.[64]

On August 4th the Privy Council received instructions from Charles to use their best endeavours to punish the persons responsible for the riot and to proceed with the settling of the new Liturgy.[65] As a result of the King's letter the Privy Council again asked the magistrates, on August 9th, to provide readers of the Service Book for the following Sunday and guarantee their protection. The magistrates' reply was naturally a cautious one; they said that "they were content to secure clergie in suche legall way as the lawes of the Kingdom in suche a caise will allow."[66] This meant in effect they could not carry out the Council's wishes. And the Privy Council apparently, at this time, was unwilling to commit itself further.

Also in August Alexander Henderson, recently outlawed by the Archbishop of St. Andrews for refusing the Service Book, emerged into the limelight from the obscurity of the country parish of Leuchars in Fife. He, along with two other ousted ministers, James Bruce and George Hamilton, presented to the Privy Council a petition asking that the charge

---

63. Ibid., p. 489.
64. Johnston of Wariston writes in his Diary: "Upon the 30 of July, Sunday, in Edr., thair was no service read at al, neyther old nor new, bot ane humble sermon without prayers, chapters, psalms (op.cit..p. 267).
65. R.P.C., 2nd series, VI, p. 509.
66. Ibid. p. 513.

against them be suspended. Their petition contained five reasons disputing the Service Book. The third, however, is the most significant as it pinpoints the most important issue: "The Kirk of Scotland is a free and Independent Kirk, and her own Pastors should be most able to discern and direct what doth best beseem our measure of Reformation, and what may seem most for the good of the People."[67] What Henderson was attacking was not so much the comparative merits of an old and a new liturgy, but the high handed manner of the Service Book's introduction which struck at the spiritual autonomy of the Church of Scotland. Meanwhile, that the Privy Council was considerably shaken by the steadily increasing opposition to the reading of the Service Book is seen by the interesting fact that they changed their attitude about its use; it was, the Council now said, really intended not for public reading but only for buying.[68]

During the month of September the Privy Council received other petitions, one a General Petition, dated September 20th, from various parishes asking to be freed from the Service Book and all innovations,[69] and another on September 26th from the magistrates not to be pressed with imposing it.[70] Both were delivered to the King who replied on October 17th with three Proclamations of his own: the first dissolved the meeting of the Council that day which meant that no new petitions could be delivered to it; the second moved the Council and Session from Edinburgh to Linlithgow; and the third condemned the book Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies written by George Gillespie.[71] The people of

67. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 513.
68. R.P.C. 2nd series, VI, p. 694.
69. Baillie, op. cit. p. 21.
70. Row, op. cit., p. 485.
71. Rushworth, op. cit. II, pp. 401 - 402.

Edinburgh were astonished and enraged with the King's Proclamations and the next day a new disturbance broke out in which the Bishop of Galloway was besieged in the Council House, the Lord Treasurer thrown down by the mob, and the Provost's house stoned.[72.]

Shortly after this outbreak two other petitions were presented against the Service Book to the Privy Council, one in the name of all the "Men, Women, and Children, and Servants and Indwellers within the Burgh of Edinburgh", and the other by the "Noblemen, Gentry, Ministers, and Burgesses" which in addition complained about the Book of Canons.[73.] The latter was known as the Second Supplication and was forwarded to Charles. By November 1st, as no reply had been received from the King, the petitioners moved against the Council and told it they were determined to send up their own Commissioners to Court. "What shall be the event," Baillie comments, "God knows; there was in our Land ever such an appearance of a stirr; the whole people thinks Poperie at the doores; the scandalous pamphlets which come daily from England, adde oyl to this flame; no man may speak any thing in publick for the King's part, except he would have himself marked for a sacrifice to be killed one day."[74.]

On December 7th the King at last broke silence and replied to the Second Supplication. The nation, however, was far from satisfied with the answer. The King's reply, Row complains, "delayes such answers as might otherwise have been expected; onlie declares he abhorrs poperie, and will defend the true religion, as it is presently professed within this Kingdom."[75.] On December 21st, therefore, a third Supplication was given to the Council and the same day a declinator was also given against

72. Ibid., pp. 402 - 404.
73. Ibid., pp. 405 - 408.
74. Baillie, op. cit. I, p. 23.
75. Row, op. cit., p. 486.

the bishops sitting on the Council; as they were the party complained upon, it was stated, they should be removed "seeing no man can be both judge and partie."[76]

About the middle of February 1638 Traquair, the Lord Treasurer, after delivering the Third Supplication to the King, was back in Scotland bringing with him the King's reply. It was to be of great moment for the Scottish nation. There was considerable feeling in Scotland that the King was receiving bad advice and that now with the true feelings of the Scottish people exposed in their Supplications Charles would surely relent from the imposition of the Service Book. The King's reply was in the form of a Proclamation which was read from the market cross of Stirling February 19th, 1638. Charles made it clear that he took upon himself full responsibility for the introduction of the Service Book and the Book of Canons. The Proclamation read in part: "In the framing whereof we took great care and pains, so as nothing past therein but what was seen and approved by us, before the same was either divulged or printed."[77] He also defended the bishops and their place on the Privy Council, and all further supplications and meetings against the Service Book or Canons were to be discharged under pain of treason.

The gravity of the situation had now increased as it was no longer possible to excuse the King. The opposition, therefore, upon the publishing of the King's Proclamation, met it with another in which,

---

76. Ibid., p. 488.

77. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 731.

article five, plainly contained the threat to oppose the King forcefully if need be:

> Seeing by the legal and submissive way of our former supplications, all those who take these Innovations to heart, have bin kept calm, and carried themselves in a quiet manner in hopes of redress; We protest that if any Inconvenience shall fall out, which we pray the Lord to prevent, upon the pressing of any the foresaid Innovations or Evils, specially or generally contained in our former Supplications and Complaints, and upon your Lordships refusal, to take order thereanent, the same be not imputed unto us, who most humbly seek all things to be reformed by an Order. [78]

The next stage was the drawing up by the opposition of the National Covenant.

---

78. Ibid., p. 733.

C. The National Covenant.

The National Covenant was drawn up by Alexander Henderson and Archibald Johnston of Wariston between the 23rd and 28th of February 1638. The Covenant began with the anti-papal Covenant of 1581, the second part was assigned to Johnston of Wariston to draw up a list of Acts of Parliament "as was against Poperie and in favoure of the true religione", and the third part was drawn up by Alexander Henderson who made additions to the Covenant of 1581 "as the corruptiones of this tyme necessarlie requyred to be joyned."[79]

On Saturday, February 24th, and the following Monday and Tuesday morning the noblemen Rothes, Loudoun and Balmerine met with Henderson and Wariston to revise what they had done.[80] Then on Tuesday afternoon, Wariston writes, "with great fears we went to the ministerie."[81] They met first with the Commissioners of Presbyteries who after a discussion of all objections and several alterations approved the Covenant. The Commissioners then returned to the rest of the ministers, between 200 to 300, and they, too, only one refusing, voted to accept the Covenant.[82]

The chief objections to the original draft focused first of all on the question whether or not Episcopacy should be abjured. Many of

79. John Earl of Rothes, Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland, (Edinburgh: Bannantyne Club, 1830, p. 70.
80. Ibid., pp. 71 - 72.
81. Wariston, op. cit. p. 321.
82. Wariston was overjoyed with the minister's acceptance and wrote the same day in his Diary: "My heart did leape within for joie of this glorious day quherwith our souls wald be revisched if they wer spiritualy disposed. Blissed be the naime of the eternal God that maid my eis to seie the Covenant of the Lord reneued in this land; and far mor to haive maid me, the wickedest, vyldest, sinfullest, unworthiest, unaiblest, servant, to be ane instrument in his hand of so great, so gracious, so glorious a work as is this renovation of that national oath of the whole land with our eternal Lord the God of Glory"(Op. cit., pp. 321 - 22).

the moderate ministers, although unhappy with the Scottish bishops, seriously questioned whether this form of church government in essence should be so condemned. Secondly, the implied threat in the Covenant to the King's authority disturbed quite a few. Baillie believed, however, that the Covenant had been altered sufficiently to overcome both these objections. For example, in a letter to Dr. Strang, Principal of Glasgow University, Baillie writes:

> I doe not only believe that there is no word into it that makes against the King's full authority, so farr as either religion or reason can extend it, or against the office of Bishops, or any power they have by any lawfull Assemblie or Parliament; or that by this write we are oblidged to oppose any novation, or any thing at all which is not contrare to God's word: not only I believe this, but hes professed so much before the whole meeting at Edinburgh, oft both in word and write, without the least appearance of contradiction of any to this houre. [83.]

But more serious than these considerations about Episcopacy and the King's authority was, for the majority of Scotsmen, the threat of English domination. In the same letter, therefore, Baillie urges Dr. Strang to subscribe to the Covenant because it had above all arisen out of fear "to have our religion lost, our throats cutted, our poor countrey made ane English province, to be disposed upon for ever hereafter at the will of a Bishope of Canterburie." [84.]

On Wednesday, February 28th, the signing of the Covenant, that "glorious marriage of the Kingdome with God", as Wariston called it, began in Greyfriars Churchyard. From early morning till eight at night the noblemen and barons signed the Covenant. On Thursday the ministers subscribed, and on Friday the signing of the Covenant by the people at large began. [85.] Also on the Friday it was decided that a copy of the Covenant should be sent to every shire for subscription. [86.]

---

83. Baillie, op. cit. p. 67.
84. Ibid., p. 66.
85. Wariston, op. cit. p. 323.
86. Rothes, op. cit., pp. 79 - 80.

The Covenant was generally enthusiastically received throughout Scotland. The one major exception was Aberdeen. Alexander Henderson, David Dickson and Andrew Cant apparently had little success in encouraging the citizens of that city to subscribe. Baillie informs us that the ministers who went to Aberdeen were coldly welcomed, the churches locked against them and the keys kept by the Magistrate.[87] The situation was quite different in Edinburgh where the Covenant was sworn to with almost hysterical zeal.[88]

The reasons for the Covenant's overall success no doubt lay, first of all, in it being framed within the context of the Federal or Covenant Theology which dominated Scottish theological thinking at the time. Federal Theology was based on the idea of two covenants between God and man - one of works and the other of grace. The Covenant of Grace worked out by Christ satisfied the justice of God, but still the redeemed had to appropriate God's offer by a second covenant which was described as "personally closing with Christ" or making a "transaction" or "bargain" or "contract" between God and man. In other words, this second covenant was the condition that had to be worked out in order to become a partaker in the Covenant of Grace. As the Covenanter William Guthrie in The Christian's Great Interest puts it: "How shall I be sure that my heart doth accept God's offer and doth close with Christ Jesus? Go make a

87. Baillie, op. cit. I, p. 97.

88. Wariston describes one such enthusiastic scene in his Diary: "Upon Sundy, 1 Apryle, I heard Mr. H. Rollo preatch. . .after sermon. . .he gart read al the Covenant over. . .thairafter he desyred the nobles, and all the people, stand up unto the Lord; and first desyred the noblemen, Montrois, Boyd, Loudin, Balmerino, to hold up thair hands and swear be the naime of the living God, and desyred al the people to hold up thairs in the lyk maner; at the quhilk instant of rysing up, and them of holding up thair hands, thair rayse sik a yellock, sik aboundance of tears, sik a heavenly harmony of sighs and sobbes, universally through al the corners of the churche, as the lyk was never sein nor heard of." (op. cit. p. 331).

covenant expressly, and by word speak the thing unto God."[89] The National Covenant and later the Solemn League and Covenant became closely identified with this kind of personal covenant made between the redeemed and Christ. Thus to break these politico-religious covenants for many was tantamount to committing apostacy.

Another reason for the National Covenant's success was that the idea of Covenant appealed to the Scottish people who believed they were a chosen race comparable to Israel. To the Presbyterians in Ireland Samuel Rutherford writes:

> For the Lord is rejoicing over us in this land, as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride: and the Lord hath changed the name of Scotland. They call us now no more 'Forsaken' nor 'Desolate' but our land is called 'Hephzibah' and 'Beulah' (Isa. 62:4). For the Lord delighteth in us, and this land is married to Himself.[90]

And Wariston sees a parallel between Israel and Scotland "the only two swome nations to the Lord."[91] The idea of the Covenant as a sacred commission for the Scottish people and as an unbreakable bond between themselves and God, was the principle which was about to rouse and rally them as a nation.

---

89. Church of Scotland Commission on Baptism, Baptism in the Church of Scotland - An Historical Survey to 1843. Edinburgh: St. Andrew's Press, 1958), p. 16.

90. Samuel Rutherford, Letters. (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1891), p. 570.

91. Wariston, op. cit. p. 344.

D. The Glasgow Assembly.

On May 16th, 1638, the Marquis of Hamilton received the King's instructions about the uproar in Scotland which allowed only the one concession to suspend the Service Book. On the other hand, Hamilton was definitely to allow no petition against the Five Articles of Perth, the town of Edinburgh was to remain barred to the meeting of the Privy Council, and the Covenant was to be completely renounced by all its subscribers within six weeks or sooner. Otherwise, Charles threatened, "power shall come from England, and that myself will come in Person with them, being resolved to hazard my Life, rather than to suffer Authority to be contemned."[92] As might be expected Hamilton made little headway with the Covenanters.[93] The Marquis in fact did not read the King's Declaration against the Covenant as he believed this would only cause further hostility. He wrote accordingly to Charles saying he must either resolve to grant all their demands or send a royal army.[94]

Among the Covenanters' demands, in a supplication handed to Hamilton on June 8th, was one for a free General Assembly and Parliament as the only means to redress their complaints.[95] The King, however, was in no mood to agree as he informed Hamilton on June 25th: "As concerning the explanation of their Dammable Covenant (whether it be with or without explanation); I have no power in Scotland, than as a Duke of Venice; which I will rather die than suffer."[96] The 'explanation' concerned

92. Row, op. cit., p. 492.
93. For June 13th Wariston notes in his Diary: "This day we trysted on al day with the Commissioner but could settle nothing (op. cit. p. 351)."
94. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 752.
95. Row, op. cit., p. 492.
96. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 754.

the phrase in the Covenant: "We promise to swear that we shall stand. . . to the mutual defence and assistance.. . .against all sorts of persons whatsoever." The Covenanters mentioned by way of explanation that this clause was not aimed against the King's person or authority which in fact they did in all reverence acknowledge.[97] But this, as we have seen, did not satisfy or convince Charles.

On July 6th Hamilton left Scotland to give the King a full account of what was happening in his northern kingdom. Charles then gave Hamilton the following instructions: he was to persuade the Privy Council to sign, as a counter to the National Covenant, the Confession of Faith ratified by Act of Parliament in 1567, which became known as the King's Covenant, and if it was well received to put it also to the people for their signing; next, to have a General Assembly meet, but not before November; to have bishops vote in the Assembly and if possible to have a bishop elected as Moderator.[98] Hamilton returned to Scotland on August 13th and told the Covenanters that the King had agreed to a General Assembly and Parliament. The question now for the Covenanters was when and where such an Assembly and Parliament would be held and they pressed Hamilton for precise dates. The Marquis craved twenty days to go to the King for an answer and accordingly left for London on the 25th of August. In London he persuaded the King to grant an Assembly which he anticipated might be managed to their advantage and, if not, could be quickly dissolved. Thus, in Edinburgh on September 21st, Hamilton announced that an Assembly should meet at Glasgow the 21st of November, and a Parliament should meet in Edinburgh the 15th of May next.[99]

---

97. Row, op. cit., p. 492.
98. Rushworth, op. cit. II, pp. 763 - 764.
99. Ibid., p. 770 (in error printed p. 762).

Hamilton also announced that the Confession of Faith of 1567 (The King's Covenant), already signed by the Privy Council, should now be publicly signed. Robert Baillie admits to the astuteness of Hamilton's plan of using the new Covenant to divide the opposition and eliminate the National Covenant: "He hoped to have gotten the King's Covenant universally subscrybed, and ratified hereafter in the Assemblie; so that the other, which had been subscrybed by us before, might be quietly, without any infamous condemning of it, suppressed and buried."[100] Henderson and Wariston drew up a Protestation against the King's Covenant which Wariston read from the market cross in Edinburgh on Saturday September 21st. And to Wariston's great relief, as he describes in his Diary, "so did the common people (protest), crying, 'God saive the King; bot awaye with bischops, thes traitors to God and man, or any uther convenant bot our auin.'"[101] Henderson also condemned it by saying that "we ought not to multiply solemn oaths and covenants upon our part and thus to play with oaths, as children do with their toys, without necessity."[102] The King's Covenant was labelled by the Covenanters the anti-Covenant and it actually enjoyed very little success so that by the time the Assembly met it was a meaningless issue.

The Assembly convened at Glasgow the 21st of November, 1638. There is little doubt that the composition of the Assembly was planned by the Covenanters to further their own advantage. For example, they arranged

---

100. Baillie, op. cit. I, p. 119.

101. Wariston, op. cit. p. 392.

102. R.Orr, Alexander.Henderson (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), p. 163.

to have lay supporters of the Covenant present as Commissioners. This was contrary to the Book of Discipline which stated that "ecclesiasticall personis" only such as ministers, doctors of theology and elders ordained into church offices for life could be Assembly delegates. These lay "elders" were quite properly challenged by the Marquis of Hamilton, the King's High Commissioner to the Assembly, but he was overruled.[103] The lay "elders" consisted of seventeen peers, nine knights, twenty-five lairds, and forty-seven burgh representatives, thus giving the Covenanters an overwhelming advantage in the Assembly. The ministers numbered one hundred and forty-two.

The bishops were absent. In part this was due to their fear of travelling in Scotland, and in part to the Covenanters' action some weeks earlier in presenting a bill of complaint to the Presbytery of Edinburgh against the Scottish bishops.[104] The Presbytery then referred the complaint to the upcoming Assembly and until such time as the bishops were cleared they could not legally be part of the Assembly. It is undoubtedly true that the Covenanters were determined to pack the Assembly, but it is also true, we believe, considering the strong anti-episcopal sentiment throughout the country, that the Assembly was representative of the feelings of the majority of the Scottish people.

The Assembly opened quietly with a worship service conducted by John Bell who as the oldest minister was also elected interim Moderator until another was chosen. After the service Hamilton read his Commission from the King which was listened to without comment. The Assembly had not

---

103. Baillie, op. cit. I, pp. 134 - 135.

104. Row, op. cit., p. 502.

long convened the following day, however, before both parties were in conflict. It began when the Assembly urged the choice of Moderator to which Hamilton objected until the commissions were discussed. Baillie regarded this as a ploy by Hamilton

> "to turne the Assemblie upside down, to put us in a labyrinth inextricable; for, before the constitution of the Synod, the Commissioner should have so drawn in the deepest questions, such as the power of Elders, the state of Ministers censured by Bishops, and many moe, which himself alone behooved to determine, no Assemblie being constitute for the discussion of any question." [105].

He was, therefore, overruled, But then he pressed that before a Moderator be chosen a paper in his possession, in the name of the bishops, be read. The Assembly was angered with this further delay and began to shout "no reading, no reading." [106]. Hamilton was again overruled, and the Assembly proceeded to elect a Moderator and Clerk. Their choice fell almost automatically on Alexander Henderson and Johnston of Wariston respectively.

On Friday, November 23rd, Henderson recommended that for the full constitution of the Assembly the commissions would now have to be examined. Hamilton, however, urged that first the paper of yesterday denied until the election of a Moderator be immediately read. He was overruled on the ground that nothing could be read to the Assembly until it was fully constituted as an Assembly by the approval of the Commissioners. Hamilton strongly protested to the Moderator that these papers contained information for the opening of the eyes of those who were to be appointed Commissioners. Henderson, however, sharply cut off further debate by replying that "if in that paper there were any light to open their eyes,

---

105. Baillie, op. cit. I. p. 130.
106. Ibid., p. 126.

they should shortlie professe their repentance of their error in not reading it when it was required."[107]

Hamilton again found himself at a disadvantage when, during the same session, Wariston declared that the Books of the old Registers of the Assemblies from 1560 to 1590 had come into his possession. These Registers brought to the Assembly's attention the condemnation of Episcopacy pronounced by their church fathers a generation or so earlier. And that they contained important guide lines for the Covenanters' attack on Episcopacy is revealed by Baillie's comment: "God has brought them out, and sett them up now at the doore of our Church, to be the rule, after Scripture, of this Assemblie and all other their proceedings."[108]

On Wednesday, November 28th, when the examination of the Commissioners was almost completed and the Registers produced by Wariston had been accepted as authentic, Henderson asked the Assembly if they considered themselves the judges of the bishops. At this point Hamilton, knowing how the vote would run against the bishops, rose to protest. First, he condemned the presence of lay elders "who never were Elders before, all or most or most part of them being chosen since the Indiction of the Assembly, some of them the very day before the Election of their Commissioners, which demonstrates plainly that they were chosen only to serve their Associates turn at this Assembly."[109] Secondly, he reminded the Assembly of their oath of allegiance to the King. Thirdly, he assured the Assembly that the King would certainly protect the Scottish bishops: "How can his Majesty deny unto them, being his subjects, the benefit of his Laws, in declining all those to be their Judges."[110] Finally,

107. Ibid., p. 130.
108. Ibid., p. 139.
109. Rushworth, op. cit. II, p. 850.
110. Ibid., p. 851.

in the King's name, he dissolved the Assembly and warned them not to proceed any further under pain of treason. While he was leaving both Henderson and Rothes answered him saying that "they were sorry he left them, but their consciences bore them witness, they had hitherto done nothing amiss, and therefore would not desert the Work of God."[111] The following day, November 29th, Hamilton posted a Proclamation for dissolving the Assembly.[112] But the same day a Protest of the General Assembly was read in reply at the market cross of Glasgow.[113] Thus, despite Hamilton's dissolution, the Assembly continued to sit.

The Assembly went on to annul the six previous episcopal dominated Assemblies beginning with the one held at Linlithgow in 1606. It also condemned the Service Book, Canons, Five Articles of Perth and the Court of High Commission, deposed the bishops, and declared Episcopacy to have been abjured by the Confession of Faith and to be removed out of the Church of Scotland.[114] This latter act was the one which caused most concern among the moderate ministers like Robert Baillie who, believing with the rest that it was necessary to remove Episcopacy "out of our Churche for ever", nevertheless could not in conscience agree to see Episcopacy abjured as if it was "wicked and unlawful in itself."[115]

Alexander Henderson sympathized with Baillie's position, but still his advice was to accept the severe condemnation of Episcopacy because "the tyme straited us, we might not enter in reasoning."[116]

---

111. Ibid., p. 953.
112. Ibid., pp. 854 - 857.
113. Ibid., pp. 857 - 862.
114. Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638 - 1842. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing and Publishing Co., 1843), pp. 5 - 18. (Hereafter referred to as A.G.A.)
115. Baillie, op. cit. I, p. 157.
116. Ibid., p. 157.

Henderson also argued that the Assembly must at all costs avoid any serious division. Thus, according to Baillie, when the time came for the debate on Episcopacy "fearing above all evils, to be the occasion of any division, which was our certain wrack. . .I, with all the rest, was as dumb as a fish."[117] Wariston, however, entertained no such doubts, and was elated about the vote against Episcopacy: "Quhen I was reading the roll and heard no word bot 'Abjured and Removed,' I was struken with admiration, and yet my thoughts faile to aprehend that great and wonderful work of God, and yet my ears sounde ever with thes words (Abjured and Removed) Abjured and Removed."[118]

The acts of the Glasgow Assembly produced an open breach between the Covenanters and the King. Both sides appeared willing to take to arms. They had in fact been preparing themselves for such an eventuality. War was now inevitable.

---

117. Ibid., p. 158.

118. Wariston, op. cit. p. 403.

CHAPTER III: THE COVENANTERS' ATTEMPT TO REORGANIZE THE ENGLISH CHURCH

A. The triumph of Presbyterianism.

(1) The First Bishops' War.

On December 18th, 1638, the Scottish Privy Council issued a Royal Proclamation annulling all acts passed by the Glasgow Assembly.[1] Then shortly afterwards on January 29th, 1639, there came a letter informing the Council that it was the King's intention to be at York around Easter to be near to Scotland for, the ominous words ran, "accomodating our affaires in a faire maner."[2] No one doubted that Charles was coming north with power to oppose the Covenanters and that this in effect meant civil war. The Covenanters, however, had anticipated that force was likely before they could settle their quarrel with Charles and had been effectively preparing themselves. Of great benefit to their army was the recruitment of Scots who had been serving as mercenaries in Europe. The most notable veteran was Alexander Leslie, a General in the army of Gustavus Adolphus, who brought the knowledge and experience of a professional soldier to the defence of the Covenant, and who in May, 1639, was given command of the Scottish army.

The campaign against the Scots adopted by Charles was to be fourfold: the King was to cross the border with the main army; Wentworth was to send forces from Ireland to Dumbarton in the Firth of Clyde; Antrim with Irish troops was to invade Kintyre in the south-west; and Hamilton was to carry a force of 5000 men to Aberdeen in the north to support the Episcopalian Huntly. But in the midst of these preparations the Covenanters had already taken action which nullified the King's plan.

---

1. R.P.C., 2nd series, VII, p. 95ff

2. Ibid., p. 106.

By the time Charles arrived in York on March 30th, the Covenanters had in the preceding month taken the castles of Edinburgh, Dumbarton, Douglas and Dalkeith and fortified the port of Leith.[3] Also by March 30th the danger from the north had been overcome by Montrose who on that same day entered the city of Aberdeen unopposed.[4] Huntly, on hearing of Montrose's advance, had disbanded his small Royalist force which never received the reinforcements promised by Hamilton. Meanwhile Argyle was in Kintyre waiting to repel Antrim's invasion which never took place.

The King, despite these setbacks, left York on May 22nd and marched at the head of his army towards Berwick. Contingents of the two armies encountered each other, for the first and only time during the war, near Kelso, but the English force, considerably outnumbered, retreated without giving fight. This failure of Charles' army in the field combined with his lack of success elsewhere in Scotland, his financial problems and a general lack of enthusiasm in his army for the cause it was called upon to defend (the maintenance of bishops) created great discouragement in the royal camp.[5] It was while the King's army was in this frame of mind that the Earl of Dunfermline on January 6th, 1640, brought a Petition to the King from the Covenanters as an initial step towards some kind of settlement. Charles had actually no alternative but to begin negotiations which finally led on June 18th to the signing of the treaty known as the Pacification of Berwick. The terms agreed upon amounted to a surrender of Charles' claims to control religion in Scotland. He was to call a General Assembly in August to meet in

3. Baillie, op. cit. I, pp. 195 - 197.
4. Aberdeen shortly afterwards fell to Royalist troops under Aboyne, Huntly's son. Montrose, however, re-occupied Aberdeen on May 25th.
5. Rushworth, op. cit. III, p. 936.

Edinburgh, at which he promised to be present, and the Scottish Parliament was to meet later the same month to ratify the acts passed by the same General Assembly. Meanwhile the forces of both armies were to be disbanded.[6] However, although the immediate crisis had passed with the signing of the Berwick agreement, the prospect of renewed hostilities remained threatening so that the Scottish army was not completely disbanded: Leslie's experienced officers were still kept in pay and the drilling of shire levies continued.[7]

Charles, the Covenanters quickly realised, was not going to give way so easily. First, after the peace terms had been settled, Baillie tells us, Argyle and several other Scottish nobles went over to the King's camp where they were coldly welcomed, and when Loudoun asked for clarification of the Treaty and how Charles intended to keep his promises, the King's reply was threatening.[8] Next, according to a Royal Proclamation made by the Privy Council at the end of June, the General Assembly was to meet on August 12th, but what troubled the Covenanters was that bishops and archbishops were included in the summons although the Church of Scotland had abolished Episcopacy.[9] And of further concern to the Covenanters was the use of the word 'pretended' by Charles when referring to the late Glasgow Assembly.[10] That it was the King's intention to restore Episcopacy as soon as possible is made abundantly clear in a letter Charles wrote on August 6th to the Archbishop of St. Andrew: "We may give way for the present to that which will be prejudicial both to the church and our own Government, yet we shall not leave thinking in time to remedy both."[11]

---

6. Ibid., p. 945.
7. S.H.S., Papers relating to the Army of Solemn League and Covenant, (Edinburgh: T.&A. Constable, 1917), 2nd series, 1, p. xii.
8. Baillie, op. cit. I, p. 221.
9. R.P.C., 2nd series, VII, p. 122.
10. Ibid., p. 123.
11. Rushworth, op. cit., III, p. 952.

On August 12th, the General Assembly opened in Edinburgh. Charles was not present, having abandoned his promise to attend because of the Covenanters' hostility to bishops. The Assembly, however, unmoved by the King's ill-will, proceeded to confirm all the acts of the Glasgow Assembly abolishing Episcopacy in Scotland. Then, in addition, it resolved that an Act in Council be passed ordering subscription to the National Covenant by all the people, and to be prefixed to the Covenant was a declaration that the Five Articles of Perth and the government of the Kirk by archbishops and bishops be acknowledged as unlawful within the Church of Scotland.[12]

The King, predictably, was not prepared to submit to these Scottish demands and determined once again to resort to arms. On the advice of Wentworth who had recently come to England in September, 1639, Charles called the English Parliament to meet at Westminster in order to obtain money to be used against the Scots. Charles accused Scotland before the English Parliament of re-creating the 'Auld Alliance' with France so as to hurt England.[13] The Short Parliament, however, as it was called, was more interested in domestic grievances, such as ship-money and Parliamentary privileges, and although it was willing to grant financial help to the King it was on condition that he come to terms with Parliament over their complaints.[14] This Charles refused to do. Parliament was therefore dissolved on May 5th, 1640, and Charles began on his own to make preparations for his second invasion of Scotland.

---

12. Ibid., pp. 963 - 964.
13. Ibid., p. 1117. Charles' criticism of Scotland was based on a letter, intercepted by the King, written by Loudoun to the French in which the word 'King' was used in such a way that it might be interpreted that the Covenanters acknowledged the King of France over Charles. Loudoun, probably in all sincerity, denied the charge. The Scots, in fact, had little regard for the French at this time: "The friendship of the French," Baillie writes from London in 1643, "was never much worth to us, and now we regard it as little as ever (Baillie, op. cit. 2, p.105)."
14. Rushworth, op. cit. III, p. 1143.

(2) Second Bishops' War. On August 20th, 1640, the King left London for York where he arrived just three days later. But on the same August 20th the Scottish army crossed the Tweed and, while the Royalists were trying with great difficulty to raise Yorkshire levies,[15] defeated the King's army defending Newcastle at Newburn on August 28th. The English army retreated to Durham leaving Newcastle open to the Scots who occupied the town on August 30th.[16] The military successes of the Scots, Charles' mounting financial difficulties, and the failure of the English as a whole to rally against the Scottish invasion, Charles having waited all through the month of September for this to happen, led at last to the King agreeing to negotiations which began on October 2nd at Ripon in Yorkshire.[17]

The discussions produced little until October 16th when articles were agreed on to maintain at English expense the Scottish army, the burden for payment to begin with falling on the northern shires.[18] Then, in order to reach a final settlement, the King was asked by the Scots to petition Parliament to compensate them for the great loss they had sustained.[19] The importance of this stipulation was that the English Parliament, as yet not sitting, be called to complete the peace terms. On October 21st both parties agreed to the negotiations being transferred to London.[20] Charles, in the meantime, under great financial strain to maintain the Scottish army of occupation, was compelled to summon the 'Long Parliament' on November 3rd, 1640. In London the Treaty of Ripon was not

---

15. The King was told by the Northern Nobility that they could not persuade an army to march without first receiving fourteen days pay (Rushworth, op. cit. III, p. 1231.).
16. Rushworth, op. cit. III, p. 1238.
17. Ibid., p. 1286.
18. After these arrangements had been made, Alexander Henderson is reported to have informed the English that they had the best of the bargain, as it was "more blessed to give than receive (Gardiner, op. cit., IX, p. 214)."
19. Rushworth, op. cit. III, p. 1298.
20. Ibid., pp. 1303 - 04.

concluded until August 5th, 1641. On that date the English Parliament, which had welcomed the Scottish Commissioners as allies and friends, finally agreed to the Scottish demands for peace which included an amount of £300,000 for arrears due to their army and as a pledge to guarantee its disbanding and removal out of England. The King was also required to approve the Acts of the 1639 and 1640 Scottish Parliaments which had ratified the Covenanting policy.[21.]

Meanwhile, there had arisen in Scotland a moderate party of some standing led by Montrose. He protested the direction of Scottish affairs by a few, which meant Argyle, and he also wanted greater assurance, while still supporting the National Covenant, that the crown be loyally maintained. The gist of his position was that "the King's prerogative and the subject's privilege are so far from incompatibility that the one can never stand unless supported by the other."[22.] As a result of these views, Montrose signed, in August 1640, along with seventeen other Scottish peers, what was called the Cumbernauld Bond. In the early summer of 1641 he wrote to the King to counsel moderation. Unfortunately for Montrose the King's reply was intercepted and on June 11th he was imprisoned.

Charles, on the conclusion of the Treaty of Ripon, journeyed to Edinburgh in August to see ratified the Acts passed against Episcopacy by the two past Scottish Parliaments. He hoped no doubt to raise support for his cause by encouraging the moderates, such as he now knew existed, but in this regard he made little or no headway. He was, in fact, obliged to appoint such radical Covenanters as Loudoun to the Chancellorship and Argyle to the Treasury as its chief commissioner. He also knighted Wariston, created General Leslie the Earl of Leven and

21. Rushworth, op. cit. IV, pp. 366 - 367.
22. Memorials of Montrose and His Times, (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1850) II, p.50

appointed Alexander Henderson to the deanery of the Chapel Royal in Edinburgh. The only constructive thing we may say that Charles did to advance his cause was to secure the release of Montrose. When Charles left Edinburgh the Covenanters had won a complete victory over the King. They had also in doing this set forces loose in England which eventually led to Charles' downfall.

B. The Quest for Uniformity along Presbyterian lines.

(1) The Solemn League and Covenant.

With his troubles in Scotland somewhat abated, Charles now turned his attention to the rising confrontation between himself and the English Parliament. By August 22nd, 1642, however, Charles felt compelled to raise his standard at Nottingham, and civil war broke out between Parliament and the King. From the start of the Civil War it was of great moment to both parties to consider what side Scotland would support, and each entered into correspondence with the Scottish Privy Council.

When the King left Edinburgh in August, 1641, the Presbyterian settlement after three years of struggle seemed at last secure. To begin with, therefore, Scotland was desirous to remain neutral and the Privy Council, in their replies to King and Parliament, tried to bring about a reconciliation.[23] It would appear, however, that the Privy Council sided more with Parliament than it did with Charles who, on one occasion, was advised by them to return to his Parliament as it was his best and most impartial counsel.[24] Charles angrily replied that he did not wish them to meddle so far as to judge the differences between himself and Parliament, but as the King's subjects to keep in touch with the real state of affairs,[25] and in another letter from Charles one part reads: "we did not requyre of yow that yee would sit as judges upon the affairs of another Kingdome."[26] Parliament, on the other hand, did not adopt so high handed a manner and simply thanked the Privy Council for their wise advice.[27] Parliament was playing its hand much better than Charles.

23. Rushworth, op. cit. IV, p. 498.
24. R.P.C., 2nd series, VII, p. 250.
25. Ibid., p. 256.
26. Ibid., p. 256.
27. Ibid., p. 258.

We may say, however, that the decisive event that led to Scotland's entry into the Civil War on the side of Parliament occurred on the eve of the conflict when the General Assembly, which met at St.Andrews in July and August 1642, passed a petition to the Privy Council desiring its concurrence "in thair remonstrance to the Parliament of England towards the setling of unitie in religion and uniformity of church government in his Majesties three Kingdoms."[28] The Council approved the petition and on August 18th sent it to the English Parliament which one month later wholeheartedly endorsed the desire for religious uniformity by the General Assembly and Privy Council.[29]

The Scots believed that Parliament's answer was more than politic, but sincere and in line with the thinking of most Englishmen. The grounds for their optimism probably began when Alexander Henderson, Robert Baillie, George Gillespie and Robert Blair were in London, during the working out of the Treaty of Ripon, as chaplains to the Scottish Commissioners.[30] In London they were feted as saviours of England. They heard everywhere Episcopacy condemned and their own Covenant approved.[31] They were also told that a petition signed by 15,000 subscribers had been delivered to the Commons for the removing of Episcopacy, the Service Book and other ecclesiastical scandals.[32] Crowds also flocked to hear them preach and hung on their words. "In my last tour (of preaching)," Baillie writes, "on the 3rd verse of the 126th Psalm, 'The Lord hes done great things for us,' I spent much of ane hour in an historik narration. . .of all that God had done for us, fra the maids commotion in the Cathedrall of Edinburgh to that present day: manie tears of compassion and joy did fall from the eyes of the English."[33]

---

28. Ibid., p. 314.
29. Ibid., pp. 317 - 318.
30. Baillie, op. cit. I, p. 269.
31. Ibid., p. 273.
32. Ibid., p. 280.
33. Ibid., p. 295.

These expressions of support followed the Scots on their return to Scotland. The General Assembly, for example, which met in St.Andrews in July 1642, received a letter from ministers in England which in part read: "the desire of the most godly and considerable part amongst us is, that the Presbyterian government, which hath just and evident foundation both in the Word of God and Religious reason, may be established amongst us."[34] The English Parliament also wrote to the same Assembly expressing their desire to settle ecclesiastical matters in England in a manner that would be most agreeable to God's Word, and out of which might result a stable union between the two Kingdoms.[35] There is little doubt that the Scots, from their London experience and the letters of goodwill they were receiving from England, genuinely believed that their desire for religious uniformity was also shared by the English themselves. They may, however, as suggested by Professor Hugh Watt, have erred in forgetting that London was not all England, and the divines they met there were not a typical sample of the English clergy.[36]

The petition regarding religious uniformity was also sent to the King whose reply was much less enthusiastic than that of Parliament. He advised them that Parliament was as likely to accept a Presbyterian system as they an Episcopalian, and he went no further towards recognition of their petition than to say he would consider reform in religion "according to the known laws of this Kingdom."[37] The missionary zeal of the Covenanters, however, would not be shaken and they instructed the Privy Council, in January 1643, with impressing on the King the supreme necessity of

---

34. A.G.A., p. 66.
35. Ibid., p. 66.
36. Watt, op. cit., p. 65.
37. R.P.C., 2nd series, VII, p. 332.

establishing uniformity in religion in the three Kingdoms.[38] In March 1643, the King replied to the Commissioners of the Church of Scotland that they were mistaken in thinking that England desired to overthrow Episcopacy in favour of Presbytery.[39] Loudoun and Henderson thereupon hastened to visit Charles in Oxford and advised him that he risked Scottish intervention on the side of Parliament unless he agreed to unity in religion.[40] But in a Declaration to the Scottish people in May 1643, Charles made it abundantly clear, so that the Scots could no longer escape his meaning, that he rejected their plan for church reform.[41] Quite soon afterwards offers of aid were made by the Scots to Parliament, and on July 18th the two Houses resolved to send Commissioners into Scotland to negotiate a treaty of assistance. On August 7th the English Commissioners arrived.

The English would have preferred a civil league, but the Scots insisted on a religious bond which when drawn up was called the Solemn League and Covenant. The heart of the Covenant is perhaps best expressed in the first clause which stated that both Parliaments would endeavour to preserve the Reformed Religion in the Church of Scotland and reform religion in England and Ireland "in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, according to the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches."[42] This phrase no doubt meant for the Scots conformity to their own Presbyterian system. Another important clause declared that the King's person and authority was to be preserved which may sound a little inconsistent as they were about to take up arms against him. This apparently contradictory statement, however, is made somewhat clearer by the qualification that

---

38. Ibid., p. 378
39. Rushworth, op. cit. V. p. 461
40. Donaldson, Scotland: James V to James VII, p. 331.
41. Rushworth, op. cit. V, p. 463.
42. Ibid., p. 478.

to be loyal to the King meant first "having before our Eyes the Glory of God, and the Advancement of the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."[43] In other words, according to the Scots, the crown rights of the Redeemer alone could guarantee "the Honour and Happiness of the King's Majesty."[44] It was not treasonable, therefore, to oppose Charles; they simply desired to bring him out of spiritual darkness into light for his own good and benefit.

The 'league' or 'civil' part in contrast to the 'biblical' or 'covenant' part is expressed in the final clause where it stated that each party will "assist and defend all these that enter this League and Covenant."[45] The Covenant closes with a confession of sin which states that they had not endeavoured to receive Christ into their hearts, nor walked worthy of him in their lives. Each subscriber was, therefore, called upon to amend his life, and "each one to go before another in the example of a real Reformation."[46]

On August 17th the first text of the Solemn League and Covenant was passed by the General Assembly and later the same day by the Convention of Estates as a basis of an alliance between Scotland and the English Parliament. Baillie tells us that when it came before the General Assembly "it was receaved with the greatest applause that ever I saw any thing."[47] The English accepted it, with a few minor alterations, on September 25th, and then in November the military aspects of the alliance were agreed upon.[48]

---

43. Ibid., p. 478.
44. Ibid., p. 478.
45. Ibid., p. 479.
46. Ibid., p. 479.
47. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 90.
48. Rushworth, op. cit. V, p. 475.

(2)The Westminster Assembly.

On June 12th, 1643. two months before the Solemn League and Covenant was drawn up, the English Parliament appointed an Assembly of one hundred and twenty divines and thirty laymen to consult for the regulating of the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and that the reform be according to the Word of God, and be in nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other reformed churches.[49] The Assembly met at Westminster, in King Henry VII's Chapel, July 1st,1643. The Scots were invited to send representatives, and on August 19th the General Assembly gave commission to five ministers,Alexander Henderson, Robert Douglas, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Baillie and George Gillespie, and three ruling elders, the Earl of Cassilis, Lord Maitland and Johnston of Wariston "to repair unto the Assembly of Divines and others of the Church of England. . .for the setling of the so much desired union of the whole church in one forme of church government, one Confession of Faith, one common Catechism, and one Directory for the Worship of God."[50]

The Scottish Commissioners arrived in the middle of August to find the Assembly involved in the revision of the Thirty-nine Articles, a task which it never completed. The English Parliament interrupted this discussion, when it had got no further than the sixteenth article, requiring the Assembly to begin work on the subjects of Church Government and the Directory of Worship. These instructions by Parliament are indicative of its control over the Assembly which had its members nominated, Chairman appointed, procedure set, work proposed and results revised by the same body.[51] The means of Parliamentary control was through a special

---

49. Ibid., p. 337.
50. A.G.A., p. 88.
51. Rushworth, op. cit., V, p. 338.

committee, known as the Grand Committee, which was made up of representatives from both Houses, certain Clergy and the Scottish Commissioners.[52] The Scots may have disliked such governmental direction, but as members of the above committee it did give them the opportunity to examine critically the whole work of the Assembly.

The Scottish Commissioners were permitted to sit in the Assembly itself with the privilege "upon occasion to give their advice in points debated."[53] They also served in the three Assembly Committees which prepared the proposals for discussion, and sometimes they were the sole persons appointed to a task, such as the drawing up of a Directory for both sacraments.[54] "We are prettie bussie," Baillie writes home with some justification, as "we sitt daily from nyne till near one; and afternoone till night we are usuallie in committees. Saturday, our only free day, is to prepare for Sunday. . .Judge what time we have for letters, and writting of pamphletts, and many other business."[55] The Scots were deeply involved in the duties related to their commission, and, as we shall see, they were to impress upon the work of the Assembly a distinctive Scottish stamp.

The majority of the Assembly probably favoured the settlement of a Presbyterian form of government, but English Presbyterianism was not established on such firm ground as its counterpart in Scotland. William Campbell calls it an amorphous 'Presbyterianism', as much an anti-prelatic reaction as anything else.[56] The Scots, therefore, had the monumental task to mould this vaguely Presbyterian group into accepting their ideal model. But this undertaking was further complicated by the opposition of two strong parties in the Assembly: the Erastians and the Independents.

52. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 110.
53. Ibid., p. 110.
54. Ibid., p. 140.
55. Ibid., p. 244.
56. William M. Campbell, The Triumph of Presbyterianism, (Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1958), p. 103.

The Erastian controversy began in the Assembly with the debate about the Pastor's power to judge who was to be admitted or excluded from the Lord's Table, and who was to be excommunicated.[57] Selden, a lay representative and political lawyer, asserted that there was no such censure as excommunication in scripture and that it needed, therefore, the consent of the civil power.[58] Those who supported this position in the Assembly were few in number, but as they had the backing of Parliament they were in fact a powerful minority. George Gillespie, for the Presbyterians, argued the contrary position declaring that it was the prerogative of the Church alone to exercise such a disciplinary function. In the course of the debate the word 'Erastian' was introduced by Gillespie after one Erastus, a 16th century Swiss-German theologian, who denied the Church had the right to use the discipline of excommunication. As used by Gillespie, however, the term had a wider meaning to denote the doctrine of the supremacy of the State in all ecclesiastical affairs. The matter of excommunication, therefore, became the centre around which the broader controversy of spiritual freedom versus state control revolved.

Gillespie's arguments prevailed in the Assembly which then petitioned Parliament in August 1645, to accept the divine right of the Church alone to excommunicate. Parliament was incensed with this unexpected turn of events and promptly rejected the recommendation, and publicly rebuked the Assembly with breach of privilege. Nevertheless, the Assembly refused to be browbeaten on this matter as can be seen when it passed, again with Scottish prompting, chapter thirty of the Confession of Faith

---

57. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 129.
58. Ibid., p. 129.

which stated: "The Lord Jesus, as king and head of his church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate."[59] And it was also the duty of these church-officers, according to the Confession, to discipline offenders by admonition, suspension from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and by excommunication.[60] Parliament condemned, as expected, this chapter along with chapter thirty-one on Synods and Councils. We may say, however, that the strong anti-Erastian stand of the Assembly was a triumph for the Scots who were the leading proponents in the debate.

The other controversy which threatened the effectiveness of the Assembly for the Scots was the matter of 'Toleration' or the complete religious freedom of the individual which was supported by those known as the Independents. These men were for the most part Calvinist in theology which to begin with endeared them to the Scots who called them "friends and gracious men" and "most able men, and of great credit."[61] But, to the horror of the Scots, they rejected, in favour of congregationalism, every hierarchical system of church government including Presbytery which, as Baillie tells us, they considered as some kind of "strange monster".[62] The Independents also championed, in opposition to the Scots, the right of every individual to interpret the Bible for himself without regard to ecclesiastical authority. The consequence of these principles, the Scots readily understood, would result in a multiplicity of sects. There would be no authoritarian church court or courts to control the schisms or to

---

59. John MacPherson, The Westminster Confession of Faith, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958), p. 158.
60. Ibid., pp. 160 - 161.
61. Rutherford, op. cit., p. 618. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 117.
62. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 117.

defend the fundamentals of the Christian faith.[63]

The Independents in pursuit of their policy of 'Toleration' harassed the Scots and their Presbyterian allies, drawing them into long debates, practically over every matter raised in the Assembly.[64] They spoke out against the Scottish usage of a Psalter and the singing of Paraphrases; they at one point reasoned against the use of all Directories which Baillie rightly interpreted as an attempt to turn the Assembly upside down as this was one of its primary tasks;[65] they objected to the Scottish custom of the minister kneeling in the pulpit; they rejected the Scottish mode of receiving communion around a table, and here the Scots, touched on something they consider crucial, were quick to react by condemning the Independent celebration of the sacrament as very irreverent.[66] It was, however, over the question of ordination, whether it be performed by the local congregation or by a higher court of the church, that finally brought matters to a head between them. Ordination was indeed an important issue because, if the Scottish position was accepted, it meant there was an ecclesiastical body or court above the local congregation. Thus it

63. The Scottish position on the matter of the right of the individual to interpret the Bible may be best expressed in the words of John Calvin who in the Preface to the 'Institutes' writes: "Although Scripture contains a perfect doctrine, to which one can add nothing, since in it our Lord has meant to display the infinite treasures of his wisdom, yet a person who has not much practice in it has good reason for some guidance and direction, to know what he ought to look for in it, in order not to wander hither and thither, but to hold a sure path, that he may always be pressing toward the end to which the Holy Spirit calls him. Perhaps the duty of those who have received from God fuller light than others is to help simple folk at this point, and as it were to lend them a hand, in order to guide and help them to find the sum of what God meant to teach us in his Word (John T. McNeill (ed.), Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 1, p.6)."

64. Robert Baillie explains the delaying tactics of the Independents as follows: "These men hes retarded the Assemblie long twelve moneths. This is the fruit of their disservice, to obtaine really ane Act of Parliment for their tolleration, before we have gotten anything for Presbytrie either in Assemblie or Parliament (Baillie, op. cit, II, p. 230)."

65. Ibid., p. 123.

66. Ibid., p. 148.

was while debating this question that the Scots began to speak of an open schism with the Independents, and that they feared from now on they would have to deal with them as open enemies.[67] The Assembly once again, however, as in the Erastian debate, sided with the Scots, and passed the proposals on ordination to their satisfaction.

It was now clear to the Scottish Commissioners that they could count on support from the Assembly, but, as far as Parliament was concerned, they realised, its favour would be conditional, not on arguments and debates, but on the success of their army. The importance of military victories in influencing Parliament was plainly evident when, shortly after the Scots occupied Newcastle, a delay they had been experiencing in the Assembly was quickly overcome by letters to both Houses from their triumphant countrymen in the north.[68] Again in May, 1645, when progress was slow, Baillie writes: "If the Lord will be pleased to uphold our armie, I believe we shall close all Church-affairs shortly according to our mind, and easily call in the wantonness of the Sectaries."[69] But, unfortunately for the Scots, military defeats rather than victories were forthcoming. Thus we may imagine their despair over the series of brilliant royalist victories in Scotland won by Montrose. As Baillie puts it: "Our spirits are deeplie wounded within us, and broken, by what we hear from tyme to tyme from dear Scotland."[70] Montrose, however, was eventually defeated at Philliphaugh on Sept. 13th, 1645, but not before, to the great humiliation of the Scots, a considerable part of their army had to be recalled to Scotland. These military setbacks inevitably hindered

67. Ibid., p. 168.
68. Ibid., p. 242.
69. Ibid., p. 270.
70. Ibid., p. 304.

their function in the Assembly and reduced their influence with Parliament.

The work of the Assembly, however, moved slowly to completion, and for the most part to the satisfaction of the Scots. They saw the four points of uniformity to which they were committed, one form of church government, one Confession of Faith, one common Catechism and One Directory of Worship completed in the Assembly and, apart from the important point of church government, accepted with few alterations by Parliament. The Directory of Worship was approved by Parliament on January 3rd, 1645, and by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland one month later on February 3rd.[71] The purpose of the Directory, as explained in the Preface, was not for the sake of novelty or to disparage the first Reformers, but "that we may in some measure answer the gracious providence of God, which at this time calleth upon us further reformation. . . and withal give some public testimony of our endeavours for uniformity in Divine Worship, which we have promised in our Solemn League and Covenant."[72] The Scottish Commissioners, however, did not find everything in the new Directory to their liking,[73] and they wisely cautioned the General Assembly that if "uniformitie in everything is not obtained in the beginning, let it not seem strange."[74] The Directory as a whole, however, was cast in a Scottish mould.

---

71. A.G.A., pp. 115 - 116.
72. Thomas Leishman, The Westminster Directory, (Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1901), p. 13.
73. Thomas Leishman mentions a few of the liturgical changes accepted by the Scottish Church: "After Westminster, our clergy laid aside the Common Prayers and Scripture of the reader's service. . .Now they began their pulpit duty by giving out of the psalm which in earlier days had marked the close of the reader's service. . .Other distinctive usages, on which the older Scottish churchmen set much value, had to be sacrificed to the prejudices of the extremer Puritans and their sympathizers in Scotland. Some of these were omitted by tacit concurrence, as the saying of the Apostles' Creed by sponsors, and the singing of the ascription of glory to the Holy Trinity at the end of psalms. The Scottish Assembly openly required that the minister's private devotions in the pulpit, before beginning service, should be discontinued, as a concession to the English (Thomas Leishman, op. cit., p. xviii)."
74. A.G.A., p. 112.

Next, the Confession of Faith was laid before Parliament on November 20th, 1646. It did not receive overall approval. Chapter thirty on 'Church Censures' and chapter thirty-one on 'Synods and Councils', as mentioned earlier, were condemned, and objections were raised against certain expressions in chapter twenty-four on 'Marriage and Divorce'; otherwise it was found acceptable. The reception of the Confession in Scotland was complete and unanimous. When the General Assembly met in Edinburgh in August 1647, the Confession was found by the Assembly "to be most agreeable to the Word of God, and in nothing contrary to the received doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of this Kirk."[75.]

The third in the four point plan for uniformity was the Catechism. This was accepted wholeheartedly by the General Assembly which met in July 1648. The Larger Catechism was received without amendment and described in such favourable terms as "a rich treasure for increasing knowledge among the people of God."[76.] The Shorter Catechism was also well received, but, excellent as the Assembly believed it to be, it was thought to be too long, and too hard for the common people and children. The Assembly arranged, therefore, to have it revised in order to shorten it and make it clearer.[77.]

---

75. Ibid., p. 158.

76. Ibid., p. 168.

77. Baillie, op. cit. III, p. 59.

The Westminster form of church presbyterial government, the fourth point in the quest for uniformity, was approved by the General Assembly on February 10th, 1645, but, to the great disappointment of the Scots, the English Parliament consistently refused to accept it. Parliament, by March 1646, went as far to propose a Presbytery, according to Robert Blair, "in a way of their own, which indeed was not Presbyterian government."[78] The 'way of their own' was to have a General Assembly subordinate to Parliament, and a set of civil courts in every shire to which the congregational eldership would be subject.[79] The City of London, in the meantime, acting independently from both Houses, set up a Presbytery according to the Westminster model, but this example made no difference to the attitude of Parliament. As late as January 1647, Baillie mentions that the model of church government approved by the Assembly "yet sticks in the hands of the Houses."[80] Parliament compromised, but never accepted the Assembly's recommendation for the settling of Presbyterianism. Parliament's reticence on this matter, we suggest, was due mainly to the military situation: the success of Cromwell's New Model Army increased the influence of the Independents, and this combined with the disastrous defeats of the covenanters by Montrose drastically if not permanently crippled the Presbyterian position in England.[81]

---

78. A.G.A. p. 121.
79. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 357.
80. Ibid, III, p. 1.
81. After the Covenanters once again had been defeated by Montrose, this time at Alford, in Aberdeenshire, July 2nd, 1645, and the Scottish army in England remained inert watching the critical developments in Scotland, Baillie explains the consequences in London: "As yet our armie here hes done nothing: if its credit be not relieved with some successfull action quickly, the clamors of this people will arise against it. Cromwell's extraordinar success, makes that partie here triumph (Baillie, op. cit. II, pp. 302 - 303)."

If the Scots were not completely successful in their dealings with Parliament, the same cannot be said about the Westminster Assembly where they were triumphant. Their influence was out of all proportion to their numbers, they succeeded in convincing the Assembly to accept, almost unconditionally, Scottish standards in worship, theology and church government.

C. The Engagement.

Although the Scots were well satisfied with the work of the Westminster Assembly, their hope of ecclesiastical uniformity was being dashed by the rise of the Independents who, because of the success of the new Model Army under Oliver Cromwell, were with increasing regularity controlling English politics. The Scots felt betrayed by Parliament which, by March 1646, began to quarrel openly with the Scottish Commissioners in London.[82] Equally unsatisfactory to the Scots was the length of the war which by the beginning of 1646 still seemed interminable. Meanwhile, the Scottish army was ill paid, its needs inadequately furnished, and Scotland's obligation to England had jeopardized her security at home from Montrose.[83]

While the alliance was thus under considerable strain, the King, through the machinations of the French diplomat Jean De Montereul, delivered himself up to the Scottish Army at Newark, near Newcastle, in May 1646.[84] Charles received a slim welcome from the Scots; he was not honoured by the local mayors as was the custom, nor was he given too much freedom.[85] Nevertheless, the Scots believed that the King in their hands was of great advantage to them: "it makes them (the Independents) madd," Baillie writes, "but all good people are very joyful of it."[86] The joy of the Scots can be explained because they had been led to believe that the King would agree to the establishment of Presbyterianism in the three Kingdoms.[87] Charles was not long in Newcastle, therefore, before both national Parliaments asked him to swear to and sign the Solemn League and Covenant,

82. Robert Blair, op. cit., p. 181.
83. Army of the Solemn League and Covenant, op. cit., p. xviii.
84. The reason for the French interest in Scotland was, as explained by Montereul, that a victorious Scotland could be later used by France as a power to oppose England. See S.H.S., Correspondence of Jean De Montereul, (Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1898 - 99), 1st series, 29, 1, p. 17.
85. Ibid., p. 194 - 195.
86. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 370.
87. Montereul, op. cit., 1, p. xx.

abolish Episcopacy, and that the reform of religion according to the above Covenant be settled by act of Parliament.[88] Charles, however, evaded a direct answer. According to Chancellor Loudoun he "had not given a present assent to the Propositions, yet he had not in his answer refused them."[89] The Scots correctly interpreted the King's hedged reply as a refusal. Several notable Scottish divines, including Alexander Henderson whom Charles favoured most of all, tried to reason with the King, but he kept insisting that he could not abolish Bishops.[90] The Scots, however, were just as resolute to do nothing for the King unless he agreed to establish Presbyterianism in England.

Meanwhile, as the Scots continued to press Charles to change his mind, a transaction between Scotland and the English Parliament was being worked out regarding the removal of the Scottish army out of England, and another about the disposal of the King's person.[91] The Scots believed they were faced with the alternative either to take Charles back to Scotland or deliver him to the English Parliament. Baillie expresses well their predicament: "The King's madness hes confounded us all: we are in a woefull evill taking; we know not what do doe, nor what to say."[92] And in another letter, the same day, he writes: "The King's answer has

88. Rushworth, op. cit. VI, p. 309 - 317.
89. Ibid., p. 332.
90. According to Montereul the arguments brought forward by Charles why he could not abandon the bishops were that "he had been brought up in that opinion; that during the first three centuries. . .there were always bishops; that in the reformation of the English Church, it was very wise to retain what was good of the Romish Church and reject what was bad; that besides, on his accession to the throne he had sworn to maintain them; and that in short, he decided not to abandon them (Montereul, op. cit. I, p. 213)."
91. Montereul said that the surrender of the King gave the English a "horror of the Scots for whom they had formerly only a hatred. They began to show it. . .by their calling them nothing but Jews, people who had sold their King and their honour (Montereul, I, p. 445)." C.V.Wedgwood, however, points out that this reaction unfortunately was misplaced: the transactions, one financial regarding the Army, the other about the disposal of the King, were quite separate (C.V.Wedgwood, The King's War, p.563. London: Collins, Fontana Library, 1966.).
92. Baillie, op. cit. II, p. 385.

broken our hearts: we see nothing but a sea of new and more horrible confusions."[93] The Scots at last reasoned against taking Charles home with them fearing, as they said, that once the King was in Scotland he may in a short time raise such forces as to turn the three Kingdoms into a field of blood.[94] Therefore, after the differences were settled with Parliament about the amount they were to receive for the arrears due their army, they evacuated Newcastle on January 30th, 1647, leaving Charles a prisoner in the hands of the English Parliament. In February the King was brought by Parliament to Holmby in Northamptonshire. Bellievre, the French Ambassador, was perhaps right about Charles when he commented: "Presbyterianism is the only thing that could save him, it is the only one that he cannot be induced to grant."[95]

The Scots must have quickly questioned the wisdom of handing Charles over to the English. First, Parliament seemed as far away as ever from settling Presbyterianism as it came more and more under the influence of the Independents and the Army. For example, on June 14th, 1647, Sir Thomas Fairfax in the name of the army under his command demanded that Parliament be purged of delinquents.[96] Then, two days later, eleven members were impeached on orders from the army.[97] But perhaps the Scots greatest fear, now that the King was out of their hands, was that he might make an agreement with the Independents. In order to forestall such a possibility the Scots entered into secret talks with Charles which led to the Engagement, a treaty concluded on December 26th, 1647, between the Scottish Commissioners, Lauderdale, Lanark and Loudoun, and the King.

---

93. Ibid., p. 386.
94. Rushworth, op. cit., I, p. 334.
95. Montereul, op. cit., I, p. 364
96. Rushworth, op. cit. VI, p. 564.
97. Ibid., p. 570.

By the Engagement the King promised that "so soon as he can with freedom, honour and safety be present in a free Parliament" he would confirm the Solemn League and Covenant by Act of Parliament in both Kingdoms.[98] The provision was included, however, that those who were unwilling would not be obliged to subscribe. The King also promised to establish Presbyterianism for three years, but his own household were not to be hindered from using the old form of Divine Service. In the meantime, the Westminster Assembly was to continue for three more years, with twenty of the King's nominees added to it along with those sent from the Church of Scotland, after which the King and the two Houses of Parliament would determine how the church government be established. On this basis the Scots agreed to send an army into England to aid Charles.

The consequences of the Engagement were considerable. First, it hastened the outbreak of the Second Civil War. Secondly, it split Scotland into two irreconcilable camps. "Scotland," Gordon Donaldson writes, "was a country divided as it had hardly been since Pinkie, a hundred years before."[99] A majority in the Scottish Estates were in favour of the Engagement; the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland strongly disapproved.[100] The position of the clergy was simply that the King should not be restored to the exercise of his power until he signed the Solemn League and Covenant,[101] and this meant in turn that no alliance of any kind should be entered into with those who serve the policy of the King.[102] The Scottish Parliament, however, according to the terms of the Engagement, proceeded to raise an army to invade England. The clergy

98. S.R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625 - 1660. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), p. 347.
99. Gordon Donaldson, Scotland: James V to James VII, p. 337.
100. A.G.A., p. 166.
101. Rushworth, op. cit., VII, p. 1032.
102. Montereul, op. cit., II, p. 433.

did all in their power to delay recruitment: they preached against its raising and appointed fast days "in order to pray to God that he may give other intensions to the ministers of this State."[103] The General Assembly also declared that not one of their order would accompany the army.[104] Perhaps we should note, however, that the clergy's opposition to the Engagement did not mean support of the Independents whom they declared would be punished by God, but without requiring help from man.[105]

The Scottish army, inadequately prepared and lacking in discipline, was defeated by Cromwell near Preston on April 19th, 1648. This defeat provided the opportunity for the radical Covenanters to gain power and Argyle and Loudoun, the latter of whom had relinquished his association with the Engagers, set up a new government with which Cromwell, when he arrived in Edinburgh on October 4th, formed a somewhat unnatural alliance, the Engagers being now more obnoxious than the Independents. The new government moved quickly against the supporters of the Engagement by passing the Act of Classes on January 23rd, 1649. This Act divided the Engagers into three categories: the prominent Engagers who accompanied the army into England and supported Montrose's rebellion; lesser Engagers who had been censured as royalists; and those who had shown sympathy with the Engagement or at least had not protested against it. Those of the first class were displaced from public office for life; the second for ten years; and the third for five years. And readmission to public office was to be preceded by examination by the Church.[106]

---

103. Montereul, op. cit. II, p. 518.
104. Ibid., p. 531.
105. Ibid., p. 386.
106. A.P.S., VI, p. 2, pp.143 - 147.

There was, however, a prospect of national unity immediately after the King's execution. The Scots had strongly objected to Charles' trial and pressed the English Parliament to make no decision about his fate without their participation.[107] All of Scotland, therefore, was genuinely shocked at the news of Charles' death and speedily rallied to support the new King, Charles II. However, the stimulus to union caused by the King's execution quickly dissipated when the rigid Covenanters systematically carried out a purge of all Engagers from the Scottish army. Wariston helped to silence criticism of this policy by giving examples from the Old Testament of Jehosophat, Asah and Amasiah, and by arguing that if they repented of their vows against the Engagement God would turn against them.[108]

The defeat of the Scottish Army by Cromwell at Dunbar, September 3rd, 1650, did not, however, mellow the attitude of the radical Covenanters who complained that the purging of the Engagers from the Army had been too lax. They further maintained that the main reason for their disastrous defeat was due to the new King's lack of sincerity in the Treaty of Breda, wherein he agreed to sign the Solemn League and Covenant, and his keeping company with Scottish and English Malignants and Engagers and "these things were looked upon as hie provocations before the Lord,

---

107. Rushworth, op. cit. VII, p. 1399.

108. S.H.S., Johnston of Wariston's Diary, 1650 - 1654. (Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1919), 2nd series, 18, p. 11. -- Sir George Radcliffe, writing from the Hague on 28th August, said, "the ministers have lately purged their army of 5000 profane persons, and Loudoun went about the camp to tell them it was the cause of God, and not to be maintained by wicked men; such they account all Cavaliers, Montrosians, and such as engaged with Hamilton, that is to say, their best soldiers." And according to Sir Edward Walker, "the Committee commanded away all Malignants and Engagers, and so lessened the army of three or 4000 of the best men, and displaced all officers suspected, concluding then they had an army of saints, and that they could not be beaten (Ibid., p. xvi)."

threatening no lesse than the destruction of us and our King."[109] But, as Preston had helped the radicals, the Engagers now became day by day the more influential party after Dunbar, and by June 1651, they were strong enough to have the Act of Classes rescinded. This rupture caused by the Engagement destroyed what hope remained for the Scots to establish Presbyterianism in England. The split survived virtually unhealed until the Revolution of 1688, but even then a few Presbyterians remained loyal to the Covenanting ideals of the 1640's such as the Cameronians who continued as a separate church until near the beginning of this century.

---

109. Scottish History Society, General Assembly Commission Records, 1650 - 1652. (Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1909), 1st series, 58, p. 97.

Conclusion.

A. Outline of events after 1649.

After Cromwell's victories at Dunbar and Worchester, Scotland settled into the iron grip of the Lord Protector who proceeded to divest the Scottish Church of much of its authority. Most importantly, the General Assembly was abolished in 1653. Cromwell, however, did not interfere with the internal workings of the Scottish Church such as the Kirk Session and Presbytery so that the Church continued to flourish. "It was the Lord's wonderful condescension and kindness to his own in Scotland," Robert Blair writes, "that, while they were under the feet of usurpers, the Lord sweetened the bitterness of their bondage, by blessing the labours of his faithful servants in the ministry."[1.]

The Church of Scotland, however, remained discontented with Cromwell's rule. The desire for national independence and dislike of Cromwell's religious toleration were the two main factors that kept the Church and Nation complaining. And it was these things that contributed finally to Scotland willingly submitting to the return of Charles II in 1660. They were, however, unknown to themselves, welcoming back absolute and arrogant monarchy. It was not long, therefore, before conflict broke out once more between Episcopacy, through which Charles hoped to silence and control the Church, and Presbytery. The struggle was essentially the continuation of the old conflict between Andrew Melville and James VI and I, and Alexander Henderson and Charles I.

---

1. Robert Blair, op. cit., p. 323.

All the elements of the past struggle were present and played their part.

The conflict was finally resolved in favour of the Presbyterians on the accession to the British throne of William and Mary. Then in 1690 by the Revolution Settlement Presbyterianism was re-established. It was after this date that Episcopacy ceased to be a party within the Church of Scotland and became a distinctive and nonconformist denomination. Meanwhile, Presbytery in Scotland, despite its many schisms and disruptions throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, remained the dominant ecclesiastical system as it has to the present day.

B. Why the attempts at church union ultimately failed.

As we have seen in the period covered by this paper there were serious attempts at church union, first, by James I and Charles I to impose an episcopal system on the Scottish Church to bring it into line with the Church of England, and then by the Covenanters in the 1640's to establish Presbyterianism in England. We use, however, the term "union" with some reservation because the attempts to bring the two churches together varied in degree from simply promoting a reasonable similarity between them to establishing outright organic union.

James I's efforts towards a closer union of the two national churches were intended, we believe, to go no further than seeking what we might call a federal union. That is to say, there would exist between the two churches a high degree of co-operation and agreement on what would be considered essentials while each would retain its national identity and autonomy regarding peripheral differences. James' aim was to change the Scottish Church sufficiently so that such a meaningful relationship with the Church of England would be possible. And to this end, we must admit, he had a reasonable kind of success which was climaxed when the Scottish bishops in 1610 journeyed to London to receive the laying on of hands in the correct manner according to the English usage.

This act of consecration, however, in no way compromised the Church of Scotland which was considered by the officiating Anglican clergy as a foreign and independent church.[2] The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, therefore, refrained from taking part in the ceremony in case

---

2. Supra., p. 38.

their participation should imply that the Church of Scotland was under the authority of either of their sees. This precaution was necessary to satisfy Scottish scruples and we believe that James was also content or at least wise enough always to consider the Scottish Church as separate from the Church of England.

The promotion of union between the two national churches begun by James and towards the end of his reign left dangling, because of the furore over the Five Articles of Perth, was taken up again by Charles I. We believe that Charles was much more concerned about the welfare of the Scottish Church than was his father. James used the episcopate as a tool to control the Church of Scotland while Charles, not unaware that the Royal Supremacy could be better maintained by this kind of ecclesiastical system, believed over and above this that episcopacy was beneficial and essential to the life and work of the Church itself, and he genuinely desired to see the Scottish Kirk, through the episcopacy, be the Church in all its fullness as it was in England. Charles, in other words, to a far greater extent than James, wanted all the features of the English Church to be visible in Scotland as well. We would hesitate to say, however, that Charles, any more than his father before him, thought it wise or proper for the Church of Scotland to lose its national identity.

The same, however, cannot be said about Archbishop Laud. He did not believe as his predecessor in office did in 1610 that the Church of Scotland was a foreign and independent Church.[3] He instructed the Archbishop of St. Andrews how to go about his business and was instrumental in having the Bishop of Dunblane removed from his diocese to Aberdeen for

---

3. Supra., p.59.

refusing to use the English Liturgy. He also through the same Archbishop called for changes to be made in the Scottish Canons of 1636. Hugh Watt quotes a modern Scottish Episcopal historian who said about the introduction of these same canons that the Scottish Church "was no more consulted than an African tribe would be today by a body of foreign missionaries engaged in their conversion."[4.]

Laud also played a leading role in the formation of the new Scottish Service Book. It is true, however, as Gordon Donaldson points out in challenging the criticism that the Service Book was 'Laudian', that certain concessions were made in order to satisfy Scottish opinion, but, apart from the omission of the Apocrypha,. it is difficult to view any of them as major accommodations to the Scottish point of view and we would seriously question whether some could be thought of as concessions at all. For example, the introduction of the King James Bible can hardly be considered a concession to Scottish opinion, as Donaldson claims, since it was already being extensively used in England. It is also difficult to regard an apology for introducing English usages into the Scottish Church, mentioned in the Preface of the Service Book, as a concession, as Donaldson does, especially when the purpose was to soothe English feelings.

Archbishop Laud was made a member of the Scottish Privy Council and it is unlikely that he found this appointment inappropriate. And yet, it is hard to imagine a Scottish churchman being given a similar appointment to the English Privy Council. We might say that for Laud the union of the crowns meant that the Scottish Church was now a domestic Church, and thus subject to Canterbury. It seems to us, therefore, that changes in the

---

4. Watt, op. cit., p. 6.

Scottish Church promoted by Charles were for Laud just a prelude to a unilateral organic union or, we might say, take over by the Church of England.

The kind of union with the Church of England contemplated by the Scottish Covenanters was quite similar to the federal type union attempted by King James. The Church of England was expected to be organized so as to bring it into nearer union with the Presbyterian system as established in Scotland by 1638 and in line with the best of the Reformed churches abroad. Both churches were to share one order of church government, one Directory of Worship, one Catechism and one Confession of Faith, but their national identities were to remain.

All these attempts at union achieved a measure of success, but ultimately they ended in failure. The Scottish undertaking to establish Presbyterianism in England we may say triumphed in an intangible way as far as the conclusions of the Westminster Assembly were concerned, and succeeded to a small extent practically when the City of London adopted the Westminster formula for Presbyterian church government. In the end, however, their efforts at union failed just as decisively as did Charles' and Laud's endeavours in Scotland after the introduction of the Service Book in 1637.

The only real success was that achieved by King James. His policy was to make headway step by step and although he was unscrupulous in his methods in that ministers were imprisoned and banished, promises made and broken, it was a well managed scheme so that a goodly number were persuaded to accept each successive stage in the process. And

besides this many of the old forms were retained such as the Kirk Session and Presbytery, and worship up to 1614 was left untouched. But what he accomplished by 1610, when the Glasgow Assembly accepted episcopacy, began to crumble in the later part of his reign and finally collapsed altogether in the hands of his successor.

Now we would like to suggest a few reasons why these endeavours at church union ultimately failed. Let us begin by considering James' and Charles' attempt to bring the Church of Scotland into closer union with the Church of England. It seems to us that one of the prime reasons for their failure in the long run to establish episcopacy in Scotland was that, unlike Presbyterianism, it ran contrary to the traditional concept of the monarchy in Scottish society. We can begin to understand something of the Scottish attitude to the crown by looking at the famous Declaration of Arbroath which was drawn up and signed on April 6th, 1320, six years after the Battle of Bannockburn. This was the Scottish Declaration of Independence. Scotland for centuries before had been a free land, but by 1320 it had just gone through an all out English assault on its independence.

It is interesting to note that the Declaration, which was addressed to the Pope, was not drawn up in the name of the King but by "the community of Scotland" who, in spite of their love for Bruce, made it plain, and in his presence, that if need be they would depose him in order to maintain their nation's freedom. The most dramatic part of the Declaration reads:

> To him we are bound. . .and to him as the saviour of our people and the guardian of our liberty, are we unanimously determined to adhere; but if he should desist from what he has begun, and should show an inclination to subject us or our Kingdom to the King of England. . .then we declare that we will use our utmost effort to expel him from the throne, as our enemy and the subverter of his own and of our right, and we will choose another King to rule over us, who will be able to defend us; for as long as a hundred Scotsmen are left alive, we will never be subject to the dominion of England. It is not for glory, riches or honour that we fight, but for that liberty which no good man will consent to lose but with his life. 5.

Two hundred years later George Buchanan said much the same, declaring that kings had been chosen originally by the people and were continued in office through their will, that kings could not override the law, and that those who broke it could justly be called to account and in the last resort put to death. John Knox also defended the civil and religious rights of the people against absolute monarchy as can be seen in the following interview with Mary Queen of Scots:

> 'What have ye to do,' said she, 'with my marriage? Or what are ye within this Commonwealth?' 'A subject born within the same,' said he, 'Madam. And albeit I neither be Earl, Lord, nor Baron within it, yet has God made me (how abject that ever I be in your eyes), a profitable member within the same.' 6.

T. M. Lindsay is perhaps not far off the mark when he says modern democracy came into being in that answer. 7.

Andrew Melville, by his doctrine of the 'Two Kingdoms', also tried to limit the power of the monarch by the exclusion of the king as king in ecclesiastical affairs. Samuel Rutherford in Lex rex (The Law and the King), which was published in 1644, again challenged the absolute power of the monarchy, declaring that the Lord and the people

5. Quoted in Nigel Tranter, "A Letter from Scotland" in The Scots Magazine, (January, 1970) p. 365.
6. Knox, op. cit., II, p. 83.
7. Lindsay, op. cit., II, p. 304.

gave the crown covenant-wise, that is, on condition that the king rule according to God's law, but should he break the covenant he would no longer be considered a lawful king. In such a case the people "are presumed to have no King. . .and. . .to have the power in themselves, as if they had not appointed any King at all."[8] Throughout Lex rex Rutherford sought historical evidence for his views by referring to Scottish law, confessions of faith, the heritage of the Reformed Church and to such writers as John Major and George Buchanan. There is little doubt Rutherford believed that he was making no radical departure in his work from well established national tradition.

English tradition in regard to the authority of the crown, on the other hand, was notably different from that of Scotland. The crown in England was absolute. The Reformation in England came not from 'below' as in Scotland, where in fact it was a revolution in defiance of the crown, but from 'above' and its cardinal principle was the Royal Supremacy. About the position of the crown in the English Reformation, Gregory Dix writes:

> Men died - publicly and in horrible ways - for not conforming to every fresh change of the royal conscience. It was made treason to speak against the Royal Supremacy, even in private conversation; and spies and 'agents provocateurs' were employed in men's houses to delate them. . .All preaching was forbidden, except to those clergy specially licensed by the archbishop, and he saw to it that they were all propagandists for the Supremacy. It was the nearest approach to the 'regime' of the Gestapo that England has ever enjoyed.[9]

And in England it was the business of the church to build up a strong and effective Royal Supremacy. Cranmer, for example, was faithful

8. Quoted in J.F. Maclear, "Samuel Rutherford: The Law and the King" in George L. Hunt (ed.), Calvinism and the Political Order, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), p. 76.
9. Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1943), p. 680.

throughout his career to the idea of the clergy as the king's ministers of religion to his subjects, as his judges were the king's ministers of justice to them.[10.]

Such a concept of the monarchy was intolerable to the Scots. Thus the ecclesiastical system that bolstered the Royal Supremacy, namely the episcopate, was equally out of place in Scottish society. It is true that a moderate episcopacy introduced by King James enjoyed for a time a kind of success but, because of its association with royal absolutism in a country that was much more egalitarian than England, we believe it really had very little chance from the beginning. There is much to be said for W. Law Mathieson's dictum that "episcopacy in Scotland (from 1560) has never been more than a government superimposed for political purposes on a Presbyterian Church."[11.]

Another important factor for James' and Charles' failure in the long run to bring Scotland into closer union with the Church of England was that they underestimated the strength of Scottish nationalism and its close ties with the concept of a National Church. The Scottish Church had always been involved in the struggle for independence. The time honoured name, 'Ecclesia Scoticana', or Church of Scotland first appears about 1174 as a result of a dispute between the Scottish Church and the Archbishop of York who claimed to be their ecclesiastical superior. The expression became official when Pope Celestine III in 1192 declared 'Ecclesia Scoticana' to owe obedience to the Apostolic See of Rome "whose special daughter she is, none intervening."[12.] This gave

10. Ibid., p. 680.
11. Quoted in Stewart Machie, Episcopacy in the Post-Reformation Scottish Church, (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, The Porch Library, n.d.), p.18.
12. Quoted in R. Stuart Louden, The True Face of the Kirk. (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 1.

what the Scots desired, that is, independence of an English Archbishop. Then during the Scottish War of Independence, the Church of Scotland again revealed its nationalism when it declared itself in support of Bruce in spite of his excommunication by Rome. And it is interesting to note that the Arbroath Declaration of Independence was drawn up by a churchman - Bernard de Linton, Abbot of Arbroath.

The Church of Scotland as a force for national unity and independence was not altered at the Reformation, and if anything its influence in this regard was increased as it became an outlet for public opinion. A.F. Pollard makes an interesting comparison between the English Parliament and the Church of Scotland at this time seeing them both as the peoples' platform. "The Reformation in Scotland," he writes, "is the triumph of the Church; and the Church is vastly stronger after than before the change, because it made itself the mouthpiece of the nation, and fulfilled a function abandoned by the Parliament."[13] And John Burleigh makes much the same observation when he says that the sermons from Scottish pulpits could be just as important as Acts of Parliament.[14]

It was inevitable, therefore, that any changes in the ecclesiastical system would produce national repercussions. Thus when innovations were being introduced to bring the Church of Scotland into line with the Church in England conflict on a national scale was virtually unavoidable. The Scot, according to Gordon Donaldson, often feels, and with some justification, that England, although she lost the war at Bannockburn,

12. A.F. Pollard, Factors in Modern History, (New York: G.F.Putman's Sons, 1907), p. 191.
13. John Burleigh, The Scottish Reformation and the idea of a National Church, (Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Publications, 1960), p. 13.

has been altogether more successful in winning the peace, and that although she failed to conquer Scotland in a military sense she subverts Scottish nationality in the cultural and economic sphere and would willingly do the same in the ecclesiastical.[15] And episcopacy, unfortunately for its advocates in Scotland, had the label of being peculiarly English and was distrusted as an instrument for putting an end to the independence of the Scottish Church. This charge may have been subject to exaggeration, but in the main the criticism was justified.[16] For example, Alexander Henderson's chief complaint about the new Service Book had to do not so much with its contents, but with the fact that the Church of Scotland as a free and independent church had been completely ignored when it was introduced. In this he was right. The fear of anglicising the Scottish Church through the episcopacy was fatal to the latter's reception in Scotland.

It has to be taken into consideration, however, that there was some support in Scotland for the mild form of episcopacy introduced by King James. And yet, we doubt its roots went very deep, especially when we remember that even a moderate and probably typical minister like Robert Baillie by 1638 at the Glasgow Assembly, although he approved

15. Donaldson, Scotland: Church and Nation through Sixteen Centuries, p. 114.
16. An interesting example of anglicising of the Kirk of Scotland was the introduction of the English word Church as an alternative for the old native word Kirk. The difference between the two nouns became with many a symbol of the difference between the two ecclesiastical systems. Note, for example, Calderwood's History of the Kirk of Scotland and Spottiswoode's History of the Church of Scotland. Drummond of Hawthornden, who adopted an attitude of a plague on both of your houses, wrote the following metrical epigram on the issue:

> The Scottish Kirk the English Church do name;
> The English Church the Scots a Kirk do call:
> Kirk not Church! Church and not Kirk ! O shame !
> Your kappa turn chi, or perish all (R.P.C., 1st series, VIII, P. xvii).

of episcopacy as a legitimate system of church government, did not hesitate to say it had no place whatsoever in the Church of Scotland.

A practical implication for today arising out of Scottish Nationalism, which is still a vital force, is that it is unlikely that any church will be able to claim the allegiance of the majority of Scotsmen unless it can claim to be in some sense the 'national church'. And the Episcopal Church in Scotland especially will find it difficult, as it has in the past, to win the loyalty of most Scotsmen as long as it designates itself as part of the 'Anglican Communion'.

A third factor that contributed to the failure of James and Charles to establish a lasting episcopacy in Scotland was the innovations they made in worship. This aroused serious opposition in every quarter of the church since, unlike alterations in church government, changes in worship directly affected everyone. The controversy in James' reign was centered round the Five Articles of Perth. In reference to these articles Thomas Leishman makes this pertinent comment:

> To the ordinary Scotsman of that day it was of secondary moment who presided at synods and ordinations in the cathedral town, which he seldom entered, or that the bishop rode up the High Street among the Estates of Scotland when the Parliament met, or was in some vague way associated with the lawyers in registering the Laird's will. To himself the Church was what it had always been. The Kirk Session and Presbytery met and did their old duties in the old way; the worship and the doctrine were the same that he had known from childhood. But his composure was disturbed when he was told that orders had come from London that he must kneel like an Englishman beside the holy table, instead of sitting there as Christ's guest. 17.

---

17. Quoted in Wadsworth, op. cit., p. 136.

Episcopacy, of course, was seriously undermined because of these unwelcome innovations in worship. "I perceived that Prelacy itself was the worst of all corrupt ceremonies" was the verdict of one contemporary minister.[18] James in the last years of his reign, however, did not enforce the Five Articles and at his death they were pretty well ignored throughout the church. Charles, on the other hand, neglected to profit by his father's experience and proceeded to instigate further changes in worship which eventually led to the explosion of 1637 and one year later to the complete overthrow of episcopacy.

One of the lessons that we may learn from these attempts to alter the traditional pattern of worship of the Church of Scotland is that worship is perhaps the most sensitive part of a Church's life as it affects everyone and, as a result, any scheme to change the liturgy requires great caution and prudence. This may be good advice to a minister going into a new church where the Order of Service is not necessarily fixed and in a wider sphere to communions which are today seeking organic union.

The three factors given above help to illustrate to a certain extent our fourth and final reason why James' and Charles' attempt to reorganize the Scottish Church eventually failed, namely, that both sovereigns were insensitive to the character of Scottish society. For James, however, this did not mean that he was unaware of Scottish aspirations and characteristics; he understood the 'stomach' of his Scottish subjects, but he disregarded their traditions in order to promote

---

18. Robert Blair, op. cit., p. 15.

the royal prerogative in Church and State. Clearly, however, towards the end of his reign his judgement of Scottish opinion began to wane as is demonstrated by his inept handling of the Five Articles of Perth controversy.

This deterioration in his understanding of Scotland, which affected his plans for the Scottish Church, was due no doubt to his long absence from his northern kingdom. He promised his Scottish subjects in 1603, before leaving for England, that he would visit them every three years. He returned, however, on just one occasion fourteen years later in 1617. Besides this the English Court provided an altogether different atmosphere from what he had experienced in Scotland. In England he was no longer liable to be insulted by Presbyterian ministers or liable to the noblemen's 'coup' as when he was kidnapped by the Ruthven Raiders. But this did mean to the disadvantage of both nations that there was now no check, as there had been in Scotland, to royal absolutism. As Ian Henderson put it with considerable truth:

> In their (the Scottish ministers) public and private lecturing of the monarch they could be rude, tactless and diplomatically inept. They could also sometimes be right and they could always act as a brake on royal megalomania. 19.

Thus James after the union of crowns was surrounded by flattering noblemen and bishops and this, combined with his absence from Scotland, was probably responsible for many of his mistakes in the later part of his reign.

Charles, though born in Scotland, had been raised in England and we doubt that he ever really understood his Scottish subjects. He never

---

19. Ian Henderson, Power Without Glory. (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1967). p. 67.

possessed any of his father's wisdom in handling Scottish affairs, but he was a better man than his father in that for him more than the royal prerogative was involved in the changes he sought for Scotland. During the Bishops' Wars, therefore, there was for Charles a real sense of betrayal by the Scottish people whose welfare he had genuinely tried to promote. We believe the Scots sensed something of his sincerity and therefore were inclined to blame his advisers. And in this regard they were to some extent right especially when we remember that Charles' chief mentor on Scottish ecclesiastical matters was Archbishop Laud and the only Scottish peers who were really close to Charles were men who, like Hamilton and Lennox, were anglicised, or who, like Roxburgh and Ancram, were courtiers, not likely to tell their King unpleasant truths.

Charles also had a sense of integrity that what he believed in should not be open to compromise. And in this he resembled the Covenanters themselves. Alexander Henderson, the greatest architect of the Covenant, recognised in Charles a faith, mistaken no doubt, but as earnest as his own. The King's integrity confronted him with a problem he could not solve. Their cause to establish Presbytery at the expense of Episcopacy was righteous, but the King, a righteous man, would not accept it. Charles is, therefore, no doubt to be admired as a man of principle. However, the consequences of such principles separated him all the more from his Scottish subjects. It is said that the early Christians suffered on the whole more under the truly religious Roman emperors such as Marcus Aurelius because he and other emperors like him

took their religion seriously. It was not unlike that in regard to Charles and the Scots.

We turn now to consider some of the reasons why the Scots failed to establish Presbyterianism in England. No doubt the obvious reason that comes to mind is Cromwell's ultimate victory over the King, Parliament and the Scots. Nevertheless, other factors, perhaps a little less evident, were also involved and these we will look at. First of all, the Scots miscalculated the degree of enthusiasm in England for their type of Church government. Practically and as a matter of fact only the City of London accepted Presbyterianism. However, the English Parliament, after initially encouraging the Scots, eventually turned it aside as did the rest of England. The Scots' error was that they forgot that the citizens and the English divines they met in London in 1641, who were wholeheartedly in support of Presbyterianism, did not speak for the whole nation.

The second reason for the Scots lack of success was their failure to convince Parliament to adopt the Westminster formula for the settling of Presbyterianism. Parliament's rebuff was due mainly to the rise of the Independents and the shortcomings of the Scottish army. The English Parliament was for the most part Erastian as can be seen by its criticism and censure of the anti-Erastian conclusions of the Westminster Assembly, and by the kind of Presbyterian system it suggested which was an arrangement of church courts subjected to State control and which for the Scots was no Presbyterian system at all.[20.]

20. Supra., p. 112.

Parliament, however, could no doubt have been persuaded to accept Presbyterianism to the satisfaction of the Scots if, as Baillie rightly understood, the Scottish army could gain the upper hand in the Civil War. It was, however, the Independents, who detested the Presbyterians, that carried the day militarily while the Scottish army came to grief at the hands of Montrose at home and, in the meantime, remained impotent in England. Thus it was the Independents, rather than the Scots, who by the summer of 1647 had gained control of Parliament.

While there is little doubt that Parliament resented the pressure of the Independents, it was nevertheless the strength of the Independents that reinforced Parliament's Erastian position against the Scots. Referring to the Independents A.C. Pollard said that "their main concern was to uphold the supremacy of the State over the Church, whether the Church was Catholic, or Protestant, Anglican or Presbyterian. They were Erastians, pure and simple."[21] The Scots by 1647 could with considerable justification have said parodying Milton's words, that Parliament and the Independents together was Absolute Monarchy writ large.[22] With both Houses, therefore, coming more and more under the influence of the Independents, the Scottish hopes of Parliament settling a Presbyterian system were virtually eliminated.

The third factor that put an end to the Scottish attempt to establish Presbyterianism in England was the division amongst themselves brought about by the Engagement. Since this treaty has been dealt with fairly

---

21. Pollard, op. cit., p. 197.

22. Milton's maxim was that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large."

extensively in Chapter III, it is sufficient to say here that it caused a split in the ranks of the Covenanters, "our woeful rupture", as one contemporary put it, which divided their nation as it had never been split since Pinkie about a hundred years earlier. It was the death blow to the Scottish dream of establishing Presbyterianism in England.

Before closing this section we would like to comment on what has struck us in particular about this study. Much of the Church's troubles in all these attempts at church union revolved to a great extent around relations between Church and State. The conflicts and wars of the Reformation if anything consolidated the view of the nation as a politico-ecclesiastical system. And this was true of the Reformation in Scotland as elsewhere. The Scottish reformers desired a real connection with the State. The Scottish Confession of Faith (1560), for example, stated, as well as members of the church being ordained to proclaim the Word of God, political rulers were also ordained as ministers of God for the administration of the political order.[23] Andrew Melville, who introduced Presbyterianism into Scotland, no doubt supported this part of the Confession but, on the other hand, he parted company from the first reformers when the same Confession maintained that the State should also undertake the reformation of the church.[24] Melville's attitude was that necessary changes in the ecclesiastical order must be made with spiritual force and not with political. In other words, it is not the concern of the State to reform the church. Thus the Presbyterians opposed every attempt to impose church union from above or by political means. Similarily when the Presbyterians sought to establish their own ecclesiastical system in England,

23. Knox, op. cit., p. 271.
24. Ibid., p. 271.

they looked to Parliament to preserve the church's freedom. It was, therefore, unacceptable to the Scots when Parliament proposed a Presbyterian system of their own consisting of a series of church courts all of which would be controlled by the government.

Our study of the various attempts at church union has impressed us as having brought to the forefront the principle of the State allowing complete religious freedom to the church. Perhaps today for those within the Reformed Church tradition this is obvious, but it was not completely obvious to Knox nor was it all that commonplace in the years covered by this study. The struggle for the church's spiritual independence in fact continued in Scotland down the years resulting in a series of secessions and separations until finally in 1929 the vast majority of the Presbyterians reunited within the established Church of Scotland. The uniting Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, however, made it clear, as had Melville three centuries earlier, that spiritual freedom belonged to them as their inherent possession. The State, in other words, did not give the church the right to exercise spiritual freedom, the civil authority was simply asked to acknowledge this fact which in 1929 it did.

It seems to us that one of the lessons we may learn from our study for today is that any ecumenical discussions between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England would profit from settling to begin with the principle of the church's inherent right for complete religious liberty. The ultimate failure of the efforts to bring the two national churches closer together in the first half of the 17th century might thereby be averted.

Bibliography

Books

Baillie, Robert, Letters and Journals, Edinburgh: Lawrie & Co., 1841.

Baptism in the Church of Scotland - An Historical Survey to 1843, Church of Scotland Commission on Baptism, Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1958.

Blair, Robert, The Life of Robert Blair, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1848.

Burleigh, John, The Scottish Reformation and the idea of a National Church, Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Publications, 1960.

Calderwood, David, The History of the Kirk of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1845.

Calvin, John, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

Calvinism and the Political Order. ed. George L. Hunt, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

Campbell, William M., The Triumph of Presbyterianism, Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1958.

Correspondence of Jean De Montereul, 1645 - 1648, ed. J.G. Fotheringham, S.H.S., Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1898 - 1899.

Dickinson, W.C., Scotland from earliest times to 1603,London: Nelson, 1961.

Dix, Gregory, The Shape of the Liturgy, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1943.

Donaldson, Gordon, Scotland, Church and Nation through sixteen centuries, London: S.C.M. Press, 1960.

Donaldson, Gordon, Scotland: James V to James VII, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1965.

Donaldson, Gordon, The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954.

Forbes, John, Certaine Records Touching the Estate of the Kirk, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1846.

Frere, W.H., The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, London: Macmillan, 1911.

Garbett, Cyril, Church and State in England, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950.

Gardiner, S.R., History of England, 1603 - 1642, London: Longmans, 1895.

Henderson, Ian, Power Without Glory, London: Hutchinson, 1967.

John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, ed. W.C. Dickinson, London: Nelson, 1949.

Johnston of Wariston's Diary, ed. G.M. Paul, S.H.S., Edinburgh: T. & A., Constable, 1911.

Johnston of Wariston's Diary, 1650 - 1654, ed. D. Hay Fleming, S.H.S., Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1919.

Laud, William, Works, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1853.

Leishman, Thomas, The Westminster Directory, Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1901.

Lindsay, T.M., A History of the Reformation, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956.

Louden, R. Stuart, The True Face of the Kirk, London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

MacPherson, John, The Westminster Confession of Faith, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958.

Maxwell, William, An Outline of Christian Worship, London: Nelson, 1946.

McMillan, William, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1560 - 1638, London: James Clarke & Co., 1931.

Machie, Stewart, Episcopacy in the Post-Reformation Scottish Church, Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, n.d.

Melville, James, Autobiography and Diary, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842.

Memorials of Montrose and His Times, Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1850.

Miscellany X, S.H.S., Edinburgh: T. & A., Constable, 1965.

Orr, Robert, Alexander Henderson, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919.

Pollard, A.F., Factors in Modern History, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1907.

Reformation and Revolution. ed. D. Shaw, Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1967.

Rothes, John Earl of, Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland, Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1830.

Row, John, The History of the Kirk of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842.

Rutherford, Samuel, Letters, Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1891.

Scot, William, Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland, Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1846.

Shaw, Duncan, The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, 1560 - 1600, Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1964.

Spottiswoode, John, History of the Church of Scotland, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1851.

Sprott, G.W., Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI, Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1851.

Sykes, Norman, Old Priest and New Presbyter, Cambridge University Press,1957.

The Book of the Universal Kirk: Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1839.

The Warrender Papers, ed. Annie I. Cameron, S.H.S., Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1932.

Trevor-Roper, H.R., Archbishop Laud, London: MacMillan, 1940.

Watt, Hugh, Recalling the Scottish Covenants, London: Nelson, 1946.

Wedgwood, C.V., The King's Peace, London: Collins, Fontana Library, 1966

Wedgwood, C.V., The King's War, London: Collins, Fontana Library, 1966.

Willson, D.H., King James VI and I, London: Cape, 1963.

Minutes and Records.

Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638 - 1842, Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing and Publishing Co., 1843.

Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625 - 1660, ed. S.R. Gardiner, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.

General Assembly Commission Records, 1650 - 1652, ed. Rev. James Christie, S.H.S., T. & A. Constable, 1909.

Historical Collections, ed. John Rushworth, London: 1721.

Papers relating to the Army of Solemn League and Covenant, ed. C. Sanford Terry, S.H.S., Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, 1917.

Source Book of Scottish History, eds. Gordon Donaldson and W.C. Dickinson, London, Nelson, 1954.

Statutes and Constitutional Documents, 1558 - 1625, ed. G.W.Prothero, Oxford: University Press, 1954.

The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, eds. T. Thomson and C. Innes, Edinburgh, 1814 - 1875.

The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, ed. D. Masson, Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1887.

Journals and Periodicals.

Hurstfield, J., "Church and State: The task of the Cecils" in Studies of Church History, London, 1965.

Tranter, Nigel, "A Letter from Scotland" in The Scots Magazine, January, 1970.

Unpublished PhD Thesis.

Wadsworth, G. Campbell, The General Assembly of 1610, University of Edinburgh, 1930.